OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 EDWARD VII., 1909-10

VOL. XCIV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JANUARY TO THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF FEBRUARY, INCLUSIVE.



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1909 10

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 17, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HALIFAX AND ESQUIMALT NAVAL YARDS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the answer which I promised to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) last Thursday in connection with a paragraph which he read from a statement in the London 'Times,' purporting to have been made by Sir Wm. White. The answer is as follows:

With reference to the matter of the Halifax and Esquimalt naval yards, referred to by the hon. the leader of the Opposition yesterday, and with particular reference to the observations of Sir William White, published in the London 'Times' of November 19 last, regarding the condition of these naval yards, the reply, so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned, is as follows:—

Whatever action has been taken with regard to the armament and works at Esquimalt, has been taken with the full cognizance and concurrence of the Imperial War Office and in furtherance of their policy at the time the fortress was taken over.

With respect to the information which Sir William White stated that he had received that the naval base at Halifax was in a similar condition to that at Esquimalt, the only remark which can be made is that the fortress at Halifax is believed to be in at least as efficient a condition at the present moment, both as regards armament and works, as it was when taken over from the imperial authorities.

So far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, the following information has been received from that department:—

With regard to Esquimalt, the naval yard at that station is still under the imperial authorities. The machinery is lying idle, but well looked after. The same is to be said as regards the buildings. The station has, however, been reduced to two gun vessels and one survey ship.

With regard to Halifax, the machinery in the workshops is looked after, though the parts are not assembled for working.

MANITOBA FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask the minister who is in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, when the report of the fisheries commission that has been working in Manitoba is going to be brought down? It was promised by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it would be brought down just as soon as printed. It was printed, I understand, eight or ten days ago, or perhaps earlier, and under those circumstances I would expect to have it brought down. I asked the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the other day and he told me he would attend to it at the earliest possible moment. That was three or four days ago, and I would like to know if it has yet been attended to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The report has been prepared, and I understand has been signed by two of the commissioners. It has been sent to the third commissioner, Mr. Metcalfe, to ascertain if he concurs in it, and if so, for his signature. As soon as the department is informed whether Mr. Metcalfe has signed the report or has signified his assent, the report will be brought down and communicated to my hon. friend.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to ask for further information. I am afraid the acting minister is not up to date in regard to this question. I understand the commissioners' report has been printed and has been signed by the three commissioners. Why has it not been brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Mr. Speaker, the acting minister is absolutely up to date, although he is something of a novice in the office. The report has been printed, and printed as if the three commissioners had signed it, but it has been ascertained that the third commissioner has not yet signed it, and it has been sent to him to ascertain whether he concurs in it in its entirety, or whether he dissents in any particular. As soon as we have this information, the report will be brought down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. May I again ask what is the harm in presenting that report as

printed and as presumably signed by the three commissioners? I would like to see it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend is not up to date. It is not the report until it has been signed.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not wish to discuss the matter, but I think the First Minister is labouring under a misapprehension. The report has been signed by three commissioners, there was a fourth commissioner, the present Mr. Justice Metcalfe, who investigated Lac du Bonnet, and he resigned. The report has been signed by the other man, Mr. Hugg, who was appointed in Mr. Metcalfe's place, and the report as printed is signed by the three commissioners: Mr. Hugg, Mr. Read and Professor Prince.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The printed report is signed amongst others by Mr. Metcalfe supposing he would agree. It is understood he does not agree, and the report is held until it is ascertained whether he agrees or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were there three commissioners or four?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So far as I know there were three. If my hon. friend will come to my office to-morrow afternoon, I will be glad to show him the report.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a request made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) last Thursday for information regarding a return that was laid on the table of the House. The reply is as follows:

An account was received on the 21st of October 1907, for $321.70 from Mr. Ernest Raynor for expenditure made by him in connection with the St. Peter's surrender. This account was forwarded to the Indian agent, Mr. J. O. Lewis, who was informed that the department had no knowledge of the authority under which the expenditure was made and he was asked for a report thereon. The agent was further told that if he was unaware of the circumstances in connection with the expenditure, it would be well for him to submit the matter to His Honour Chief Justice Howells who had carried on certain preliminary negotiations with regard to the taking of the surrender and who might be able to inform him as to the authority, if any, under which the expenditure was made by Raynor. No report has, however, been received from Mr. Lewis in regard to this matter.

Mr. BRADBURY. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the return brought down regarding St. Peter's reserve does not contain the instructions to Chief Justice Howell, nor does it contain his report. I wish these documents to be laid on the table and also the advertisements in the newspapers regarding the sales of land, and which the minister, when in committee, promised he would have brought down.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

QUESTIONS.

LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What is the amount of work in repairs or new work to be done by carpenters on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien?
2. What is the amount for machinists?
3. Will any moneys be paid for new lumber out of the $22,907.78 still left to Lachine canal work?
4. What is the total estimate for wages for carpenters, machinists, labourers and carters for the balance of the fiscal year, in detail?
5. Has the department any knowledge of the treatment of the carpenters on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien, and have any complaints been received by the department? If so, of what nature?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. It is impossible to give any definite figure. A few of the Lachine canal carpenters have been retained during the winter. They are engaged on one pair of lock gates and completing the gate lifter and will be kept on as long as the appropriation will allow, the work being performed by them, being less urgent, than some other work now being done.

2. There is considerable work to be done by machinists, blacksmiths and assistants towards preparing gears for the electric operation of the valves of the supply, regulating and waste weirs, &c. These appliances must be installed while the canal is unwatered next April. It is not possible to state the amount of work to be done by these men, as should it be found necessary, in order to have the weirs equipped in time, to lay off the carpenters, other machinists would have to be employed.

3. The balance of the appropriation for repairs on the 31st December, 1909, was $10,535.41, not $22,907.78, as stated in the question. No lumber or timber will be paid for out of this balance.

4. Approximately as follows:

Carpenters	$2,300 00
Machine shop	2,000 00
Blacksmith's shop	600 00
Carters	800 00
Labourers	3,100 00
	$8,800 00

The balance, or $1,735.41, will be used in purchasing iron, steel and brass castings, bolts, nuts, tools, &c.

5. The department has not received any complaints in regard to the treatment of carpenters on the Lachine canal under the supervision of Denis O'Brien.

REPRESENTATION OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any representations been made by the government of Nova Scotia or any person on its behalf to this government, looking towards the securing of an amendment to the British North America Act, whereby the representation of the province of Nova Scotia in this House as at present, may be maintained by said province?

2. If so, when were such representations made, and what action has been taken thereon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No written representations have been made, but the subject has been discussed between the Dominion and provincial ministers.

BAIT SUPPLY.

Mr. JAMESON:

Have any complaints reached the Minister of Marine and Fisheries regarding the difficulty experienced by Canadian fishing vessels in obtaining a supply of bait in the Bay of Fundy, owing to the practical monopoly enjoyed by the American sardine packers in respect to the purchase of herring taken in weirs in waters contiguous to the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick? If so, what action does the minister intend to take to relieve the situation, and when will he act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; but inquiry did not reveal that there was any difficulty on the part of Canadian fishermen obtaining bait at the prices the fishermen were at the time receiving from sardine buyers.

FARM WEEDS.

Mr. FOSTER:

What has been paid for each edition of 'Farm Weeds,' published by the Department of Agriculture for preparation and printing, respectively, what number of each edition was published, by whom printed, and how was each edition distributed?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

First Edition.

Amount paid for preparation....	$ 116 95
Amount paid for printing..	26,770 49
	$26,887 44
Number published (English)..	20,000
Number published (French)..	5,000

Printed by Toronto Lithographing Company, (through King's Printer). Distribution was made free to public libraries, educational institutions and agricultural societies. Three copies being given to each member of the Senate and the House of Commons. Of course the amount for preparation is exclusive of the salaries of the permanent officers of the department who were engaged in the work. The cost of the work of these officers was not divided from their ordinary work.

Second Edition.

Not yet complete. 12,000 copies in English and 3,000 copies in French are being printed by Mortimer and Company, Ottawa, (through the King's Printer). Distribution to be made by the superintendent of stationery, in single copies at nominal price of $1.

Distribution free to public libraries, universities and colleges of agriculture. Three copies given or to be given to each member of the Senate and the House of Commons.

Amount paid for preparation....$	362 58
Amount paid for printing on account, 10,000 copies.....	13,990 60
Total.....$	14,353 18

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any figures as to the contract for printing the whole lot?

Mr. FISHER. No. I think it is printed by numbers, not a lump contract.

Mr. FOSTER. This is only what is paid to date?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might find out what the whole cost is.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

LANDS ALONG LINE OF GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What lands have been sold along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway since the sales shown in sessional paper No. 69?

2. To whom sold?

3. At what prices?

4. For what purposes?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. N.E. 21, 53, 7, W. 5; N.W. 21; S.E. 21; S.W. 21; S.W. 27, 53, 8, W. 5; N.E. 27, 53, 9, W. 5; N.E. 2, 54, 16, W. 5; N.W. 2; S.E. 2; S.W. 2; N.E. 32, 53, 16, W. 5; N.W. 32; S.E. 32; S.W. 32; N. 15, 53, 17, W. 5; N.W. 15; S.E. 15; S.W. 15; N.E. 16; N.W. 16; S.E. 16; S.W. 16; S.E. 21, 53, 17, W. 5; S.E. 22; S.W. 22.

2. The Grand Trunk Pacific Town and Development Company.

3. These Crown lands were sold at $3 per acre, the government, in addition, to receive one-fourth of the net proceeds of the sales,

rentals or other dispositions of all lands comprised within such lands.

The complete schedule of such lands is attached herewith. See answer No. 1.

4. For townsite purposes.

DREDGE 'INDUSTRY.'

Mr. FOSTER:

1. When was the tug 'Industry' reported as ready for work in 1900?

2. What was the total cost to date, including scow repairs and scow purchase?

3. When did she commence work, and where?

4. What has she been doing since, and where is she now?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman means the dredge 'Industry'.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but she has had a hard tug to get along.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 3. The dredge was ready and commenced work at Toronto on 7th June, 1909.

2. $223,990.84.

4. Worked at Toronto from 7th June to 26th June, at Port Burwell from 26th July to 6th October, and from 11th October to end of season at Port Stanley, where she is at present.

CANADIAN COINAGE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What is the amount of Canada's copper, silver, and gold coinage, respectively, for each of the last ten years, and the cost and profit of each year's coinage, counting the interest and depreciation of the cost of the Canadian Mint at 6 per cent, and the cost of maintenance and staff for the years during which it has been in operation?

2. How much United States silver, and at what cost, has been deported each year, and what is the estimated amount of United States silver current in Canada from year to year?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. As this question covers a period of ten years the answer could more conveniently be given by way of a return and if the hon. gentleman will make a motion I will expedite the bringing down of the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I make the motion.

PORT COLBORNE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What is the total amount spent to date on the Port Colborne works by the Department of Railways and Canals and the Public Works Department, respectively, and are any further sums necessary to complete?

2. What are the main improvements made and the cost of each?

3. What was the cost of elevator and the equipment of the same, respectively, and what its capacity?

Mr. OLIVER.

4. When was the elevator first used?

5. How much grain was handled there in 1908 and 1909, respectively, and what is the rate per bushel for transfer?

6. What was the cost of operating the equipment in 1909, calendar year?

7. What was the total revenue received in 1908 and 1909, respectively, from all sources?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

For the Department of Public Works:

1. (a) $905,047.82. (b) The works, as they stand at present, are complete; but, eventually, the superstructure of the inner portion of the western breakwater, which was built of wood, will require to be renewed in concrete at an estimated cost of $250,000. Representations have been made by the Department of Railways and Canals as to the advisability of constructing a spur from the western breakwater to the extremity of the Welland canal, which would cost in the neighbourhood of $350,000; the matter is under consideration.

2. Construction of breakwaters, $905,057.82.

3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. To be answered by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. GRAHAM:

. Total spent to date on Port Colborne improvements:

Expenditure Railways and Canals Department only:

1901-2	$202,881.72
1902-3	197,242.95
1903-4	124,296.01
1904-5	239,488.12
1906-7	287,586.16
1907-8	90,031.82
1908-9	60,333.16
1909-10	58,566.17
Total	$1,700,946.73

The amount necessary to complete works now contemplated, not including elevator, $104,000.

2. The main improvements made are: Deepening the harbour and canal entrance to 22 feet, cost $870,602; building docks and piers, $816,571; building elevator siding, cost, $36,707.

3. (a) $817,734.94. (b), 800,000 bushels with provision for increase to 2,000,000 bushels, when justified by sufficient business.

4. October 6, 1908.

5. 1908, 365,033 bushels; 1909, 1,747,550 bushels; 1908, rate per bushel, ⅜c.; 1909, rate per bushel, ½c.

6. $19,310.24.

7. Revenue, 1908, $1,409.04; revenue, 1909, $9,477.00.

COST OF SURVEYS, WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. FOSTER:

What amount has been spent in surveys to ascertain the most desirable route for the possible new or enlargement of the old Wel-

land canal, and are these surveys completed? If not, what amount is estimated to complete?

Mr. GRAHAM:

(a). About twenty thousand dollars have been spent in surveys to ascertain the most desirable route for the possible new, or enlargement of the old Welland canal.

(b). These surveys are not completed. It is estimated that twenty-five thousand dollars will be required to complete them.

EXPENSES RE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSTER:

What has been the cost for engineering, examination, reports, preparation of plans and specifications incurred, since August 29, 1907, in connection with the Quebec bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM:

(a). The total cost of the commission in connection with the inquiry into the collapse of the Quebec bridge was $31,765.44.

(b). The total cost to December 31, 1909, of the board of engineers in preparation of plans, etc., was $123,469.03.

WHARF AT CANNING.

Mr. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government built a wharf at Canning? If so, when was it finished, and what is the total cost?

2. Has a wharfinger been appointed therefor? If so, when and at what salary?

3. Have any tolls been collected thereon? If so, to what amount each year?

4. Is there a building upon this wharf? If so, by whom erected and at what cost?

5. Is there a public road to this wharf?

6. What vessels touch regularly at this wharf, and how often during the year?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Yes, a wharf is being built affording accommodation for railway as well as general traffic on the Habitant river; total length, including railway and highway approaches along the river bank, about 900 feet; the sum of $2,000 being still required to complete work now under construction. (b) Total cost, $33,867.33. The site was contributed by the riparian owners free of charge.

2 and 3. No. When the work is finished and the spur line of the Dominion Atlantic railway installed thereon, a wharfinger will be required.

4. Yes, a small temporary warehouse built by the Minas Basin Steamship Company at an approximate cost of $100.

5. Yes. Three public roads and an open private way connect this wharf with Main street, and another public road connects it with the settlements to the southward. Besides this, the Dominion Atlantic railway has undertaken to build a spur line or railway from its line to and along the water front of the wharf.

6. A subsidized steamer owned by the Minas Basin Steamship Company runs regularly to St. John, New Brunswick, and Minas Basin ports. Large vessels load potatoes for the West Indies; apples and other products are loaded for various ports and return cargoes received.

KENSINGTON WHARF, DESBARATS.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Is the Kensington wharf, near Desbarats, West Algoma, the property of the government of Canada? If so, when was it acquired, how much was paid for it, and from whom was it purchased?

2. How much land was conveyed with the wharf to the government?

3. If the wharf was not purchased by the government, is there any contract in writing between the owner thereof and the government with regard to the use of the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. No.

3. No.

LOBSTER FISHERIES, DIGBY COUNTY.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many lobster cannery licenses for Digby county were issued during 1909, and of these which were renewals?

2. To whom were same issued, and what is the address of each licensee?

3. How many canneries were operated under said licenses?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. All renewals.

2. A. Boutilier & Company, Centreville; E. W. Morehouse, Sandy Cove; L. H. Outhouse, Tiverton; A. F. Saulnier, Meteghan river; Moses Terrio, Meteghan; Ellis Bros, Cape St. Mary's; J. W. Comeau, Comeauville.

3. Six.

APPLICATIONS FOR NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. How many applications have been received from persons desiring to serve on the proposed Canadian navy?

2. For what stations were applications so made?

3. How many applications have been received for each of such stations?

4. Upon whose recommendation and by what system will any such appointment be made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 117.

2 and 3. These applications were for general service.

4. Appointments will be according to regulations to be drawn up as provided by the Naval Bill.

INSTRUCTIONS OF CADETS ON CANADIAN BOATS.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Are there at present any naval cadets or midshipmen receiving instructions on any Canadian government vessel?
2. If so, upon what vessel or vessels is instruction so given, and since when?
3. By whom is instruction given, what is the ordinary station of the instruction on the vessel, and is any extra allowance made in respect to such services as instructor? If so, what allowance?
4. Of what does the course of instruction consist?
5. What are the names, ages, and places of residence of each cadet or midshipman, the date of joining, and by whose recommendation in each case were they shipped?
6. Have any examinations been held? If so, upon what dates, by whom, and what were the results in the case of each cadet?
7. What scholastic standard, if any, is required of cadets when accepted as such?
8. Is any pay allowed such cadets? If so, what is the rate of pay, and how much has been paid to each to date?
9. For how many cadets or midshipmen was accommodation provided when the system was initiated, what is the extent of the accommodation now, and upon what vessels?
10. Was the public informed of the government's intention in this regard? If so, when and by what means?
11. What has been the cost of this branch since its inception?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes.
2. 'Canada' since June 1908.
3. Instruction is given by the officers of the ship in seamanship, and by the seaman's instructor in gunnery. From May to November, 1909, a tutor was paid $35 per month for instruction in mathematics, previously the parents paid for instruction in mathematics.
4. Practical seamanship and ordinary scholastic subjects, with physical training and rifle drill.
5. C. T. Beard, midshipman, 19, Ottawa, January, 1909; J. Barron, 16, Stratford, O., June, 1908; P. W. Nelles, 17, St. Johns, Q., August, 1908; Victor Brodeur, 17, Ottawa, October, 1909; H. T. Bate, 15, Ottawa, October, 1909. These appointments were made on the instruction of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.
6. The officer commanding marine service on each of his visits examined the cadets, and is satisfied as to their progress.
7. None required.
8. $15-$18 per month. Mr. Beard, midshipman, at $18 per month, $209.60; Mr. Barron, cadet, at $15 per month, $277.50; Mr. Nelles, cadet, at $15 per month, $240; Mr. Brodeur, cadet, at $15 per month, $24.50; Mr. Bate, cadet, at $15 per month, $32.42.
9. No special accommodation was provided when the system was instituted; the accommodation now is for five cadets and is upon the 'Canada'.
10. No.
11. Total cost for salaries, tuition and uniforms, $1,324.

NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government purchased any warships since the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909? If so, what warships have been so purchased, and from whom?
2. What is the date and cost of construction of each of the said warships?
3. Have they been struck off the effective list? If so, at what date?
4. What are the details of construction, comprising tonnage, dimensions, &c., of said warships, and what is the armament of said warships?
5. What is the price of purchase of said warships, and on what date and through whom was said purchase or purchases effected?
6. Is the government negotiating for further purchases of ships?
7. Was it agreed at the conference of 1909, that the imperial defence plan adopted should only be carried out after its approval by the colonial parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. No.
2, 3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.
6. Yes. As I stated the other day negotiations are now pending with the imperial government for the purchase of a vessel but these negotiations are subject to the approval of parliament.
7. No.

COLD STORAGE PLANT AT BARRINGTON, N.S.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Was the government assistance given towards the construction of a bait freezer or cold storage plant, at Barrington, N.S.? If so, what is the nature and capacity of the plant, when was it built, and at what cost?
2. From whom was the application received, and by whom signed?
3. What amount, if any, was paid toward construction, and upon whose recommendations?
4. What quantity of bait has been frozen and stored, by years, since built?
5. What quantity of ice has been stored, by years, and to what use has it been put?
6. Has any bonus been paid on bait? If so, what was the amount paid, the date of payment, and upon recommendation or certificate?
7. Is the plant owned or controlled by fishermen? If not by whom is it controlled?
8. Has the operation of the plant proved satisfactory to the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Preliminary assistance was given towards the establishment of a fishermen's bait freezer at Barrington Passage, N.S. It was to have been of about fifty tons capacity. March, 1908.

2. From the Barrington Passage Fishermen's Bait Association, through Mr. Peter MacFarlane, the outside officer of the department in charge of the establishment of such freezers. It was signed by William Duff, Wm. Acker, Gilbert E. Atkin, Elijah Ross, Floyd Ross, Joseph Ross, Moses Atkinson, Charles E. Ross, Samuel P. Ross, Ernest Brown, Horatio Brownnen, Henry Ross, Alfred K. Ross, James J. Ross, Archie Scott, William R. Reid, Barkley S. Reid, Warren Ross, Smith G. Penny, and George E. Kenny.

3. The usual advance of $500 was made to the association, on the recommendation of Mr. Peter MacFarlane.

4. The freezer was never completed.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. No.

7. The provisional directors of the association are William Duff, William C. Acker, Gilbert E. Atkins, Smith G. Penny, and Charles E. Ross.

8. Answered by No. 4.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Upon what class of newspapers or publications mailed out to the United States of America is postage charged and not charged, respectively?

2. What number of newspapers, if any, mailed out to the United States of America is exempted from paying postage, and upon what number is postage charged?

3. When was postage first charged on newspapers going to the United States of America?

4. What discrimination has since been made, if any, as to the class to be charged, when did it become operative, and why was it made?

5. What amount has been paid yearly as postage on daily newspapers and other than daily newspapers, respectively?

6. What reduction in the circulation in the United States of America of the class of newspapers on which postage is charged, has followed the imposition of such postage?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX:

1 and 2. Postage is charged on all classes of newspapers and periodicals addressed to the United States.

3. In the year 1783.

4. No discrimination.

5. No separate account of postage collected on papers addressed to the United States is kept at the Post Office Department. The rates applicable to such papers being the same as those charged on some other classes of mail matter, it would be impossible to make any separation at this date.

6. This department has no statistics relative to the matter for the reasons given in answer to No. 5.

MESSRS. SULLIVAN AND LANGDON.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How much money has been paid by this government from 1896 to the present time to the firm of Sullivan & Langdon, contractors, of Kingston, or to Mr. Sullivan, contractor, Kingston?

2. What public buildings or other public works have been let by contract to either of the above firms since 1896, what was the contract price in each case, and what was the total amount paid to the said contractors in each case?

3. What was the total cost of each building or public work in which either of the above mentioned firms was interested?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion.

ELLIOT BROTHERS AND R. CARSON.

Mr. EDWARDS:

How much money has been paid by this government in each year from 1896 to 1909, both years included, to the firms of Elliot Bros., and of R. Carson, of Kingston, Ontario, for supplies furnished to, or services of any kind performed by the government

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion.

TEULON BRANCH C.P.R., MANITOBA.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. Has the government approved of the extension of the Teulon branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, Manitoba?

2. If so, was such approval made contingent upon the company agreeing to extend the Winnipeg Beach branch northerly by way of Gimli to some point on or near the Icelandic river?

3. If such approval was so contingent, is it the intention of the government to insist on the company extending this branch this year?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. When the government approved of the extension of the Teulon branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, it was made contingent, upon the company agreeing to extend the Victoria Beach railway, northerly by way of the village of Gimli. This agreement has been carried out. The above line is also subsidized for a further distance northerly of twenty- five miles from Gimli to Riverton.

WIRE FENCING, I.C.R.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. Did the Department of Railways and Canals, or the purchasing agent of the Inter-

colonial Railway at Ottawa, at any time during the year 1909 ask for tenders for any wire fencing?

2. If so, were any tenders received for such fencing, and from whom?

3. What were the prices quoted by the said parties tendering for the different kinds of fencing??

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion for return.

WM. PAUL—GASOLINE BOAT.

Mr. TAYLOR:

Has the Department of Public Works purchased from one Mr. William Paul a gasoline boat? If so, what was the price paid, for what service is the gasoline boat required, on whose recommendation was the said boat purchased, who valued said boat, and who fixed the price?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. $3,500.

3. Required for towing purposes and general service in connection with the works of this department in the district of Montreal.

4. On recommendation of Mr. James Howden, General Superintendent of Dredging, and Mr. L. J. Michaud, District Engineer, who examined and valued the boat and considered fair and reasonable the price asked by the owner.

J. B. KAINE—TUG 'WITHERBEE.'

Mr. TAYLOR:

1. Has the Department of Public Works purchased from one Mr. J. B. Kaine, a tug, the 'G. J. Witherbee'? If so, at what price, for what service is the tug required, on whose recommendation was the said tug purchased, who fixed the value of said tug and when was it built?

2. Was there any debt or mortgage on said tug when purchased from Mr. Kaine? If so, to whom was the money paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Authority was given by order in council, December 30, 1909, for the purchase at $12,000, but no payment has yet been made. (b) Required to tend departmental dredges. (c) Purchase recommended by Mr. James Howden, General Superintendent of Dredging, who examined and valued her, with Messrs. Samson and Duclos, government hull and boiler inspectors. (d) built in 1872.

2. (a) Yes. (b) Payment not yet made.

CHIEF JUSTICE DUBUC, MANITOBA.

Mr. A. HAGGART:

1. On what date was the Hon. Joseph Dubuc formerly chief justice of the Court of King's Bench for Manitoba retired from this office?

Mr. WILCOX.

2. What is the cause of the delay in filling the vacancy?

3. Have any representations been made to the government to the effect that the number of cases ready for trial is said to be increasing, that the present judges cannot overtake the arrears, and that the public and legal profession are suffering serious inconveniences?

4. Have any representations been made to the government that the former chief justice as the only judge of French origin on the Court of King's Bench of Appeal, and claims made that the vacancy on the Court of King's Bench should be filled by appointing one of the French speaking people of that province?

5. Is it the intention of the government to recognize such claim in making the appointment?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH: ,

1. Chief Justice Dubuc was not retired from office, but resigned of his own motion. His resignation was received on November 15, 1909.

2. The subject is one for careful consideration.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. In considering the appointment the principal object which the government will keep in view will be the importance in the public interest of securing for the position the best man available—giving due weight in doing so to the natural desire of all classes and languages and creeds to have adequate representation on the Bench in every part of Canada.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all accounts of George Tracy, of Selkirk, against Indians of St. Peter's reserve, Manitoba, now on file in the Department of Indian Affairs here, and of all correspondence of the department in relation thereto.—Mr. Bradbury.

1. For a return showing the name, cost, date of construction, place of construction, and gross tonnage of each of the steam vessels now owned by the Dominion government.

2. The names of those built in Canada.

3. What ones thrown open to Canadian competition.

4. In each case that was open to Canadian competition, the difference between the lowest Canadian tender and the price paid.

5. In each case where a contract was made with a builder for the construction of any of said steam vessels, the month and day when each of said contracts were signed, and when each of said contracts called for delivery of vessels.

6. The price each of the said steam vessels would have cost if the government in each case paid the current Canadian customs duty chargeable on vessels constructed outside of Canada.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a return showing—1. What amount has been annually expended by the govern-

ment since the year 1900 in connection with the Atlantic Fisheries of Canada, apart from sums spent in the fishery protection service and for bounty, in the respective provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec.

2. The amount expended in each of said provinces annually for fishery breeding purposes, dogfish reduction plants, bait freezers, cold storage and salaries of officials, respectively.

3. What other general purposes in connection with the fisheries expenditures were made in such provinces within said period.—Mr. Jameson.

For a return showing the foreign exhibitions in which Canada has taken part since July, 1896, the time and place where such was held, the expenditure thereon by the government of Canada, the persons, not common labourers, who had charge of the same or were employed thereat, the sums paid to such severally under the heads of (a) salary, (b) expenses, and the total cost to the country of each such exhibition; also the amounts received as revenue from the sale of articles or commodities, lumber, buildings and other materials, respectively. The whole statement to be made up in tabular form and the additions of money columns to be made.—Mr. Foster.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

For a return showing the various commissions appointed for all purposes by the government since July, 1896, the person or persons composing the commission and the date of appointment, the purpose for which appointed, the date of completion of the work in each case, and the cost of each under the heads, (a) salary, (b) travelling expenses, and (c) printing report, if any; the word 'Commissions' to include the missions of ministers, single or associated, going on public account to countries outside of Canada.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I am not sure that, in all cases, the expenses of ministers have been subdivided. However, the motion may go, and, as far as possible, we will bring down the return.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF THE SENATE.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved:

That an humble address be presented to His Most Gracious Majesty the King, as follows:—

MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY:

We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, beg leave most respectfully to represent—

That in the year 1867 by Act of your imperial parliament commonly known as the British North America Act, the then existing provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were federally united and formed into one Dominion under the name of Canada, and the constitution of the legislative authority of such Dominion provided for and the nature of its executive government declared, and since the said Act other provinces in British North America have also been federally united to the said Dominion and now form part thereof, with representation in this House of Commons, pursuant to the provisions providing therefor in the said British North America Act and amending, and other, Acts subsequently enacted;

That by the said British North America Act the executive government and authority of and over Canada is declared to continue and be vested in Your Majesty and Your Heirs and Successors, Kings and Queens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and Your Majesty is represented in Canada by a Governor General;

That by the said British North America Act there is also a council to aid and advise Your Majesty, styled the King's Privy Council for Canada, the members of which council are from time to time chosen and summoned by Your Majesty's said Governor General and may be from time to time removed by the said Governor General;

That by the said British North America Act the parliament of Canada consists of Your Majesty, an upper House styled the Senate and the House of Commons, but with powers not to exceed these at the passing of the said Act held and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons and that no such Bill or vote, resolution or address for such appropriation or tax or impost shall be adopted or passed that has not been first recommended to that House by message of Your Majesty's said Governor General in the session in which such Bill, vote, resolution or address is proposed;

That by the said British North America Act it is also provided that where any Bill passed by the House of parliament is presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for Your Majesty's assent, he shall declare according to his discretion but subject to the provisions of the said Act and to Your Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in Your Majesty's name, or that he withholds Your Majesty's assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure, and that where he assents to a Bill in Your Majesty's name if Your Majesty in Council within two years after receipt thereof by the Secretary of State thinks fit to disallow the Act such disallowance shall annul the Act, and that a Bill reserved for the signification of Your Majesty's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until within two years from the day on which it was presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for Your Majesty's assent he signifies to the Houses of parliament or by proclamation that he has received the assent of Your Majesty in Council.

That by the said British North America Act legislatures for the various provinces constituting the said Dominion of Canada are also established, each governed by a lieu-

tenant governor appointed by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council for five years, and whose salaries are required to be fixed and provided by the parliament of the Dominion of Canada and such provincial legislatures are empowered exclusively to make laws in relation to a large number of matters and subjects of great importance, subject to disallowance by Your Majesty's said Governor General in Council within one year, but not in any way subject to consent also by the said Senate;

That in regard to all matters and subjects not within the said exclusive power of the said provincial legislatures it is provided by the said British North America Act, that all laws to be made by the said parliament of Canada must be consented to and passed by both the Senate and House of Commons, before being presented to Your Majesty's said Governor General for assent and the members constituting the said Senate are appointed for life and not subject to election or rejection by the people, and the members of the House of Commons are elected by the people every five years or at any less period at which Your Majesty's said Governor General may dissolve the parliament;

That during the forty years since the said British North America Act has been in force much dissatisfaction has been caused from time to time to Your Majesty's loyal subjects in Canada by the actions of the Senate in regard to matters dealt with by the House of Commons and the rejection of laws sought to be made by the people through their representatives in the House of Commons and passed by the House, and by reason of the heavy expense and burden of taxation placed upon the people to provide for the maintenance of that two-fold system of dealing with the making of laws by the Parliament of Canada;

That in view of the many other provisions heretofore referred to for guarding against and disallowing any ill-advised or improper legislation which might by any possibility pass the said House of Commons, and of the aforesaid dissatisfaction of the people and heavy burden of expense involved and of the great advance made in education by the whole people of Canada since the passing of the said British North America Act, this House is of the opinion that the Senate is no longer required or advisable for the properly carrying on of responsible government in Canada, or safeguarding of Your Majesty's full rights and prerogatives; and that the abolition of the said Senate would greatly conduce to the welfare of the Dominion of Canada and promote the interests of the British empire.

We therefore respectfully pray that the said British North America Act be so amended as to provide for the abolition of the said Senate.

He said: This motion is in exactly the same language as one which I had the temerity to move at the last session of this parliament. I believe, judging by what has transpired in the meantime, that there is a stronger desire on the part of the country now that such a motion should pass than there was then. That is why I feel it my duty to renew the motion this session. As to the conduct of the motion at the last session of this House, I cannot say that it was satisfactory. An hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate at the hour of half past nine in the evening under circumstances which, I thought, did not call for adjournment at that time. But the House was light and the members who were present did not seem to care for the continuance of the discussion at that time, and I did not demur to the debate being adjourned. It was then early in the session, and I supposed that the discussion could be resumed at a later date and the motion disposed of in some way. However, early as it was when the adjournment of the debate took place, the motion was never called on the order paper again, so was not dealt with by the House. I hope that a different action will be taken by the House this session. It is idle to say that the country is now satisfied with the conduct of the affairs with which this motion deals. The petition here proposed is concrete, and if acted upon it means something. The object is to bring about a great change, and a change, I admit, in the constitution. But it is a change that, I believe, is favoured by the vast majority of the people.

At the outset, let me call the attention of the House to the fact that this is not by any means a new agitation. For a couple of decades, at least, the people of this country have been finding fault with the way in which affairs are carried on so far as the second Chamber of this country is concerned. So great was this feeling sixteen years ago that Senate reform was made a plank in the platform in one of the two great political parties just on the eve of a general election. Various and numerous suggestions have been made from time to time since then looking to a remedy, but no two advocates of change seem to agree on any particular plan. All agree that matters as they are, are not right and that the results are not well for the country. All agree that as things have been going on and are going on the actions of the second Chamber —or the first if you choose to call it so; the other Chamber—are not conducive to the welfare of this country. When, after two decades of agitation, all are agreed that the existing condition ought to be changed, but none agree as to what the change should be, what is the logical conclusion? The conclusion is that the obstruction, that part of the machine which none can make workable and which none can agree upon a plan for improving, should be removed. In 1896, as I pointed out last session, and as I now remind the House, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Richard Cartwright, upon the eve of a general election, speaking in Massey Hall, Toronto, used this language:

The Senate was a mill-stone around the neck of the Canadian people which he prayed that Providence would soon remove.

I presume the right hon. gentleman is still praying. But he is not praying in the form in which this House should pray, by a concrete motion to bring about a result. And, if I may say so without being flippant, I do not think that the locality in which he is praying is quite consistent with his prayer, for he is now a member of the Chamber which he hoped Providence would abolish. But here was the statement of a gentleman who was making an appeal to the people as the result of which he hoped and expected—and his hope was realized—that he would have a seat in the cabinet councils of a governing party. And ever since then that gentleman has been in the cabinet of the party in power. Whether it was that the number of people who joined in that prayer was not sufficient, or whether it is that he wants help in regard to it, I know not. But, assuming him to have been sincere in 1896, if he were still a member of this Chamber, I cannot for the life of me see how he could help but second the motion to send this petition to the King, as the practical way to gain the result he wanted of removing this millstone from about the neck of the Canadian people. So, to begin with, I have the authority of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce who, in 1896, made the statement I have just referred to, but after he got into power he neglected absolutely to do anything to supplement his statement made previous to getting into power, in Massey Hall, Toronto. But we ought to do something, it is up to every member of parliament to do his duty in this respect, as in every other. If we find, in the light of the experience of forty-two years, that there was a mistake made by the fathers of confederation in constituting that second Chamber, it is our duty now to pass a resolution in the shape of a petition to the King asking him to have an Act passed in Great Britain by which our constitution would be amended and this evil removed.

Now, following upon that expression of opinion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, we find that several other members of both political parties in this country have from time to time agitated for some reform in regard to this matter, if not for the total abolition of the Senate, as some of them have suggested, but which has never been, until the last year, put in a concrete form in this House. I think this is the way to settle the question. If a majority of the people in this country, speaking through their representatives, are not in favour of abolition, they can say so, and we will know then what the people want done about it. If, on the other hand, the majority of the people in this country, speaking through their representatives in this House, are against the second Chamber, they can vote for this motion, knowing they are voting on a concrete resolution, and getting a concrete result; knowing that if the majority of them petition for it, the petition goes to Great Britain, and something will be done. Now, we had also from Ontario a very celebrated gentleman, a man highly respected, who has gone to his great reward, Sir Oliver Mowat. He spoke in favour of abolishing the Senate, although some hon. gentlemen may think that he merely wanted to reform it. Let me give the exact language he used in 1893:

We are agreed as to the necessity of a fundamental reform of the Senate, if for any reason it must or should be retained.

Now, the latter part of Sir Oliver Mowat's statement is the strongest argument in the world for its abolition. He says we must have some fundamental reform of it, if for any reason it must or should be retained, clearly admitting that in his opinion it was not necessary it should be retained. Now, in a matter of this kind which deals with the constitution of the country, we do not want to act hastily or thoughtlessly, but with the greatest care. And am I not right in saying to-day that, with the experience of forty years under our constitution, for at least one-half of that time there has been a steady agitation in the country for the abolition of the Senate as absolutely necessary for the welfare of this country? Am I not right then in saying that it is high time now that somebody should move in order that this House may be seized of the question in a concrete form, not by mere academic discussions of resolutions, but by some positive action that will secure a removal of the evil? In my opinion the only way to remove it is either by the abolition of the Senate entirely, or else its reform in some way. As I have said, no two of us can agree upon what would be a practical reform; therefore, the only thing that is left us to do is to go to the foot of the Throne in Great Britain and ask to have the constitution amended so that the Senate may be entirely abolished. Now, Sir, I ask this question: Would those who have since been called the fathers of confederation, who thought they knew what this country needed, and asked for a second Chamber, in the light of the information we have to-day, could they have known what was likely to happen, would the fathers of confederation have done as they did and asked for a second Chamber? Did they not do it rather because, when drawing up the constitution, they were guided by the example of Great Britain, without realizing that her example might not fit this Canada of ours? There was the House of Lords in England and they thought we should also have a second Chamber in this country. But in the very constitu-

tion which they were then establishing, by other sections they took away the necessity for that House of Lords, or Senate, in this country as an obstacle to hasty legislation between the King and the people. By the constitution we are under, the British North America Act, every Bill that passes this House and passes the Senate to-day—and it would be the same if we had no Senate in this country under the amended constitution I am suggesting—such Bill, though it has passed both Houses of this parliament, can have no effect if the King in Council in Great Britain sees fit to disallow it within two years. So there would be no wrench in our constitution if that was done. This is provided for in our constitution by sections 55, 56 and 57 of the British North America Act, that, whether we have a Senate or have not, if there is any hasty legislation passed by this parliament, either by both Chambers, or by this House of Commons alone if the Senate were abolished, if that legislation involved any serious question of the rights of the people, those rights would not be interfered with to any extent worth speaking of, because those who felt aggrieved might go before the King in Great Britain and ask him to veto that legislation. So it is not true to say that our Senate stands in the place of the House of Lords in Great Britain; because the House of Lords in Great Britain is the only guard between the commoners and the King; and if in Great Britain a Bill is passed and becomes law, if both the Commons and the House of Lords assent to it, it seems to me that the King would have to abdicate unless he also gave his assent to that legislation. But in this country, if the Senate were removed, and the House of Commons alone passes legislation to which His Excellency the Governor General gives his sanction, he has only that limited power of attorney, so to speak, given him from Great Britain he does not stand in the place of the King, he only consents to that Bill for the King, and after he has consented, by these sections I have quoted, that legislation does not become operative in Canada if the home government for any reason sees fit to disallow it within two years. So you have the King represented here by the limited authority to the Governor General, who has not the absolute authority of the King in Great Britain. And so to-day we have two checks on any hasty legislation in this country, the one in the Senate of Canada, and after they have consented, the other authority in Great Britain composed of the King's cabinet in council. Therefore, when hon. gentlemen hesitate to vote for the total abolition of the Senate in Canada because they feel there should be some institution interposed between what might be radical legislation and finality, and when they oppose this motion for that reason they oppose it without a correct knowledge of the facts. If we did pass legislation which might be thought to be too radical, or to require to be submitted to a cooling process, or which interfered with rights which were not properly looked after in this House, if those rights were interfered with to any extent, an appeal could be taken to Great Britain and within two years that legislation would be amended, or disallowed, and that without any wrench to the constitution. I am not advocating that that should be tried; I am simply stating what has been the constitution and the practice since 1867. There has always been that protection, and for that reason we do not need the Senate to do less effectively what can be done in the way that I have just indicated.

Let me speak for a minute as to the condition of the people of this country educationally as compared with that of 1867. I may say that with the comparatively low state of education that existed among the masses in 1867 as compared with that which exists now, there might have been some necessity of having learned, college-bred or educated people to control what might be done by some ignorant people who had been elected to parliament. But, what is the condition that we find to-day? Is there not a vast difference to-day? Is not the difference almost indescribable in regard to the state of education as between what it was in 1867 and what it is to-day? Have not the educated people of our country taken good care to see that men are not elected to this House unless they are fully competent to deal with public matters in all their different aspects? Let any hon. gentleman bring a Bill into this House to-morrow that is going to interfere with any corporation's rights on one side as against the rights of the ordinary common people on the other; you will have any number of gentlemen in this House ready to defend the rights of any corporation affected by legislation introduced here and to insist that the Bill must go to a select committee so that their rights may be dealt with and carefully protected. Are they not carefully protected in every piece of legislation that comes before this House. I am not saying that hon. gentlemen are not doing right in taking this course. It is their duty to do it. I would do it myself if some one else was not doing it. We do see to it that all interests, whether they be those of the poorest and humblest or those of the richest, most aristocratic and most powerful, as far as wealth can make them powerful, are fully protected by the legislation that comes before this House. I do not think that any cabinet would last for a year that did not, before they brought down government legislation, consider how it would affect different classes of people. So I say that in the beginning of the twentieth century there

is not the necessity that might perhaps at one time have existed for that protection in regard to what I have endeavoured to describe—the protection of capital, perhaps, as against labour, nor of the rich as against the poor, or of landed interests or proprietors as against casual newcomers who may be asking for some radical legislation to protect themselves or help them in some special and peculiar way. Thus the necessity for these things does not exist to-day with the House of Commons as at present constituted, and I believe that the people will take care, now, with the education that the masses have, to see that the House of Commons is constituted of gentlemen sufficiently educated and able to protect every interest that may be brought in question with regard to any legislation that is proposed. So much for that.

Now, let me say one word with regard to some of the suggestions that have been made other than by myself in sessions gone by. I listened to the discussion of this question, but I never took any part in it until last year. I have had the benefit of hon. gentlemen giving their own opinions, and I have endeavoured to form a correct opinion as to what was best in the interest of the country. Some people have suggested the appointment of senators by the provincial legislatures instead of as they are now appointed. It seems to me that can accomplish no good. That could not make things any better, but a great evil would exist that does not exist now. With the questions that are continually arising as to whether the province or the Dominion has authority to deal with certain matters these senators, appointed by the provinces, would feel it to be their duty to protect the provinces that appointed them, human nature being as it is. The provinces would be found clashing with the House of Commons when the House of Commons undertook to exercise its authority as a federal institution and their legislation would be annulled by a Senate coming from the provinces and which would therefore be provincial in regard to the source of their appointment, and it seems to me they would be guided by this in settling the question as to who they should protect. I never heard any strong argument in favour of appointment by the provincial legislatures. I never heard it suggested with any particularly good reason being given with it, and I never heard any hon. gentleman give any sound reason or his own opinion solidly and unequivocally in favour of such a change. I suggest that it would be an evil, for the reason I have stated, and it would not accomplish from a federal standpoint the object which its advocates have in view. We have the legislatures to deal with local matters, and from the federal standpoint the appointment of senators by the provincial legislatures would result in interference with federal legislation, for the reasons which I have given, and it would bring about no good as far as I can see. While I am speaking about provincial legislatures, perhaps I might point out that the greater number of matters that are dealt with in the shape of legislation in Canada are dealt with by the provincial legislatures, and that what the provincial legislatures do comes home to the ordinary man in his every-day life and affects him more directly than any of the things that we do in this House, important as they may be. Yet, notwithstanding this, no provincial legislature has ever found it necessary to have a Senate to see that it does not go wrong. The provincial legislatures of the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec have no second Chamber, no cooling basins, to save them from the results of passing too radical legislation. Gentlemen are elected to these Houses who take care to look after provincial interests and to protect everybody on fair terms in all legislation that is brought forward. If it has been found that there is no need for any second Chamber where such a multitude of matters is dealt with of such great importance to the ordinary man every day of his life and which affect him to a much greater extent than do the things that are dealt with in the federal arena, it is another good reason why we require no second Chamber in federal matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They have a second chamber in Quebec and Nova Scotia.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend says that they have a second Chamber in Quebec and Nova Scotia. They had them in other provinces, but dropped them. That is the best answer to that. There was no earthquake, there was no army called out and there was no trouble in the country when they did drop them. It seemed that the people did not notice them. They had been so inactive that they were not noticed when they were dropped. Their dropping did not make any noise, it hurt nobody and things have gone along in these provinces ever since at least as well as if there were upper Chambers. I do think that the legislative councils in Nova Scotia and Quebec are not accomplishing very much or we would not have to be informed that they are actually in existence to-day. They are such nonentities that I had forgotten about them until I was reminded of the fact. At all events, the fact that the upper Chambers in the other provinces have fallen out of use without anyone noticing it is the very best argument that they were not much use when they existed. Two sessions ago there was a motion made by the present hon. deputy-speaker, in relation to the constitution of the Senate, and the Prime Minister, speak-

ing in that debate, said that he could not suggest any reform which would be wise, although I think we all agree that the conditions are not desirable as they at present exist. It was mentioned by the Prime Minister in that debate that if the Senate saw fit to throw out a Supply Bill passed by the House there was no remedy under the constitution and the country might be starved.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That happens in England to-day.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, and that might happen in Canada and there would be no remedy. And yet we calmly go on here from year to year with that possibility staring us in the face. Now, I do not speak in any partisan spirit, because what I am going to say might apply in the case of any party which was in power for a number of years. But the right hon. gentleman may not be afraid to-day because there is a majority of his former political supporters in the Senate and from party loyalty they possibly would not reject a finance Bill of this government. But, if the Senate is of any use at all it is as an independent institution and were it really independent it could control the country against the will of the elected representatives of the people, a thing which I do not think was ever contemplated by those who framed the British North America Act. We claim to have responsible government in this country, but let us take a chain of circumstances which might possibly happen and let us see if we actually have responsible government. Suppose the government brings down a Bill to this House and a certain number of its supporters object to it and joining with the members of the opposition there is a majority which amends that Bill in a way which the government does not like. That Bill would go to the Senate and the Senate as at present constituted, having a majority of one political stripe, the Senate might amend that Bill against the wishes of the majority of the elected representatives of the people and in favour of the will of the government which appointed the Senators and this elected chamber would have to submit. We know that in practice the government is supported by those elected to support it in any measure it submits, but in theory the government is responsible to the House of Commons and they have to run the risk of proposing measures which may not meet with the approval of their supporters. But, with the Senate endorsing the action of the government, the government would remain in power in a case such as I have instanced when under all proper constitutional rules it should resign. Now, what has been done by the House of Lords in England may at any time be done by the Senate of Canada. Indeed, the Canadian Senate has already thwarted the will of the Canadian House of Commons. For three years this House unanimously agreed upon a measure for the protection of people at railway level crossings. The influence of the corporations was not sufficient to prevent the House of Commons passing that measure, but through some influence, or in their judgment, or whatever you may call it, the Senate rejected that measure and last session such was the deadlock that the majority of the Commons felt finally obliged to accept the Bill in the mutilated form which the Senate forced it upon us. Speaking from a national point of view that was an evil. The fact was that thirty-five senators constituting a majority in the Senate were able to force their will on the twenty senators who were in the minority and on the two hundred and twenty-one members of the House of Commons combined. That is not right and it shows that the Senate is not serving a good purpose in this country. The ex-Secretary of State, Hon. Sir Richard Scott, moved in the Senate a resolution beginning:

That, in the opinion of the Senate the time has arrived for so amending the constitution of this branch of parliament, as to bring the mode of selection of senators more into harmony with public opinion.

Senator Scott was hardly out of the council chamber until in his capacity of senator he expressed the feeling that the interests of the country required the adoption of some means of bringing the constitution of the Senate into harmony with public opinion. This opinion of a prominent member of the Senate is another evidence that to-day, in the year in which we are now living as distinguished from the year 1867, gentlemen in that branch of the legislature believe that there is a need of bringing that Chamber more in harmony with public opinion. I do not know what suggestions Senator Scott made; I think he proposed something in the shape of an election, but I think it stands almost as a self-evident proposition that the electing of senators would cause no better result. If they did not, when elected, impede the legislation of this House, they would not be necessary. If public opinion was expressed to them when they were elected in the same form as it was expressed to the members of this House from the smaller constituencies, and if they did impede the legislation of the members of the Commons elected from the smaller constituencies, they would be out of place and an obstruction and an ill to the country. So I cannot see that there would be any benefit in electing senators. You would have either two men to do one man's work or you would have one cham-

ber so constructed as to prevent the larger constituted body from acting according to public opinion. The suggestion to elect the senators seems to be nothing but an excuse for the retention of that Chamber.

The argument was advanced last year that they were necessary to protect the minority. I ask when did they protect the minorities. I have never heard of their doing anything to protect the minorities in this country. We have heard discussions during the last 30 years, if not during the whole 40 years since confederation, about the rights of minorities being interfered with, but we have never heard of any occasion when the Senate went into the arena of politics or public life in any sense to protect the minorities. Some gentleman has said that they might be needed at some time because the smaller provinces, having a smaller number of members in this House, would not get justice as between different localities in Canada, and that the Senate might force the House of Commons to give these smaller provinces some greater rights. But the smaller province has also a smaller number of senators and, human nature being as it is, and the number of representatives of the smaller, the majority in the Senate would favour the same legislation as the House of Commons, and therefore the grievance would not be remedied.

Thus, it seems to me to be about almost idle to-day to ask for the retention of this body on the ground that the Senate will protect minorities. Minorities have called out for protection from time to time during the last 40 years, but I do not remember that the Senate itself ever interfered to protect any minority, nor do I think that they could or would do so for the reasons I have expressed. If the home government can, as I have pointed out, interfere in any large matter under our construction, in the case for instance of a small province being unjustly treated, surely His Majesty's government, a council composed of representatives of the Lords and of the Commons, would afford as effective a safeguard as any Senate that could be formed in Canada. So again, I am obliged to say that the Senate is unnecessary.

I wish to place on 'Hansard' a few newspaper quotations. Last year I placed upon 'Hansard' a quotation from the Toronto 'Star' of 1909. I shall again read a portion of it because I intend to make another quotation from that paper and the two are better read together. Shortly before I made my motion last year the Toronto 'Star' on February 4, said:

As the matter now stands the Senate is simply an addition to the patronage of the government. Patronage in the civil service we have learned to endure through custom, but surely it is unwise to extend the system of patronage to the appointment of those who make the laws of the land. Responsible government means the responsibility of the government to parliament, but who can speak seriously of the responsibility of a government to a portion of parliament appointed by the government itself?

The plan laid before the Senate by the Hon. Sir R. W. Scott is good in so far as it proposes to substitute election for appointment. An elected Senate, dealing independently with the measures sent up by the House of Commons, including government measures, might occasionally serve a good purpose. It is doubtful whether such a body could work in harmony with a system which requires that the government of the day shall have a parliamentary majority for the support of its measures, but if it were found unworkable, it would probably be a half-way house on the road to abolition, which to many seems to be the logical solution of the problem.

Since this matter was debated last session, when it had the benefit of what was said pro and con with regard to this motion, that same newspaper wrote another article, dated November 16, 1909. That was written just after this parliament was opened by His Excellency and when notice of this motion was given on the order paper. The Toronto 'Star' then said:

Against the Senate we wish to register several objections. The least of these is that it is a feeble echo of the party in power in the Commons. When the Senate does nothing but ratify the will of the Commons, we see it at its best, for we are then having representative government. The will of the elected parliament is not being frustrated by another body, whose members are chosen for reasons the people know nothing about, and which no amount of study can enable them to understand. At such a time the Senate is only unnecessary, and nothing worse.

Yet we must qualify the statement, for in that case it is even worse than unnecessary and worse than being a profitless expense, because no member of parliament knows just how soon a vacancy in the Senate may occur, and it is not uncommon to find representatives of the people forfeiting their popularity at the polls confident of reaching that Upper Chamber where no poll is long enough to reach them.

At another time the Senate is not the feeble echo of the Commons. We submit that it is seen at its worst when it resists the will of the Commons, or undertakes to originate legislation. In that case it weakens popular government, impedes, and frustrates it. Why should the people support an appointed House to resist and baffle the purposes of an elected one?

Thus we have from that newspaper its confirmed opinion, since the debate of last session—a newspaper not agreeing with me in party politics, but having a large circulation in Toronto and throughout Ontario, and therefore some pretension to voice public opinion. We have

also a large newspaper in Toronto called the 'Mail and Empire', which spoke on this subject in a few words, but all the more effective than any long argument. On the 5th of the present month that newspaper said:

> Canadians are being incited by several papers to indignation against the House of Lords as a political institution. Like other human works, the House of Lords is full of imperfections, but candour compels us to admit that it is both an abler and a more conscientious legislative body than the Senate of Canada or the Senate of the United States. In practice, also, it is more democratic than either of these Chambers.

Under all the circumstances, I shall not weary the House any longer. In the British North America Act we have protection, even without a Senate, for any class or province the need of protection for which is our only excuse for having any second Chamber. Such a Chamber cannot be independent owing to the fact that the party in power can appoint to it their own political supporters, and the senator who owes his appointment to his party loyalty and service cannot be expected to give an impartial vote on legislation introduced by that party. And the converse is true should the government which appointed him go out of office. Those senators who owe their appointments to a defeated government may be naturally expected to veto any legislation introduced in that body by the new government. Therefore, whichever way you look at it, the institution is no good as it stands to-day, and I am satisfied that such is the opinion of the vast majority of the people; and as no remedy is suggested satisfactory to any two persons and as all agree that the institution, as at present constituted, is worse than useless, we ought to do the only logical thing open to us as commoners and humbly petition His Gracious Majesty to remove that section from the British North America Act and let us get along without a Senate. Not that there is anything in the expense alone, but the expense of that body is a serious one. However, if it cost fifty times as much, and was serving a good purpose, I would not mind the expense, but it does cost the country about $300,000 a year, without taking into account other expenses, as to which there is dispute more or less, because they are interwoven with other legislation, such as printing, &c., which you cannot charge entirely to the Senate. But that body costs at least $300,000 a year. That money is needed for other purposes which would better serve the people. It would go a long way to improve the postal service, it would go a long way towards the nationalization or improvement of the telephone or telegraph system, it would not be wasted if it were handed over to the Railway Commission for the purpose of contributing to the cost of protecting railway crossings, which the railways themselves make dangerous, and which is now put upon the municipalities. It would be much more profitably used in any of these ways than in keeping up a second Chamber. I do not think, in view of my extended remarks last session, and of the fact that I am addressing practically the same parliament, that I should trespass upon the time of the House, and will conclude by asking you, Mr. Speaker, to put my motion.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Having been the first member of this House to place on the order paper such a resolution as we have been discussing to-day and having been the first to discuss it, I rise merely to say a few words. Having spoken on two former occasions at considerable length, I do not propose to occupy the attention of the House for more than two or three minutes. I was as I have said, the first member to introduce a resolution similar to the one now submitted. That was some few years ago, and I have not since then changed my mind on the question. In my opinion a very large number of persons in the Dominion would vote in favour of the abolition of the Senate. Some of them for reasons I could not at all agree with. I have met many who speak with derision of the Senate. I am not one of those, I have never seen any reason to speak in that way of the Senate or its members. I am glad to number among the senators a great many personal friends, and there are many in that body whom I regard as very able Canadian statesmen, whose opinion and experience entitle them to a great deal of respect.

Last session when this matter was being discussed, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said that we could find among the members of the Senate many men who would make most desirable directors on any financial board in Canada. I quite admit that to be true. But I contend that, the Senate, being a body of men not elected by or responsible to the people, has not the confidence of the people that an elective chamber has and its members have not the same influence that the members of an elective body possess. You, Mr. Speaker, or I, or almost any member of this House, could select from the members of the Senate, say, fifteen persons who, placed in this House, would have a greater influence for good than the whole ninety members of the Senate in the place that they occupy. The House of Commons, elected by the people is the Chamber that is primarily responsible to the people for

the work of this parliament. I can see no logical reason why the work done in this Chamber by the members of this House elected by the people, should be revised—nor can I see what is to be gained by having it revised—by the members of the other Chamber who are not elected by or responsible to the people. The members of the other Chamber are not superior—and I am quite ready to admit that they are not in any way inferior—to the members of this House by birth, education, information, experience or in any other way. I would object, and strongly object, to any reform of the Senate. As the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) has said, many reforms have been suggested. I would look upon a Senate such as we should have were we to adopt any of the methods of reform I have heard proposed as not equal in value to the Senate we have to-day. I would be opposed to the Senate reformed in any way I have heard suggested, and I am opposed to the continuation of the Senate as we have it. It is true that, from time to time, the Senate has made many changes—most of them minor changes—in legislation passed by this House. But to say that they have changed legislation is not to show that they have improved it; it is a matter of opinion whether these changes have been improvements or the reverse. It may be that sometimes they have improved legislation, it may be that sometimes the changes made by them have been a detriment. I contend that when the same political party has a majority in the House of Commons and also a majority in the Senate, the Senate is not likely to prove a very great check upon the work of the Commons. On the other hand, if either political party has a majority in the Commons while the opposition party has a majority in the Senate, the Senate may often times, from partisan feeling—because the members of that House are and must be possessed of partisan feeling as are the members of the Commons—become a nuisance and a mischief. Without taking time to repeat arguments that I have stated in this House twice already, I merely state in conclusion that, if this matter comes to a vote, I will vote in favour of the resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no doubt whatever, having had the pleasure of listening for the second time to my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) upon this question, that he is very much in earnest and very sincere in the view which he has advocated. I cannot believe, however, that they are the views of the party to which he belongs, for if there is one thing more certain than another, it is that throughout the constitutional history of Canada the Conservative party has always stood for a second chamber. There is no merit in this, I think; it is merely the maintenance of the tradition of the British constitution that it would be inadvisable to have legislation confined to a single chamber. I would invite the attention of my hon. friend to one most striking fact, and that is that the British constitution has spread throughout the world. It has been adopted, not only by the most highly civilized countries of Europe, but it is now being adopted by the nations of the orient as well. I do not say that these nations have adopted the British constitution in its entirety, but in two characteristic features, the first being ministerial responsibility—adopted even by the French republic—and the other a second Chamber. Does the hon. gentleman believe, in view of this universal testimony rendered to the excellence of the British constitution, that we who pride ourselves on being the banner colony of Britain should go back upon this principle of constitutional government? Does he believe, when the experience of centuries in the wisest country in the world, the wisest in its constitution—has taught the desirability of a second chamber, that a second chamber was absolutely necessary to the adoption of wise and satisfactory legislation, that it would be wise for us in Canada to suppress the second Chamber? It may be that the present action of the Senate is not satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster). I can remember when the action of the Senate as it existed twenty years ago was not very satisfactory to me, for instance. My scruples are not the same to-day as they were then, and it may be that the time will come when my hon. friend will change his views on this point, and, the composition of the Senate being different, his objection may be removed. But he says that, as no satisfactory reform of the Senate is suggested, there is a general opinion that the condition of the Senate at the present time is not satisfactory and that all heartily desire a change. I agree that there has been a strong suggestion, made at different times and in different quarters, that we should have a reform of the Senate. But those who suggest not a reform of the Senate but its abolition are far less numerous. Canada is not the only country where exception may be taken to the action of a second Chamber. At the present time an election is going on in England upon action taken by the second Chamber. Without expressing an opinion—which, I think, would be very inopportune to say the least—it is clear that the action of the House of Lords is blamed by many, perhaps by the majority of the people of Great Britain, in fact that is the point before them. But whether the Unionists succeed or whether the present government succeed, there is no doubt

that the action of the Lords in rejecting the budget is resented by a very large portion of the people of the United Kingdom. But I have never heard it suggested, even by the most radical of the radicals, that the House of Lords should be done away with and the second Chamber suppressed. Of course, the wish is expresed that there should be a reform of the House of Lords, and, indeed, it is very probable that whichever party succeeds in the present election, whether the Unionists or the Liberals, as a consequence of the elections the House of Lords will in some way be reformed. But I am sure— and I think my hon.friend (Mr. Lancaster) has no doubt either—that there is no suggestion that the House of Lords should be abolished. I think it would be an unfortunate thing if the second Chamber were abolished. The same principle applies here. And now, in going a step further, let me speak more particularly to my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) than to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). At the time of confederation the second Chamber was established as a pillar of the constitution; it was established, not only for the general reason for which a second Chamber exists in all countries under constitutional government, but for the additional reason of the protection of minorities. Let me quote on this point to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Miller) the very suggestive language of Mr. George Brown, and I know it will be appreciated by my hon. friend:

> And first, it is said that Upper Canada should have had in the legislative council a greater number of members than Lower Canada——
>
> Mr. T. C. WALLBRIDGE. Hear, hear.
>
> Hon. Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for North Hastings is of that opinion; but that hon. gentleman is in favour of a legislative union, and had we been forming a legislative union, there might have been some force in the demand. But the very essence of our compact is that the union shall be federal and not legislative. Our Lower Canada friends have agreed to give us representation by population in the lower House, on the express condition they shall have equality in the upper House. On no other condition could we have advanced a step; and, for my part, I am quite willing they should have it. In maintaining the existing sectional boundaries and handing over the control of local matters to local bodies, we recognize, to a certain extent, a diversity of interests; and it was quite natural that the protection of those interests, by equality in the upper Chamber, should be demanded by the less numerous provinces.

So one of the reasons, one of the inducements given to the smaller provinces, to lower Canada, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, was that there should be an upper Chamber as well as equality of representation, and this was for the protection of minorities. My hon. friend asked with some pertinence: What have the Senate done during the forty years that it has existed for the protection of the minorities? He answered, nothing. Sir, I am glad that my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) can say that the Senate has done nothing in the forty years of its existence for the protection of minorities. But this is not to the discredit of the Senate, it is rather to the credit of the House of Commons It means simply that the House of Commons has done nothing to endanger minorities.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then you do not need a second Chamber.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me, there is always a possibility of the power being abused. If we could depend upon human nature as we can upon my hon. friend, never to do anything wrong, then there would be no reason at all for keeping the second Chamber. But it is because men are fallible, it is because majorities may abuse their power, that it has been deemed desirable to have a control over the majority for the protection of minorities. Without at all going back to the old condition of things, to the old quarrels which happily have disappeared, and of which we have heard nothing for many years past, I may remind my hon. friend that there was at one time a strong effort made under the old union to disestablish the French language. Now it has been embodied in our constitution that the French language should be an official language. It is sometimes used in this House, hon. members speaking the French language keep it as a sacred thing. They do not abuse the privilege, but they sometimes use it, and I am sure no one will find fault with them if they sometimes speak in the French language, because it is one of their rights. But if the majority should take it upon themselves to abolish the French language, then the Senate would justify its existence for the protection of minorities. So it is with respect to the subject of education. There are special clauses in our constitution safeguarding the privileges of minorities in regard to education; and if the majority in this House attempted to do away or to interfere with anything secured to the minority in this matter, then the Senate would exercise its powers. May the time never come, as it has not come during the forty years, when the power of the Senate may have to be invoked to protect a minority against a majority in this House. But it would be a poor argument to say that because no case has occurred during forty years, it may never occur. Therefore it does not seem to me that my hon. friend's argument on this head is a very strong one.

He put forth another argument, that

there is no necessity for this second Chamber to protect the people against hasty or unjust legislation by this House. He says that there is a provision in our constitution —and he cited the articles, 55, 56 and 57— giving the power of veto to the imperial authority. Well, it is true that there is a power of disallowance given to the imperial parliament, it is possible for the imperial parliament to disallow any Act passed by this parliament. It is possible they may do so; but would my hon. friend seriously advise that any legislation passed by this parliament should be disallowed by the imperial government? Would my hon. friend think it conducive to good relations between the colonies and the imperial authorities if, when this House had passed an Act which some parties might deem to be unjust, and if they should petition the imperial parliament to disallow that legislation —does my hon. friend believe it would tend to good relations between the different branches of the empire if the imperial government were to veto that legislation? If his object were to dissolve the British empire, that would be the very way of doing it. We have had some experience in this country as to the effect of the disallowance of provincial legislation by the federal authority. The late Conservative government supported by my hon. friend, exercised the power of disallowance on several occasions; but would my hon. friend, after his longer experience think it conducive to good relations between the provinces, conducive to good results, for the federal government to exercise the power of disallowance and trample upon the action of local legislatures?

Mr. LANCASTER. In an extreme case it would be just.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But what might be considered an extreme case by one would be considered a very moderate case by somebody else. I appeal to my hon. friend to say whether the disallowance of provincial legislation by the federal government has been conducive to any very good results. The Conservative party at one time was rather of the opinion that it was wise to disallow provincial legislation. I think they have changed their mind of late years. I do not think that the Conservative party at the present time would believe it conducive to good relations, to peace, harmony and concord among the people of the different provinces, for the federal government to trample upon the will of the legislature in any one of the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. In looking over the history of Bills which have been disallowed, I find the present government have made no change in that respect, if there has been any change.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is a great difference. The present government have been very chary of disallowing local legislation. But the government which my hon. friend supported were prodigal in disallowing local legislation. Let me refer him to the Streams Bill, which was disallowed once, twice or three times in succession; and I could cite several others in which the local legislation of Ontario, under Sir Oliver Mowat, was disallowed by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. But after a while, I am glad to say, better views prevailed in the Conservative party.

Mr. SPROULE. From 1873 to 1878, when the Reform party were in power, they disallowed as many Bills, in proportion to the time they were in power, as the Conservative government did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Liberal party disallowed a certain number of Bills which were admittedly beyond the powers of the legislature. But, when the powers of legislation which were strictly within the purview of the local legislature have been properly exercised we have been very chary of disallowing any such legislation. I do not remember of any occasion on which we have disallowed such legislation, whereas, I recall several occasions on which such legislation was disallowed by the government supported by my hon. friend. But I say this to my hon. friend that the remedy which he suggests against hasty legislation would be a dangerous one and not such an adequate remedy as we have at the present time.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is there in the constitution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is there in the constitution, but it is one of those powers only to be resorted to in extreme cases and which are made more effective by their non-observance than by their observance. My hon. friend gave another reason. My hon. friend said that the character of this House has so much improved from what it was forty years ago that there could be no apprehension whatever of any hasty legislation being passed. Well, I am not so sure that my hon. friend can make that statement with accuracy. I am not so sure that the character of this House is superior to what it was forty years ago. I do not think it is inferior but I do not believe it is so much improved that this would be a measure which the people would be satisfied with. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I think we had better keep to the old method. I hope my hon. friend will not find fault with me when I say that I am somewhat shocked and horrified and scandalized that I should be called upon to defend Conservative principles against a Conservative member.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few words on the question of the abolition of the Senate which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has just been discussing. I noticed that the right hon. gentleman kept himself strictly within the bounds of the question of the abolition of the Senate and that he had not a word to say with reference to the conduct of his former friends and himself in the House when he was in opposition and when he urged upon the House and the country the reformation of the Senate. He does not even propose it at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I keep to the question.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, I am speaking to the question now. Not a word in reference to the reformation of the Senate! Of all the anomalies that were ever imposed upon a country the Senate, as constituted in the past, was one, in the eyes of the right hon. gentleman and his friends. But not a word now, not even now, when his friends over in the old country and all parties there are in favour of the improvement of the upper House—not a word of commendation from the right hon. gentleman, not a word to say that he proposed to carry out the promises which he made to the people of the country again and again with reference to the reformation of the Senate. Oh, the Senate has reformed itself at the present day. There is no danger of anything wrong being perpetrated there. The senators are a different set of men at the present time. What has the personnel of the Senate to do with the question? The question is as to the constitutional foundation of it. Is it right or wrong? Are life senatorships in Canada today in accordance with the democratic principles advocated by the right hon. gentleman and by every one in this House? Is not the feeling nearly universal in this House that there should be not the abolition of the Senate but the reformation or change in the manner in which the Senate is constituted? The right hon. gentleman refers, in contradiction of statements of my hon. friend from Lincoln, to the powers of disallowance. He says that this government ought not to exercise the right of disallowance which was constantly exercised in the past, and he suggests that perhaps there is a change of opinion on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House with reference to that question. Why were these powers put in the constitution? If they are to be useless and not to be exercised at any time, why is it that they are in the British North America Act? The right hon. gentleman says that he has made a change in reference to Acts passed by the provinces in exercising the right of disallowance. He has made no change. If I remember correctly, the order in council which specifies that the power of disallowance shall be exercised is the same at the present moment as it was under the former administration. The right hon. gentleman and his party have not made any change in it. The principles laid down are the principles advocated by a leader of mine, Sir John Thompson, in this House, and embodied in the order in council. The right to the exercise of disallowance was limited by the government itself, and it was only to be exercised under certain conditions. The right hon. gentleman speaks very truly in reference to the Acts that we submit to the imperial authorities. These Acts are submitted to the imperial authorities for the purpose of disallowing any which might interfere with the federal constitution itself or which might interfere with the allegiance which we owe to the imperial authorities or to the Throne. The right is one which will not be exercised unless for very grievous reasons, and it has never been exercised that I know of up to the present moment. The method that is most frequently followed is this: The Governor General sends Acts of parliament over to the imperial authorities. The imperial authorities look and see if any of these Acts interfere with what they consider the imperial prerogative, and if they do, they come back to the Governor General and a Bill may be introduced by the authorities in this country for the purpose of correcting that which requires change. Or, the Governor General may exercise the authority himself. The imperial authorities have never exercised it.

Now let us come to the question that is at present before the House. My hon. friend, in introducing his motion, does not propose a plan for altering or amending the constitution of the Senate, but he brings the question of abolition boldly before the House. No doubt the constitution of the Senate is an anomaly. The present constitution of the Senate is not consistent with the democratic ideas of the people of this country, and some reform is absolutely necessary. My hon. friend who moved the motion has a right to hear from the government of this country what they intend to do towards carrying out the promises they made broadcast throughout the country that they would reform the Senate. There is, I believe, a feeling in the country that there should be a second Chamber, but there is also a feeling that the Senate of Canada as it exists, is an anomaly in a country having such democratic institutions as we have.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I entertain the same opinions I have ever entertained regarding the Senate. Our own experience and the experience of all the great nations of history has taught

us the advantage of a second Chamber. From the dawn of constitutional government in England there has been a House of Lords and a House of Commons, and when the United States came to form its constitution it created a second Chamber. We hear arguments advanced in favour of amending the system of appointing United States senators but we hear little or no argument in favour of the abolition of that Chamber. France has a second Chamber, Germany has a second Chamber, Japan has a second Chamber, all great civilized countries have second Chambers, and in view of the experience of history it would not be wise for us to recklessly do away with a Senate in Canada even though that body does not fulfil our expectations of what a second Chamber should be. It should rather be our aim to endeavour to devise some means to bring the Canadian Senate into harmony with the spirit of the age and the requirements of the country. We acknowledge our weakness when we say that we cannot accomplish any reform of the Senate. If we give our attention to the task, if this government gives attention to the task as it promised to do, I have no doubt that we can easily bring about reform. Before the Liberals attained power they pledged themselves to reform the Senate and the people believing that they were honest and truthful men, and men of resource returned them to power on that platform, but since the day they assumed the reins of government they have made absolutely no effort to carry out their pledges. There are two reasons, it seems to me, why the Caandian Senate has not come up to our expectations. In the first place the method of appointing senators is defective and I think a great improvement could be made in that direction. In the second place, the class of men who have been called to the Senate for many years past, since the present government came to power—and in this respect their predecessors sinned although not to the same extent—for many years past the men who have been called to the Senate are men who have been discarded by the people as unfit to sit in the House of Commons. That very fact is an evidence to my mind that they are not the best men to select for the Senate. I have always thought that those appointed to the Senate might be men from various walks of life selected for their fitness, their knowledge of affairs and their independence. If that rule were followed the Senate would be independent of the House of Commons and would be better equipped to fulfil the expectations of the people. There can surely be some means devised either of electing or appointing senators which would cause that body to be more beneficial to the country than it is to-day. I am in favour of having a Senate, but I am also in favour of having it reformed. At all events surely it is high time that the government should make some attempt to carry out its pledges. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has referred to the fact that the province of Ontario has no second Chamber, but in my judgment had there been a well constituted second Chamber in that province, the late Liberal government there would never have dared to perpetrate the things they did. There would be a check upon them, their bad legislation would be rejected, and higher councils might have had a beneficial effect on their policy. The province of Quebec has a second Chamber and whether it is doing good or not I leave it to those who are best informed to say. No doubt, in the smaller provinces which are something like our county councils there is not that urgent need for a second Chamber that there is in a country like Canada and in countries like the confederation of states in South Africa and Australasia. In my judgment the proper thing is to follow the system adopted in the mother of parliaments and to have two Chambers, the one to be a check upon the other. I believe that if we reform the Canadian Senate and adopt some better means for the selecting of its members, the country will not complain of the expenditure of that body.

House divided on the motion (Mr. Lancaster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Best,	McCarthy,
Campbell,	Magrath,
Chisholm (Huron),	Meighen,
Crothers,	Miller,
Currie (Simcoe)	Russell,
Emmerson,	Sexsmith,
Fraser,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Kidd,	Thornton,
Lancaster,	Wallace.—22.
Lewis,	
McCall,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McGiverin,
Armstrong,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth,	McKenzie,
Barker,	McLean (Huron),
Black,	Major,
Blain,	Marcile (Bagot),
Blondin,	Martin (Wellington),
Borden (Halifax),	Mayrand,
Boyce,	Meigs,
Bradbury,	Nantel,
Broder,	Nesbitt,
Brown,	Neely,
Carvell,	Northrup,
Cash,	Oliver,
Champagne,	Owen,

Chew,	Papineau,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Paquet,
	Pardee,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Parent,
Clark (Red Deer),	Paterson,
Congdon,	Perley,
Conmee,	Pickup,
Crocket,	Porter,
Daniel,	Proulx,
Demers,	Pugsley,
Devlin,	Rankin,
Douglas,	Reid (Grenville),
Dubeau,	Reid (Restigouche),
Elson,	Richards,
Fielding,	Rivet,
Fisher,	Ross (Middlesex),
Fortier,	Ross (Rimouski),
Foster,	Roy (Montmagny),
Gauvreau,	Rutan,
German,	Schell,
Girard,	Sealey,
Graham,	Sinclair,
Haggart (Lanark),	Smith (Middlesex),
Harris,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Hodgins,	Smith (Stormont),
Jameson,	Sperry,
King,	Sproule,
Knowles,	Talbot,
Kyte,	Taylor (Leeds),
Lake,	Templeman,
Lapointe,	Todd,
Laurier (Sir W.),	Tolmie,
Lavergne,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Warburton,
Loggie,	White (Victoria, Alta),
Macdonald,	
MacNutt,	Wilson (Laval),
McAllister,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
McCoig,	
McColl,	Worthington,
McCraney,	Wright.—111.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Turriff,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Molloy,	Staples.

Motion negatived.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PROVINCIAL REPRESENTATION IN THE SENATE.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR moved:

Whereas, it is provided by the British North America Act, section 22, that in relation to the constitution of the Senate, Canada shall be deemed to consist of three divisions, viz., Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, which shall be equally represented by twenty-four senators for each division;

And whereas, there is no provision for the creation of additional equal divisions upon the admission or constitution of other provinces, and the provinces west of Ontario have at present representation by only fifteen senators, although in population, size, contribution to the revenue and representation in the Commons, they have attained importance calling for treatment as an equal division;

This House is of the opinion that provision should be made for immediate augmentation of the representation of the western provinces in the Senate, by increasing said representation to six members each for British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, respectively; and for such further readjustment of the representation of the western provinces in the Senate as may from time to time be called for by reason of development in population and importance of interests.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this being a day devoted to the consideration of the Senate, it seems to me most opportune to go on with this resolution. I may say that I felt myself justified this afternoon in voting for the resolution calling for the abolition of the Senate because, amongst other reasons, the Senate, as at present constituted, does not give the province which I represent the representation to which we think we are entitled. While this resolution covers the four western provinces, of course I speak more particularly for the province of British Columbia, because that province seems to suffer most from insufficient representation in the Senate. We find that in the scheme of confederation provision was made for three units of representation, one for Quebec, one for Ontario and one for the Atlantic maritime provinces the idea being to protect the smaller provinces by giving them an equal division of representation in the Senate. We find this difficulty in the scheme of confederation that no one then seems to have contemplated the inclusion of the great western provinces in the confederation and when one by one the western provinces did come in no general amendment was made to the British North America Act, but in each case, in the separate Act bringing in the province, provision was made for the representation of the new province in the Senate. The representation of British Columbia in the Senate was fixed at three and remains at three to this day, there being no provision for an increase. Manitoba's representation was fixed at four and remains at that figure. With respect to Saskatchewan and Alberta there is a provision that after the next decennial census their representation in the Senate may be increased to six for each province and while, of course, that gives to each of these provinces about what would be a fair representation, the very fact that provision is made for them and no provision is made for Manitoba or British Columbia, makes the deficiency in the representation of the latter two provinces more apparent.

I gathered from the address of the right hon. the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid

Laurier) this afternoon that he is entirely in accord with the sentiment that the Senate should protect the smaller provinces, that the Senate should be so adjusted as to insure to the western provinces that they shall be represented in all important matters quite as fully as the larger provinces. I gathered from his remarks that he is in favour of the spirit of the resolution now before the House. I gathered also from the records of a few years ago when the question of Senate representation was before the House, that the right hon. leader of the House then realized that something should be done for British Columbia. Therefore, as I do not wish to make this in any sense a political address, but simply wish to bring the question in a formal way to the attention of the House and of the government, I shall not say anything more upon this resolution at present, but leave it with the hope that we may receive some sympathetic assurance from the government that a measure of justice will be done to the provinces of the west.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to give some explanation of the vote I gave this afternoon in favour of the resolution for the abolition of the Senate. In the province from which I come, we are entitled to four senators, and it has so come about during the last few years that we are now entitled to only four representatives in this House. There has been a vacancy in our representation in the Senate for some time, and if the government really believes that representation in the Senate is of any value to a province, I think it behooves this government to fill that vacancy without delay. The vacancy occurred during last summer, this House has been in session for some time and the vacancies in the Senate representation from other provinces have been filled. The government, however, has not seen fit to fill this vacancy in the smallest province in Canada, and I repeat that the government should at once give us proper representation in that body.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word or two in support of this resolution. We in our province have felt for many years that we have not been quite fairly treated in regard to representation in the Senate. In the last general election, for the first time, the western provinces stood equal in representation to the maritime provinces. Under the British North America Act three units of representation in the Senate were established, each of 24 seats. We feel now that we have reached a time in the west when we should have one unit of representation, namely 24 senators, as we have west of Lake Superior equal representation, namely 35 members, with the maritime provinces. That, I understand, is what this resolution asks for, that the Act shall be so framed that when our population shall warrant it, automatically we shall have the same representation as the other provinces. The new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have four senators each and automatically they will be increased to six each, but there is no provision of that kind in relation to British Columbia, we having only three senators. I shall not advance any argument after the able argument advanced by the Prime Minister himself this afternoon in regard to the resolution upon the abolition of the Senate. He very eloquently stated that the justification for the Senate would be that it afforded protection to minorities. I think that is a very strong argument in support of the resolution we have here. We want protection to minorities, and in this second Chamber which is supposed to safeguard the interests of the people, being an independent chamber, we seek to be duly and justly represented. You will readily see that, under present conditions, instead of being a source of strength, instead of being an assurance of fairness, the Senate might be a source of great danger to the western provinces. If, at any time, a question should arise in which there was a difference of opinion between the western provinces and the other three units that compose this Senate, advantage might be taken of the western provinces. I think that for this, if for no other reason, we might reasonably look not only to the first minister, but to the government also for support of this resolution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no complaint at all to make that this motion has been brought, still less of the manner in which it has been introduced by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor). I rather welcome this motion and the expression of opinion which, up to this time, it has elicited in the House. I may say without hesitation that, so far as concerns my own individual opinion, I am altogether in sympathy with the object of the motion. The enacting part of the resolution begins as follows:

> This House is of the opinion that provision should be made for immediate augmentation of the representation of the western provinces in the Senate, by increasing said representation to six members each for British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, respectively——

In introducing, some five years ago, the Bill for the creation of the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, I suggested, if I remember aright, this very idea that it would be advisable, before long,

to give to the new provinces an increase of representation in the Senate. The difficulty, however, is rather in what follows in the resolution of my hon. friend:

—and for such further readjustment of the representation of the western provinces in the Senate as may from time to time be called for by reason of development in population and importance of interests.

My hon. friend, I think, will agree with me that, when we deal with this question, we should deal with it in the spirit of the Confederation Act and at once make a new unit in the west and determine what the representation of that unit should be. It would not, in my juldgment, be in accordance with the spirit of the Confederation Act to leave it to parliament to increase from time to time the representation in the Senate. If there is one thing upon which all agree as to the controlling spirit of the constitution, it is that, in the popular Chamber, representation should be based on population, but in the second Chamber the principle of representation by population should not be followed, but that each sectional unit should be represented by a fixed number. Ontario was made a unit with 24 members in the Senate, Quebec another with 24 and the maritime provinces another with 24. My hon. friend suggests, in effect, a unit of 24 members. But the part of his motion to which I would invite his further attention and ask for his consideration is this: In giving 24 members to the western provinces, six for each of the four, leaving the matter to be changed from time to time, should we be acting according to the spirit of the constitution? If it were declared that the unit should remain at 24, or that, on these provinces reaching a certain population, it should be made a certain additional number, I for my part, would be prepared to consider that view. But I think that the one thing we ought to insist upon is that nothing should be left indefinite, but that we ought to determine at once what is the maximum of representation to be given to the western provinces to make them a unit. The question is not free from difficulty. It is one upon which I should be glad to have the views of my hon. friend. It is a question the consideration of which I should approach sympathetically. If the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Taylor) will allow me, I would suggest that he do not press his motion to a vote, but withdraw it and leave it to the consideration of the hon. members. I assure him, on behalf of the government, that we will give it the best consideration possible.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It seems to me that the position taken by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is a very proper one under the circumstances. I think it is generally understood that the representation of the country both in the Commons and in the Senate was settled on a basis that was intended to be permanent at that time—though changed conditions may necessitate changes in the future—and that in the House of Commons the basis of representation was population, Quebec being the pivot. I think it was equally intended that there should be no change in the number assigned to the representation in the Senate. With equal propriety, I believe, Quebec might have been made the pivot of representation in the Senate as well as in the Commons, with the provision that when the western country was brought in it should be considered one portion to which similar representation should be given to that given to Quebec. It is a very good plan it seems to me, for us to provide for the present. Let us deal with the conditions of the future as those conditions make change necessary. I do not think that our experience of the past in laying down cast iron rules intended to apply for all time justifies us in believing that we can with safety and propriety repeat that course. So many changes take place that we are obliged to make changes to adapt ourselves to the new conditions. It seems to me wise to deal with the present and practically let the future take care of itself in this regard.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am sure I could not reasonably find fault with the reception which the right hon. the first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has given to this resolution. And I may say at once that I am very glad to accept the suggestion which he has made to withdraw the resolution, leaving the matter to his—as I am sure it will be—favourable consideration. Let me say that my reason for suggesting provision for future readjustment was this: We have at present 35 members from the west in the House of Commons. In the next parliament, if the election takes place after the census of 1911, we shall have 65 members at least. Then in the parliament first succeeding the census of 1921, unless all signs fail, we shall have at least 125 members from these western provinces in this House. Therefore I did not suggest as a finality that the west should be content with one unit of 24 senators. I might also point out that western, like eastern Canada, is varied in its interests, and the time may come when we shall have on the Pacific coast sufficient population to justify a unit for purposes of representation equal in importance to the unit of the Atlantic maritime provinces. It may very well be that it will be thought proper to give us a separate unit for the Pacific coast, because our interests differ entirely from those of the

Northwest Territories constituting the central part of Canada. That was my idea when I suggested a further augmentation rather than suggest for the present the two units, as I think will be accorded the west in the lifetime of this generation, or appear to suggest that the people of the western provinces would be content with one unit as a final solution.

Motion withdrawn.

TRIAL OF WALTER BLYTHE.

Mr. T. G. WALLACE (Centre York) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, documents and correspondence with reference to and in any way concerning the postponement of the execution of Walter Blythe and also of his second trial.

He said: It is only right and just to the constituency I have the honour to represent, where considerable dissatisfaction exists, and having been brought to my attention with the postponement of the execution, that I should move to have the papers brought down.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). For one reason I do not regret that the hon. gentleman has placed this notice of motion upon the Order Paper. That reason is that it gives me the opportunity to explain what possibly may be an entire misapprehension in the minds of some people as to the position of this case. But apart from that reason, I am very sorry to see a motion of this character proposed in the House. There have been two or three previous occasions, during the few years I have been Minister of Justice, upon which similar motions were made; and on each of these occasions I have tried to explain why it was extremely undesirable that papers of this character should be ordered by the House. The relations which necessarily exist between His Excellency the Governor General and his advisers regarding the exercise of clemency are of more than usually confidential character, and I am scarcely able to imagine a case in which it would not be better, in the public interest, that the exercise of clemency or the refusal to exercise it should not be the subject of public discussion. The King, under our constitution, is not only the fountain of justice, but it is his most distinguished prerogative that with him rests the pardoning power. That personal prerogative he delegates to each Governor General by his own letter of instructions and by special directions signed with the royal hand. The power to pardon, the right to exercise clemency, rests entirely with the Governor General of Canada for the time being. In capital cases His Majesty's instructions to the Governor General are not to act except upon the advice of his privy council, but in other cases he does not take that advice. The government as a whole is not responsible for the action which may be taken with regard to any criminal condemned, except in capital cases, but in these the Governor General acts only upon the advice of his cabinet and upon the government of the day rests the responsibility. The case referred to in this motion is of that character, and I think I might content myself, in objecting to the passing of the motion, with the statement of fact that the man who was reprieved was afterwards awarded a second trial upon the ground that there had been a miscarriage of justice in the first, and upon that second trial he was found by the jury not guilty of the capital offence of murder, and as a consequence is now a prisoner in the penitentiary for a term of years. That circumstance surely demonstrates how dreadful it would have been had His Excellency not intervened and granted the reprieve which postponed the execution. I wish to say further that, judging from references to this case which I have seen in the newspapers and reports of statements said to have been made by men of the locality, another very great misapprehension as to the facts seems to exist. It seems to be thought that there had been repeated exercise of the power to reprieve on the part of His Excellency the Governor General in Council. That is a mistake. The prisoner, who had been found guilty of murder and condemned to death, and sentenced to be executed upon a certain day, about the middle of May last, was, on the day previous, reprieved by order of His Excellency. For that reprieve the government necessarily takes the fullest responsibility. That reprieve having been ordered by His Excellency—and I may say at once the reason for it was simply that the House of parliament, being then in session, there was absolute necessity for time to give further consideration to the case, and it was impossible to give that necessary time before the date which was set for the execution—that one reprieve, or postponement of execution, however, having taken place, His Excellency's advisers decided that they could not recommend any interference with the sentence of the court, and there was an absolute end of any further interference with this case, or connection with it, so far as His Excellency's advisers are concerned. There were renewed applications to different members of the council, to myself, and I think to the First Minister and possibly to other members of the council, in an effort, on the part of those who were interested in the prisoner, to secure further delay, or to secure some advice which might lead to a commutation of the death sentence. Those efforts were entirely fruitless. No further advice on the matter was tendered to His Excellency,

and so far as the government is concerned, their final advice, and their only advice, except in regard to the postponement I have described, was that they could not recommend any interference with the sentence of the court.

But under the law, any judge of the court before which a prisoner has been tried, has power, upon good cause, in his opinion, being shown, to postpone the execution of the sentence; and acting under that power there were, from time to time, I do not know how many different postponements of the execution of the sentence in this particular case. For those postponements, no member of the government has the slightest responsibility. His Excellency did not intervene; the decision of His Excellency under the advice of his council was that the law should be allowed to take its course; and no doubt the law would have taken its course, and wrongly, as it afterwards appeared, but for the circumstance that on different occasions some member of the court intervened and ordered another and still another delay of the execution. Ultimately, under these delays, the case was heard before the Court of Appeal when that court reassembled after vacation, I think in the month of September last year, and upon argument before that court, that court ordered a new trial, being of the opinion that the learned judge who had presided at the trial upon which the prisoner was condemned had omitted to charge the jury upon one very important issue in the case. It was entirely within the power of the court, it was the duty of the court, if the court saw error in law in the course of the original trial, to order that a new trial should be had, and the court having so ordered a new trial, its action would seem to have been justified by the fact that upon the second trial, and upon the jury at the second trial having been properly instructed as to the law, the second jury found the prisoner guilty, not of murder but of manslaughter. In the special facts of the case the whole question turned upon that distinct issue. The case was in many respects a very terrible one. The prisoner, in a condition of more or less intoxication, had beaten his wife and she died as the result. The question of his intention in striking her was all important. If he intended to kill, it was murder; if he intended but to chastise and was mistaken, if his blows were more violent than in his drunken condition, he knew, he was not in the eye of the law guilty of the more heinous crime of murder, but guilty of manslaughter. The jury having received from the court the proper instructions as to their duty in the matter, and having their attention drawn pointedly to the question which they were deciding, decided upon the evidence which they heard, and of which they were the proper judges, that the man did not intend to kill. I have not seen the evidence taken upon the second trial. The sentence not having been a capital one, that evidence did not in any way come under review before His Excellency's ministers. With regard to the evidence which was given at the original trial, I have read it, necessarily studied it, with all the care that it was possible for me to apply to it. I had my view, other members of council, upon the report which I made, and upon the discussion which took place in regard to the case around the council board, had their view. I am free to say that there was not unanimity among the individual members of the council on the subject. But that is just the kind of thing that to my mind, shows plainly that it is not in the public interest that the papers should be brought down, and that the advice in matters such as this given by council to His Excellency, should be canvassed, even in this House. I hope my hon. friend, under the circumstances, will not press his motion, but that, having had the discussion that there has been, having heard the explanation of the state of the facts which I have made, will see his way to withdraw the question from further consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. This is not a question upon which a layman would be expected to say anything, and but for the fact that it is equally important to the layman as to the lawyer that the public should have the greatest confidence in the impartiality of the administration of justice, I would refrain from speaking. But I have always held the opinion that one of the safest and surest guarantees for making the people believe that there is perfect impartiality is to give them the ground upon which the reasoned judgment was reached. I have heard the Hon. Mr. Blake say in this House once: 'I care very little for a man's judgment, whether he be high or low; but I care a great deal for his reasoned judgment, for then I can bring my intelligence to bear upon the question, and endeavour to satisfy myself at least whether he reached a sound conclusion or not.' Now I may say what may not be known to the Minister of Justice and the government, that there is a growing impression in the country that certain lawyers have such an influence with the administration of justice, or the government, or the Minister of Justice, that they can get almost any criminal off, or they can get the verdict of the court quashed. Now that impression that certain lawyers, whether it is due to the accident that they happen to be of the same political persuasion as the Minister of Justice and the government who are in power for the time being, or whether it is not, that impression is growing rapidly in the country, and it must be apparent to the Minister of Justice, as well as it is to every member

of this House, that it will ultimately lead to a very bad condition of affairs in any country if it results in destroying that respect which we have for the administration of justice in this country. We expect perfect impartiality. If the giving of publicity to the reasons which enabled the Minister of Justice, or the Governor in Council, who, I presume, was largely guided by the advice of the Minister of Justice, to reach the conclusion he did, results in settling the minds of the people who entertain improper views of the matter, in my judgment, it would not be an unmixed evil if these papers were given to the world. I can see very strong grounds for the contention which the Minister of Justice entertained, but, on the other hand, it seems to me that there are equally strong grounds for making these papers public so as to disabuse the public mind of the impression that there is anything wrong. There is another thing that I think will probably lead to good results; that is the distinction which the Minister of Justice has stated as between the Governor General and the Justice Department, that only in capital cases must the Governor General be guided by the advice of his council but that in other cases he may exercise his own judgment. Let that be known and it goes a long way to satisfy the public mind. If the people are under the impression that a wrong conclusion would be reached the responsibility would be placed on the right shoulders and the government would be relieved of it as a result. But, I think if it would accomplish no other end than satisfy the public mind that the same principles apply and that the same justice is meted out to all regardless of what their political leanings are, or what the political leanings of the lawyer are, or what their religious convictions are, or what their nationality is, it will do a great deal of good in the country, because, just so long as everybody has respect for the administration of justice and believes that every one is treated impartially there will be a good state of affairs in the country, while, if the reverse is the case, it breeds contempt for the law and it makes many men take the law into their own hands believing that they cannot get justice from the Justice Department.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to agree with the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) as regards a great many of his remarks, but I wish to say that there is a strong feeling in this country that a man who, because of the crime committed by him, really deserved to be hung, has escaped the gallows. A drunken man who, while he does not intend to kill the woman, pounds that woman to death, is entitled to suffer the full punishment for his crime. The Minister of Justice will agree with me that, even if he did not intend to murder the woman, the English law says that where a man is committing an unlawful act he is guilty of every act which ensues while he is committing that act. If the evidence adduced in this case only produced a verdict of manslaughter, then I think it is the duty of the Minister of Justice and of this House to have the law changed so that a man who commits the crime that this man did will be really punished and hung as this man should have been.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware from the circumstances and history of the case, that if a guilty man, a murderer, has escaped the gallows, the blame cannot be brought to the door of the government, but the blame must rest upon the court. The only thing which was done by His Excellency the Governor General in the case of this man was simply to give him a reprieve. He was to have been executed at a certain date and the date was postponed. Numerous petitions were presented to the government in favour of this man asking for a pardon or rather a commutation of the sentence. The advisers of His Excellency did not think it possible that this petition could be granted, but as there was a good reason to know whether or not the man had been properly convicted a reprieve was given and then application was made to the court for a new trial. The court granted a new trial. Now, my hon. friend says there is reason to believe that under the British law, if a man commits a breach of the law, such as was committed in this instance, it follows that it was murder. In the present instance this man committed an offence upon his wife, he committed an assault upon her, he beat her —there is no doubt about that because the fact is admitted—and as a consequence of that treatment his wife died. My hon. friend says it was murder. I do not know that I would differ from him, but the courts say differently. The courts say it was not murder. The case was tried again and the man escaped. Under such circumstances does my hon. friend believe, or is he prepared to say—

Mr. LEWIS. I said that if that did not constitute murder it was high time for the Minister of Justice to amend the law so that it would be murder.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, we are discussing now another matter. The government has been held to blame, as I gather from the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because they granted a reprieve. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) say that the government did anything wrong? On the contrary, will not my hon. friend admit that the govern-

ment could not do anything else than that which they did and that they acted wisely and humanely in granting a reprieve since the result was to give the man a new trial, the consequence of which was an acquittal? In view of the circumstances in this case, whatever may be the private opinion which any one may have, we must take it that justice has been done to this man. His life was saved and he was found guilty not of murder, but of manslaughter. Under such circumstances would it not have been shocking to believe that if this reprieve had not been given this man would have been executed for a crime for which, after all, he was found not to be guilty? My hon. friend from East Grey says that there is an impression growing that certain lawyers have an influence upon the government and can get almost any sentence commuted. I disagree altogether from my hon. friend. I do not believe there is any such impression abroad in the country. I do not agree that such an impression is growing because there is no evidence to support any such imputation upon the government. Nobody can boast that he has any such influence upon the government. The facts of this case prove to the contrary. Counsel for this man asked for the commutation of the sentence. It was refused. They asked for a reprieve. It was granted and what followed showed that the reprieve had been properly granted. If the second trial, after the reprieve had been granted, had resulted in the same manner as the first, then my hon. friend would have had some ground for his contention, but when the reprieve was granted and the granting of it was justified by the courts my hon. friend has no justification for saying that there was any improper influence brought to bear upon the case.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. gentleman improperly accuses me of saying something I did not say.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. SPROULE. I made absolutely no reference to the case at all although I know something about it. Nor would I pretend to say there was anything wrong. But I did say what I know to be a fact because I move enough around in the world to hear what is current talk; I said there was a growing feeling in that direction, and if giving these papers to the public disclosed the fact that there was nothing wrong, I said it would go a long way to disabuse the public mind of that impression and satisfy every one that the Department of Justice was right. That is the only feature of it I pretended to talk about. I did not accuse the government of anything wrong in this case nor do I pretend to say there was anything wrong. But I desire to impress upon the government that if anything can be done, by giving publicity to these papers or anything else, to disabuse the public mind of that growing impression it would do a great deal of good in the country.

Mr. LANCASTER. I rise to say a word, principally in corroboration of what has been said by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that he thought these things were as common talk makes them, but I am bound to say that we in that district of the province of Ontario not far from Toronto, and on the streets of Toronto, continually hear that a certain half dozen lawyers in the city of Toronto can get anything they want from this government providing the men who want it will give them the money. I am not saying this is so, but I am saying that certain lawyers are taking advantage of that impression in the city of Toronto, and the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is right in saying that if these papers are brought down and show there was ground for this reprieve it will go a long way to remove that idea. I do not say it myself, but if people believe these things the country suffers. I have not yet heard any good reason given why these papers should not be brought down. If these papers contain the information that the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister say they contain everything will be all right and the people can see it is so. The hon. gentleman from Centre York (Mr. Wallace) and his constituents will see if the papers are brought down that things are in a proper condition. I must say that on the main point, the rights of the hon. gentleman are being disregarded by the Minister of Justice. Surely this government is responsible to parliament for their action in advising the Governor General. The Minister of Justice has not said in so many words that they are not, but that is the logical result of his contention. If that is what he means, I must dissent from the view that the cabinet can advise the Governor General in regard to these matters and not be responsible to parliament as to why they gave that advice. There is a very good reason why the papers should be brought down, and it would be for the public good if they were brought down.

Mr. LEWIS. Am I in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. Not except by way of explanation; the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. LEWIS. I did not say nor do I wish it to be inferred that I thought there was anything wrong at headquarters, but there has been a travesty of justice, there

has been a miscarriage of justice and I say it is the duty of the government and of the Minister of Justice to have the law amended if it requires amendment so that this should not occur again. There is a strong feeling throughout the country that a guilty man has escaped the gallows.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I would ask permission of the House to say a brief word which is in the nature of personal explanation, in view of the observations which have fallen from some gentlemen with regard to the impression which is said to exist that some lawyer or lawyers can get anything they want from the Department of Justice. With regard to this particular case I understand it has been disclaimed that there was any intention to apply that observation to it. The gentleman who appeared as counsel in this case for the prisoner is a practising lawyer whose practice principally consists in the defence of accused persons and it necessarily results that many of his clients are convicted, and I suppose it results as an equal matter of course that he is a very frequent applicant for clemency. I do not know; I cannot remember taxing my memory to the utmost while I have been sitting here, if that gentleman appeared in this particular case or did not appear upon the application for commutation of the sentence. I can assure you, Sir, that it did not make the slightest difference whether he did or whether he did not. It is the duty of the Minister of Justice in all capital cases to read the evidence with all the care that he can bestow upon it. The responsibility rests I think upon him personally. Certainly that responsibility has not, in the time that I have occupied the position of Minister of Justice been neglected in any single instance. It has made no manner of difference whether the prisoner was defended by a lawyer or was not defended at all; whether the prisoner had any lawyer coming to Ottawa or writing to Ottawa, or whether he was absolutely friendless and had no one interceding or interesting himself on his behalf. How could it in the nature of things? Every word of the evidence has to be real and sifted and weighed, and marshalled one statement with another, in order that an opinion may be formed as to whether or not there is in this particular case or in that particular case any room for doubt. The only action of the government in this particular case, was as I have explained, to advise a postponement of the execution. That proceeded absolutely upon the motion of the government itself and not upon anybody's request. It was for the reason which I have explained, and certainly in that action no lawyer at all intervened. Now, with regard to criminal cases generally in respect to which it is said this impression exists—the same statement was made in this House by the member for North Toronto two years ago in moving for a return which was prepared with great labour and after long examination of the files for the last 13 years to show in each instance where there had been any lawyer intervening on behalf of any prisoner asking for clemency, who that lawyer was and what was the result of the application. That information is before the House. I hope hon. gentlemen will study it, and before any hon. gentleman will again say such a thing on the floor of this House as has been said to-night that the impression prevails or that the impression is abroad that some lawyers can have anything they choose to ask for from the Department of Justice, I hope any hon. gentleman who meditates such a statement will in common fairness examine that return and read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it. I feel indignation that such a statement should be made here when the facts are before the House and before the public if any one chooses to look at them, and I want simply to say this further: That since I have been administering that branch of the Department of Justice in this country the cases which have passed through my personal hands have averaged from 50 to 60 each week; I have never let a single case pass through my hands without reading every word of every page of every paper on the file in that case. In the vast majority of these cases no lawyer at all intervened. The great bulk of them are cases in which either the prisoner himself applies from his prison or some member of his family writes to ask or some friend calls to see me to ask consideration of the case. I have let no opportunity pass unimproved to impress on every prisoner and on the friends of every prisoner that it is better for him, better for his pocket at all events, that he should have no lawyer representing him before me in the case. I want the assistance of no lawyer in the matter, I see no need of any lawyer in such a matter, it is not a matter for argument as upon legal points, it is simply a question of whether or not facts are presented on which clemency could be recommended, and I have done everything in my power to persuade prisoners not to pay lawyers money for any such offices, which do them no good in the world. If a lawyer comes to me and asks to see me to discuss a case pending consideration I cannot refuse to see him; in common courtesy I see any person, it makes no difference who it is, and any one can do as much good as any lawyer, no matter who that lawyer may be.

Mr. WALLACE. I brought this matter to the attention of the House as I considered it my duty to do so because this murder was committed in my constituency. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction, and I do not know whether the Justice Department or some one else was responsible for the postponement of that first trial. I simply brought it before the attention of the House as I thought it was due to my constituents that I should do so. After hearing the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, I do not wish to press the motion. I do not see any reason why the papers should not be brought down, but in view of what they have said I do not think it would be of any use, as they are opposed, to press the motion, and I beg leave to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

STATUS OF ENGINEERS IN CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.) moved:

For a copy of all papers, correspondence and memorials in the hands of the government with regard to the engineering service of the government, and respecting a high professional standard, a recognized official status by enrolment or incorporation in the Civil Service, and respecting a system of pensions and superannuations in connection with that service.

He said: Mr. Speaker, during the short time I have been a member of this House, and for a good many years before I had the honour of a seat here, I had not been an altogether uninterested spectator of what was going on in the Dominion, and I have not been an uninterested student of public affairs. I have deemed it my duty as a citizen of Canada to know as much as I could of what was going on in this country of ours, and among other things I have thought it well to inquire into some branches of the public service, not that I would pose as a reformer, but that I would wish as a Canadian, to understand what was going on in my country, to understand the position in which the public service was placed, and if it ever were in my power to give credit to any public servant, to be able to give it, or if I could not be of assistance to any of my fellow countrymen, to try and be so. In looking over the public service of this country it has always appeared to me that the engineers who are now perhaps one of the most important parts of that public service, were in somewhat of an anomalous if not a false position. I have in conversation with members of the engineering service of this Dominion and also with many other engineers not connected with the public service, talked over and discussed this matter, and the consensus of opinion, so far as I could gather it, was that the engineers are not in a position in which they ought to be placed. In the early days of confederation it did not appear, I presume, that engineers were of as much importance as we now know them to be. The engineer of that day might be a very accomplished, eminent and skilled engineer or he might be an engineer whose training was the training of the rule of thumb and of experience or none at all. The work they had to do in those days was not the work they have to do nowadays, and consequently many men, and very deserving men, found their way into the public service as engineers, who, in a strict sense, were not qualified for the position they gained, although their old time experience in works throughout the country enabled them in a great measure to succeed in the works entrusted to their hands. These works, however, were very different from the works which must now be undertaken by government engineers. Many of these gentlemen, some quite recently, have asked me to bring this matter to the attention of the government and of this House. so that their position might be placed before the government and before this country in order that such steps might be taken to ameliorate that position as might appear fit in the eyes of the government and of this House. As far back as March, 1901, the petition signed by the engineers in the public service from the Atlantic to the Pacific, was forwarded to the then chief engineer or acting chief engineer of the Public Works Department. That was some seven or eight years before the present minister entered this House, and I am informed on authority which I cannot doubt that no answer was ever received to that petition. In that petition the engineers set out the changes which they would like to have made in regard to that part of the public service with which they were concerned. Let me, before going into these matters, point out for a moment the vast importance which the profession of the engineer in Canada and in the public works in Canada has attained. You have enormous public works, railways, canals, public buildings and innumerable other public works being carried on in this country in which the expenditure of money is simply enormous, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that the difference in cost of many public works in this country will be very great in accordance with the capacity of the engineer employed. The engineer who thoroughly understands his business and is a man of integrity may save hundreds, thousands or hundreds of thousands of dollars. An equally honest engineer who does not understand his business so well may, with perfect honesty, lose the government and his country equally large sums.

As a very large proportion of the expenditure of Canada has to be made under the supervision of and to some extent through the engineers employed in the various branches of the government, it is, I think, right for us to consider their case. I am informed that in all the branches of the public service of Canada the engineers, perhaps the most important of the whole lot, are not included in the Civil Service of Canada. There are, I believe, one or two exceptions of engineers in some of the departments who are members of the Civil Service, but I am informed that in some of those cases, and they are very few, they are there not as engineers but as clerks, they draw salaries as chief clerks or clerks and not as engineers, not as members of the profession to which they belong and whose duties they perform. If that be correct, and I have the information on good authority, it justifies the statements I have made that the position of the engineering profession in the public service is not only anomalous but to a very great extent a false one. What course should the government take? The members of the engineers association are naturally proud of the profession to which they belong and object to their status not being equal to that of other branches in the public service. It may be gathered, from the few opening remarks I have made, particularly with reference to the past, that not much care is exercised in the admission of gentlemen into our public service as engineers. As I am informed, it has not been necessary for them to produce certificates or diplomas from any recognized engineering institute or credentials of any kind in order to get employment. It has not even been deemed necessary that they should produce any evidence of education, scientific, technical or general. But in saying this, I wish to be distinctly understood as not reflecting on the engineers now in the public service. On the contrary, I have a very high opinion of them, and it has been a source of astonishment to me that the government should have succeeded in procuring and retaining the services of such an excellent staff.

The first requisite for the government service should be high professional standing. That should be insisted on. While, as a rule, the engineers in the public service are well up in their profession, there are some exceptions, and I think that it would be in the interests of the service and of the engineers themselves that a fixed standard of efficiency should be enforced on admission. In other parts of the world, the importance of education, scientific and otherwise, is recognized by governments in the selection of their engineers, and it seems to me that a similar course should be followed here and a high standard insisted on. I know that the great majority of the engineers of Canada are very anxious that should be done. They are not at all anxious that men should be admitted into the service as engineers who have not reached that high standard in the profession which ought to justify their appointment.

I have already referred briefly to the enormous expenditure of public money which takes place throughout the Dominion under the direction of engineers. Take for instance the Grand Trunk Pacific, on which hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent, a great part of it under the supervision of engineers. How vitally important it is in the interests of Canada that the men who superintend that expenditure should be thoroughly competent is self evident. But not only is there the expenditure of money to be considered. Enormous as that expenditure is, it is perhaps not the most important matter. By the expenditure of that money we are opening up and developing this great country, and this country could never have been developed as it has been were it not for the work of these engineers. On that work we have to depend for the opening up of the rich and fertile regions of the west; and unless the men we employ be competent, thoroughly trained to a high standard, it is almost hopeless to expect that the work will be done in a satisfactory manner. Therefore, I would suggest that before a man is admitted into our public service as an engineer, he should be required to possess a high standard of qualification. He should have gone through a proper technical school, a proper school of engineering, or have the certificate of some institute of engineers on which reliance can be placed. A distinguished English engineer, Mr. James Chas. Inglis, the newly elected president of the Institute of Civil Engineers, London, in his inaugural address said:

> Several important departments of state rely to a considerable extent upon the work of the council, and in some cases, upon advice given by it with respect to questions of the qualification of the engineers and of their selection for public services. The result of all this strengthening of the efficiency of the institution is that a higher average technical proficiency is undoubtedly attained by the young engineers attached to it than was formerly the case, and this state of affairs has been notably marked by the action of the India office with respect to engineering appointments in the Public Works department; and, very recently, by the War Office which has entrusted to the council of the institution the important function of selecting and recommending young engineers for nomination to the newly organized reserve of officers for the Royal Engineers. . . . The War Office has assigned to the president of the institution the duty of selecting men for nomination to this reserve, as may be required from time to time.

Thus the contention I am putting forward has already been acted upon by the governments of Great Britain and India. No doubt many of us take some interest in India. I know, that although I have never visited that country, I am much interested in its progress, and I am aware that some of the finest and greatest public works there are carried on under the direction of engineers employed by the government—young men sent out to India, who begin with a small salary and rise to large salaries, and who are noted for their faithfulness to duty and the excellent work they perform. We have in Canada the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers, started in 1867, consisting of 2,000 members from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This institute has for a considerable time past exercised a very potent influence upon the matters which come under its notice. That influence is bound to go on increasing, as I understand—in fact, I know—that that institution takes remarkably good care as to the qualifications of the gentlemen admitted to its membership and as to their character as well. It is an institution whose influence must be for good, its membership and usefulness must increase as the country grows older. I do not suggest that we should go so far as Great Britain or India and ask this institution to supply officers for the service of the government. I think that, perhaps, that would be to abdicate some of our own functions. But it would not be out of place to have the certificate of that institution or some other institute in which confidence could be placed, or the approval of such society based upon examination, as a preliminary before a young man could take a position in the engineering service of Canada.

Then there is the question of the official status of those thus included in the Civil Service. We have reason to believe that, while the pay which the engineers in the outside public service receive is not on a large scale—and I propose to come to that shortly—I have reason to believe that the smallness of pay they receive is not so much a matter of complaint on the part of these gentlemen as that they have no proper status in the public service. When the Civil Service Act of 1876 was passed, the engineers seem to have been overlooked; and, in the different Acts that have been passed since that time, so far as I have been able to see, they still remain out in the cold. Many of these men have been in the public service practically during their whole working lives. You have men in the public service as engineers who have been there for forty years, men who have done good service and remain on simply because they have to. Like the rest of us, they have wives and families and they have a position to maintain. In fact, the engineer, I believe, is more called upon to expend money than almost any other man in the public service, owing to the fact that he is sent about the country a great deal and expenses are practically forced upon him, which, perhaps, he cannot charge in his bill of expenses but which are very real nevertheless. Though the engineers have been left without the scope of these Civil Service laws, I understand that in the schedules of the outside service no provision has been made for engineers as to appointment, promotion, retiring allowance and so on. But the great difficulty, and that to which they take most exception is that while they are a most important part of the public service of Canada, they are not considered part of the Civil Service of Canada but are a sort of outcast people so far as the Civil Servie is concerned. Again, while, in many other departments of the public service provision is made for superannuation and pension, no such provision is made in the case of the engineers. By superannuation I mean an allowance to a man who has served faithfully, and who, owing to old age, accident, or some similar cause must end his service and retire. By pension, I mean provision for the families of those who have spent their lives in the public service and have passed away leaving their families unprovided for. Such provision is made for many other classes of the Civil Service, and the members of the engineering service think that they ought not to be treated differently from others. I think that, rightly and justly, they should form a branch of the public service and that not only should they have the privilege of working for their country as other public servants do, but that when their working days are over they should have the same privilege as other employees have of superannuation and pension allowance.

The engineering service of India, is, perhaps, one of the best. In Australia also, they have taken remarkable care of this service and have brought it to a very high state of efficiency. I have taken some pains to have extracted from the reports bearing on this subject matter relating to the engineering services of India and Australia, which, I think, will be of interest. Here are some of the provisions made in India:

Candidates for appointment must be between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five, British subjects, of good moral character and sound physique.

They must have passed the A.M.I.C.E. examination (Associate Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers), or have obtained a science or engineering degree in one of the standard universities of Great Britain. He must also have had some practical experience in the design or execution of some engineering work of importance.

The candidate, upon appointment, enters the service as an assistant engineer of the third grade, at a salary of $1,824.

In calculation I have counted the rupee as worth forty cents. I believe the government of India counts it as forty-two cents.

His travelling expenses are paid to India and his salary begins upon arrival.

The salaries of the various ranks of the department are as follows:

Class.	Salary per annum.
Chief engineer, first-class	$13,200
" second-class	12,000
Superintending engineer, first-class	9,600
" " second-class	8,400
" " third-class	7,200
Executive engineer, 20th year of service and following years	6,000
Executive engineer—	
19th year of service	5,760
18th "	5,520
17th "	5,280
16th "	5,040
15th "	4,800
14th "	4,560
13th "	4,320
12th "	4,080
11th "	3,840
10th "	3,600
9th "	3,360
Assistant engineer—	
8th year of service	3,168
7th "	2,976
6th "	2,784
5th "	2,592
4th "	2,400
3rd "	2,208
2nd "	2,016
1st "	1,824

Now, as to pensions:

Pensions.

An engineer is eligible for a pension on voluntary retirement, after completing twenty years' service, or reaching the age of fifty-five years. If, at an earlier date, he is compelled to retire from the service through ill health, he becomes eligible for an invalid pension or gratuity, according to the length of his service, as follows:—

After ten years of service an invalid gratuity of one month's pay for each year in the service.

After ten years or more of service, an invalid pension of the following amounts:—

Years of Completed Service.	Sixtieths of average emoluments.	Limit of Pension.
10	20	$ 400
11	21	560
12	22	720
13	23	880
14	24	1,040
15	25	
16	26	
17	27	
18	28	1,200
19	29	

After a service of not less than 20 years, a retiring pension not exceeding the following amounts:—

Years of Completed Service.	Sixtieths of average emoluments.	Limit of Pension.
20 to 24	30	$1,600
25 and above		2,000

Engineers who have shown special efficiency during three years service in certain appointments may be allowed an additional pension of $400 a year.

Provident funds.

Engineers in the service make a compulsory contribution of five per cent on their salaries, with a voluntary contribution of a further five per cent. Compound interest on these payments is credited, and the whole accumulated sum is handed over to him upon retirement, or, in the event of his death before retirement, to his heir.

Leaves of absence.

Privilege leave (with full pay) is granted to the extent of one-eleventh part of the time that an engineer has been on duty without interruption. It may be accumulated up to three months, earned by thirty-three months duty.

Furlough and special leave are granted of an aggregate maximum of six years during the engineer's service. The amount of furlough earned being one-fourth of an engineer's active service. Furlough is limited to two years at a time. During the first two years of furlough, half pay is granted. After two years furlough, one quarter pay.

For purposes of pension, the rupee is calculated at 1-9 d. equal to 42·58 cents.

I calculate the rupee at forty cents. Now those are the Indian regulations. I would call attention to the leave of absence, because I do not think there will be any need for similar regulations here. The climate of India is such that longer furloughs are necessary than would be necessary in Canada; consequently, not only in the engineering service, but in all the other services of that country, extensive furloughs are the rule, running up to two years at a time. Such long leaves of absence would be altogether impracticable in Canada. At the same time stiff regulations ought to be made with regard to leave of absence, so that there can be no complaining or fault finding when a man seeks for such leave. Now, in Australia also they have taken a good deal of trouble over this matter. I will read from a synopsis I have made of the regulations in Australia:

Candidates for appointments in the professional division (the engineering service of the Public Works department) must be British subjects, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two.

After passing a competitive examination, a successful candidate is appointed a 'cadet draughtsman'. The first appointment of a successful candidate is probationary and the initial salary is £75 per annum, advancing by annual increments of £15 up to £150 a year.

In due course, the candidate draughtsman may present himself for examination for the office of junior assistant engineer. The examin-

ation embraces mathematics, (including plane and spherical trigonometry, calculus, analytical geometry, algebra, statics and dynamics, and astronomy). Applied mechanics, materials and structures, mechanical, hydraulic, railway and sanitary engineering (any two of these), physics, surveying, drawing and design.

A successful candidate is appointed junior assistant engineer, with initial salary of £175 a year.

Candidates (other than cadet draughtsmen, or engineer cadets), for the position of junior assistant engineer, must have the degree of B.E. or M.E., of the university of Sydney, or a diploma in engineering from some recognized university or school of engineering, and must also produce a certificate from some recognized professional man, of practical work in field and office for a period of not less than nine months, and such candidates are also required to submit to a competitive examination in field instrument work, drawing and design, and the writing of reports or theses.

From junior assistant engineer, promotion is by examination and vacancy, successively to third class, second class and first class assistant engineer, thence to district engineer and 'principal assistant' engineer, in the railway, roads and bridges, water supply and drainage departments, respectively; and finally to chief engineer of railway and tramway construction, and chief engineer of rivers, water supply and drainage.

The following table shows the maximum and minimum salaries of the above grades:—

	From.	To.
Cadet draughtsmen.....	£ 75.....	£150
Junior ass't. engineer..	175.....	230
3rd class ass't. engineer..	230.....	300
2nd class ass't. engineer..	300.....	410
1st class ass't. engineer..	400.....	500
District engineer....	510.....	600
Principal ass't. engineer..	630.....	850
Chief engineer..	825.....	1,000

Leave.

The regulations provide for the granting to every officer of the department leave of absence for eighteen working days during each year. Also for short leave absence for special purposes, not exceeding three days at a time, any excess of the special leave over three days in one year being deducted from the officer's next annual, or accumulated, leave.

Travelling expenses.

Allowances for travelling expenses from 10s. per day up to 17s. 6d. per day, according to the salary of the engineer or officer, are allowed as sustenance allowance, all cost of conveyances being paid in addition by the department.

Living allowances to the amount of 10 per cent of the salary are allowed to engineers residing in certain distant parts of the state.

There appears to be no system of pensions in the department, but pervading the whole public service is a system of compulsory insurance, at standard rates of premium and with policies of a size commensurate with the salary of the officer. In exceptional cases, in lieu of insurance, an officer is permitted to dispense with insurance, and in these cases a percentage is deducted from his salary which accumulates with compound interest, and on his retirement or death is handed over to himself or his heir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may have taxed your patience in reading those extracts, but it seems to me they are important, as showing the high standard placed upon engineering service in other parts of the empire. I think it is becoming more and more evident that the government of Canada, or any other government, cannot expect to obtain the service of competent men unless these men get a good remuneration therefor. We have had, within the last few days, a most notable instance in the fact that the Department of Railways and Canals has lost its deputy minister, who had been in the department for seven or eight years, and though he was receiving what the general public looked upon as the enormous salary of $8,000 a year. But a private corporation thought he was worth $25,000 a year, and very properly he decided to throw in his lot with the private corporation. Now, so long as private corporations and private individuals can come in and take away the best men you have, or can induce our best young men in this country to enter their employment, so long will the engineering service of Canada be in the unsatisfactory state in which we find it. Here I wish to recall a remark which I made in opening, that I am not reflecting upon the men who are in the service, because I believe that, considering all things, they are an exceptionally fine body of men. The only wonder is that you have such a good body of men as you have. But make the service better worth entering, and you will get better men to enter it, and when you get more competent men, you will get a more efficient public service, and save money thereby. You will have better men to look after the expenditure of your money, they will do better work, and their labour will procure a better development than you can expect under present circumstances. I have no doubt also that the saving of money will be very great. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take up so much time, but this is a matter in which I have taken a great deal of interest, and I thought it worth while to bring it before the attention of this House and of the government. I know instances of men in the public service who themselves wished to be out of it some time ago because of advancing years, but who cannot, in justice to themselves and their family, leave off work; so they have to remain until death calls them away, or until some one else who wants their position succeeds in expelling them from it. That is not right. I have heard it said, and I believe it is true, that the worst thing ambitious young men can do is to take employment under the government. It is true that they get a certain fixed income, and they are sure of it while they

remain in the service, but the stimulus of ambition is taken away from them, they have no broad outlook. They can always depend upon getting enough to eat and to wear, but not much more, under their present salaries. It will be a marvel to me if in the course of a few more years, when the demand for skilled engineers will have increased enormously, as it must and will increase, you can expect to have the benefit of a first rate class of men in the public service and without having a first rate class of men in the public service the public service must necessarily suffer.

Now, I do not propose to take up more of your time. I wish simply to present the case of the engineering branch of the public service to the House and the government in the hope that a higher standard will be insisted upon for admission into the service, that the status of engineers will be improved, that they will be placed on an equal footing with their fellow employees in the public service who have the advantage of being enrolled under the Civil Service Act, that while the salaries and pay in other branches are being increased, consideration will be given to the case of the engineers who are perhaps the most important body of men in the public service, that their needs and claims will not be overlooked, and that they will be treated in such a way that we will not be losing many of our best men.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, speaking for the department over which I have the honour to preside, and with a knowledge of the position which our engineering staff occupies in the department, I can say that I feel that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the view which has been presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton), more especially in so far as the salaries of the engineering staff of the department are concerned. In speaking of the engineering staff, I include not only those who are engaged in the department at Ottawa, but those who are engaged throughout the Dominion, acting as resident engineers in the various important centres of Canada. My hon. friend has said that it is a wonder that we have been able to keep such good men as we have in the department. Sometimes I have entertained the same opinion as that which my hon. friend has expressed. From my observation since I have been minister I am satisfied that the country is fortunate in having in its employ such able and conscientious men as are engaged upon the engineering staff, not only at Ottawa, but throughout the Dominion. When we come to consider what engineers get in the employ of the different railway companies and other corporations engaged in the carrying on of various industries in the country it does seem remarkable that we have been able to secure and retain in the employ of the government so many able and experienced men as we have at the comparatively small salaries which are being paid to them. To that extent I agree with the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend. I also agree with the view that every reasonable encouragement should be extended to the engineers in the employ of the government. But, I do not agree with my hon. friend, that, apart from the matter of salaries, they are treated any way differently from those who are engaged in other departments. My hon. friend says that they are not entitled to superannuation. The same remark will apply to others who are in the employ of the government, and who have come into that employment in recent years. Under the old Civil Service Act, the employees of the government were entitled to superannuation, but there were a great many employees in the Public Works Department, not merely engineers, but architects and clerks in the different branches performing important duties who were equally outside the Civil Service Act. When the present Civil Service Act came into force, out of a total of 230 employees of the Public Works Department at Ottawa, in its different branches, I think there were only some 36 who came within the terms of the Civil Service Act, and, therefore, there are almost 200 occupying the same position as far as the right of superannuation is concerned. My hon. friend is no doubt aware that some years ago the Superannuation Act was repealed, and that those who have come into the department since are not entitled to superannuation. As far as the engineering staff outside of Ottawa are concerned, they are in the same position as many other outside employees in the different departments of the government. The Civil Service Act, it is true, does not apply to them; neither does the Civil Service Act apply to other outside employees in the various departments. Therefore, those who are engaged outside of Ottawa are not in any worse position than the other employees of the government. I think, perhaps, my hon. friend based some of his remarks upon what was the status of the engineers in the Public Works Department before the Civil Service Act came into force. By that Act those upon the staff in Ottawa were all brought under its operation, and while some are named as chief clerks and some as clerks belonging to one division and another, the reason they were so classified was in order that full justice might be done to them, in order that they might go into that class to which the salaries they were receiving entitled them to go, and what we did for them we did in the effort to do complete justice to them and not, as I can assure my hon. friend, with any desire to do

any injustice, or from any failure to recognize the important services which they are rendering to the country. I only wish to make a few further remarks with regard to the way the engineering staff is being implemented from time to time, and I think that our practice is calculated to secure good service to the country just as much as the practice which prevails in other countries. We have, I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the resident engineers throughout Canada—and I am not prepared to suggest now that there is any exception to the remark which I am going to make—men who are a credit to the country, who are capable of discharging their duties well and who, I believe, do discharge the important duties of their positions in the best interests of the country. I believe they are intelligent and what is of even greater importance I believe that without exception they are honest and are endeavouring to get for the country full value for the moneys which are being expended under their supervision. What we are doing from time to time is to give encouragement to young men who are graduates from our various engineering colleges by giving them employment during the season of vacation under the direction of the resident engineers. If these young men show their ability in the work in which they are engaged, we give them encouragement by employing them permanently, and as from year to year they get greater experience, we add to their duties and place them in greater positions of responsibility. In this way the engineering staff throughout the country is being recruited, and so far as my observation goes we have not made many mistakes in the young men we have selected. I shall not refer especially to the work that is being done by the engineering staff at Ottawa and throughout the country, but I may say that any hon. member who keeps in mind the work that is being done by the engineers of the Department of Public Works must feel that these gentlemen are not only capable of doing good work, but that they do bend their best energies to giving entire satisfaction and seeing that the work under their supervision is well and faithfully done. I am very glad my hon. friend has brought this matter to the attention of the House. I recognize with him that the salaries are small, although they are larger to-day than they were some few years ago. Every year we recognize the services of the engineering staff by giving an increase, in some cases of $50 and in some cases of $100, and in a few cases more. We do all that parliament has authorized us to do with the moneys which have been placed at the disposal of the department. It will afford me very great pleasure to have the return prepared upon the motion of my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY

ANGUS SAUVE.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports, despatches, documents and other papers relating in any way to the claim for a homestead, by the members of the family of Angus Sauvé, who was in the African campaign, and who died a short time after his arrival in the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Carried.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. LOUIS J. PAPINEAU (Beauharnois) moved second reading of Bill (No. 48) to amend the Railway Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. PAPINEAU. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is intended to repeal one of the amendments adopted last session to subsection 1 of section 298 of the Railway Act, which concerns damages caused to property by fires started from locomotives used by railway companies in the operation of their lines. This section is comparatively recent law, having been first enacted in the Consolidated Railway Act of 1903, as a consequence, I believe, of the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific railway, which no doubt is familiar to the hon. members of this House. It enacts first, that railway companies are responsible for damage caused to any property destroyed by fire started from a locomotive, whether guilty of negligence or not, and that it can be sued therefor before any court of competent jurisdiction. Their full responsibility is there well established. But it is immediately altered in the next sentence, which states that if it is shown that the company employs modern and efficient appliances,and is not otherwise guilty of negligence, their liability in such case, for such damage caused by one or more fires on the same occasion is limited to $5,000 without regard to the value or number of properties destroyed. That is, Mr. Speaker, a railway company may set fire by sparks from its locomotive and burn out a whole village or town, and if it is established that it has used modern and efficient appliances, then it will be held to pay $5,000 to be apportioned among the parties who have lost their property on this occasion. This was the law in force since 1903 till last session when a Bill to amend this section was then adopted by this House, which made two amendments to it. The first struck out the enumeration of property for which compensation could be claimed from the company and substituted therefor the words 'any property.' The second added the words 'under this section' after the word 'recoverable' in the

ninth line, and was needed also, and the Bill was then sent to the Senate. When it came back another amendment had been added to it which I consider ought to be repealed. That amendment is as follows:

Provided further that the company shall, to the extent of the compensation recoverable, be entitled to the benefit of any insurance effected upon the property by the owner thereof. Such insurance shall, if paid before the amount of compensation has been determined, be deducted therefrom; if not so paid, the policy or policies shall be assigned to the company, and the company may maintain an action thereon.

By this amendment the railway companies are entitled to claim from the owner a sum equal to the amount they pay him out of the insurance there may be on any property that they destroy by fire started from their locomotives, provided they show that they use modern and efficient appliances and are not otherwise guilty of negligence. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the amount of insurance carried on property represents generally but a fraction of its value. In most cases, I dare say, it amounts to one-half or two-thirds of such value. Under the law as amended, and as it now stands, if a property worth $15,000 is insured for $5,000 and it is destroyed by fire caused by a railway locomotive, the owner has practically no recourse against the company because he will have to give the amount he may receive from the insurance to reimburse the company what it has paid him. The consequence of this is that since this amendment came into force, every property which is near a railway line and liable to be destroyed by fire from locomotives, is insured by the owner for the sole benefit of the railway company to the extent of its full limited liability. This law in this case takes away the insurance of the owner, who has paid, may be, for years and years, annual premiums for his own protection and gives it to the railway companies which, though they are solely responsible for the loss of the property, not only pay absolutely nothing, but deprives also the owner of his partial indemnity to help him out in such hard circumstances. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment should be repealed and the old clause, which in my opinion goes far enough if not too far in favour of the railway companies, should be restored.

Subsection 3 of section 298 states that the railway companies have an insurable interest in the properties that they may damage or destroy by such fires, and if they do want insurance, they can have it and pay for it, as everybody does. The principal objections to this amendment, which I propose to repeal, may be summed up thus:

1st. It practically deprives the recourse against railway companies for partial compensation for damage caused by fires set by their locomotives, and restores the old law in force before 1903.

2nd. It takes away the benefit of a contract of insurance between the owner of property and the insurance company and gives the benefit to the railway company which was not a party to that contract.

3rd. It, as a consequence, makes the owner of property pay premiums of insurance on his property, but for the benefit of railway companies, who get it to the prejudice of the owner.

Such is the object of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and with these remarks, I have the honour to propose its second reading.

Mr. GRAHAM. As my hon. friend (Mr. Papineau) has pointed out this amendment to which he refers was placed in the Railway Act in 1909 by the Senate. As he has rightly pointed out, the liability of the railway company is limited to $5,000 unless negligence on the part of the railway company be shown. The amendment inserted by the Senate was in brief to the effect that if a property destroyed by fire originating from a locomotive had been insured the insurance would practically be deducted from the amount the railway company would have to pay. In other words the principle was that the man insuring would not get damages from the railway company for his loss and also collect insurance, getting double pay for the same loss, and that the railway company, if it had to pay damages up to a certain amount, would be protected to the extent of the insurance which the man collected. There is some reason for that, but as my hon. friend has pointed out there might be a case where the railway company might benefit rather than lose on account of an action for damages or the result of such an action. At all events it has been represented to me very strongly that if that Act of last session were allowed to remain on the statute-book there might well be some amendment which would provide that the owner of the property who paid the premiums on the policies should get back the premiums he paid. Strong representations have been made to me during the two years I have been a member of the government along the line of the amendment made last year by the Senate, and there is some reason for some clause to that effect. My hon. friend has pointed out circumstances under which it would not be fair. In view of the representations made to me in the past few weeks concerning this Bill, and in order that we may enable those who favour as well as those who oppose the Bill to place their views before the House, I would suggest to my hon. friend that we refer it to either a special committee or to the Railway Committee which is large enough to provide many special committees. If my hon. friend will

agree to that I have no objection to the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LOAD LINES ON SHIPS.

Mr. LEWIS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 10) respecting load lines on ships. He said: I would be glad to have this Bill and also Bill (No. 11) respecting wireless telegraphy on ships, receive their second reading and be referred to the Standing Committee on marine matters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY ON SHIPS.

Mr. LEWIS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting wireless telegraphy on ships. He said: I would be glad to have this referred to the same committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

INJURIES BY MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. LEWIS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 13) respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles. He said: I would be glad to have the Bill referred to a committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It should be referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not adopting a bad precedent to send a public Bill to the Private Bills Committee? It is rather an anomaly. The member has the privilege of moving for a special committee or a Committee of the Whole House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It does not follow from its name that this committee is to deal only with Private Bills; it is to deal with Bills of this nature also. I do not see why the Bill should not go to that committee, who can investigate it. However, we might let it stand and I shall consult the Minister of Justice about it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BANKING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JOSEPH DEMERS (St. John's and Iberville) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 56) amending the Banking Act. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the object of the amendments moved by me is to avert a recurrence of the business misfortunes or rather disasters which have befallen certain parts of our country within a few years past. It is intended to bring about this result through the establishment of a system which, though imperfect it may be, would, I think, materially improve the condition of things actually existing. Now, Sir, I do not for one moment contend that our banking system is not a good one; I am satisfied of the contrary, and would be averse to exchanging it as a whole for any other just now in existence in foreign lands. But with all its good points, it has its defects, its imperfections, which actual practice have brought to light and which we are in duty bound to correct, if possible.

Public opinion is anxious that the Banking Act should be amended, and, if I am not mistaken, amended in the way which I propose in this Bill. What induces me to move these amendments is the fact that I have been in a position to ascertain by myself, under particularly painful and mournful circumstances, the utter impracticability for shareholders to keep track of the business dealings of their various banks, the lack of security for depositors, and the insufficiency of the law as a means for attaining the object which the legislator had in mind, that of ensuring government supervision of the financial status of banks.

I do not propose going very deeply into a consideration of the important part played by our financial establishments, nor do I propose referring to the enormous influence wielded by them as regards the country's welfare and the resulting importance of securing for them a solid, indestructible foundation. Those facts are known to all, so I shall forthwith take up the consideration of the provisions of the Bill of which I have the honour to be the mover.

The first section of the Bill is as follows:—

28a. At the annual meeting for the election of directors, and before such election takes place, the president, or the person acting as such, shall render a detailed account to the shareholders, present at such meeting, of the operations of the bank, and of the loans or advances made by the bank to any person, company or association, exceeding the sum of ten thousand dollars, and give, if required, all information regarding the guarantees of the bank for all such loans or advances.

What reason is there for such a change? I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that heavy losses, losses which in many cases have caused the downfall of the firms affected, would have been avoided if the shareholders had been better posted as to the dealings of the bank. I am informed, and I am strongly of the belief that in the case of a goodly number of financial institutions, only the presidents, general inspectors, and general managers are in touch with the actual financial status of the bank. At the yearly meeting there is submitted a report made up of a considerable accumulation of figures, showing assets and liabilities, but these figures have absolutely no meaning, and the shareholders, depositors, and government are bound to rely entirely on the uprightness and honesty of those who

have prepared these reports. Now, at these yearly meetings, if instead of merely submitting figures, particulars were given and if the names of the persons with whom dealings had taken place were mentioned, as well as the nature and amounts involved in each case, securities obtained and held by the bank, such enormous losses could not possibly occur, such large risks would not be taken, while under the present system shareholders are mere figure-heads. These are some of the facts in support of such an amendment. And, Mr. Speaker, with the object of further inducing shareholders to take an active part in the management of the banks, I move that section 31 of the Banking Act be amended in such a way as to facilitate the holding of general meetings at special dates. The law as it is, provides that 25 shareholders will make up the required number for the calling of such meetings, when they are holders of one-tenth of the subscribed stock; while my amendment reduces the number of shareholders required to 15, provided they are holders of one-twentieth of the subscribed stock.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been ascertained on several occasions that persons apparently shareholders were not bona fide shareholders, but mere dummies, without responsibility, who never paid a dollar on the shares held in their names, made mock payments by means of notes renewed for the full amount at maturity; and with a view to doing away as much as possible with such grievances the consequences of which might be and, as a matter of fact, have been disastrous to depositors, I move that the Act be amended in such a way to compel directors, who under the present system may abstain if they think fit, to cancel all purchases of shares unless a sum equivalent to 10 per cent on the subscribed amount has been paid at the time of the purchase or within 30 days of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I deemed it proper to insert in our Act some new sections providing for a system of inspection of banks by the Dominion Finance department. I need not say that it is in the very best interests of the people that the government should be in a position to efficiently supervise the working of our financial institutions. Our present Act itself is evidence of the primary importance of that principle; the provisions already included in the Act go to show that the legislator has deemed such supervision necessary. To satisfy ourselves as to this, it will suffice to refer to sections 112, 113, 114, 147, 148, 149, 150 and 151 of the Act as it now stands. Besides, section 153 provides the heaviest penalties against any infringement of the Act in this respect. Clearly then, the legislator has grasped the necessity for such supervision and deemed it of the greatest consequence. Now, I have no hesitation in stating that the object which the legislator had in view cannot be attained under the law as it now exists. I contend that it is impossible for the Department of Finance and the public to ascertain what is the financial status of a bank by merely looking over its monthly and yearly reports. I think nobody will contradict that statement, and that being so, if it is admitted that the Department of Finance should be posted as to the actual standing of the bank's accounts, the necessity for amending the law must as a matter of course be acknowledged; and I believe that the proper way of amending the law would be by providing a system of inspection under the control of the Department of Finance. I have witnessed some frightful bank failures; the word is not too strong. For years past, false or misleading annual and monthly reports were issued by the management of such banks. Branches had been established in several cases at a time when the head office was in a state of utter insolvency, and thereby was enabled to drain the savings of people living in the neighbourhood where these branches were established. People holding shares for enormous amounts were and had always been insolvent. Loans aggregating to hundreds of thousands of dollars had been made to utterly irresponsible people, and the outcome of it all was mournfully and terribly disastrous. I am satisfied that such disasters would have been averted, or at any rate greatly attenuated, had there been in force such a system of inspection as I advocate. The people, in view of recent developments demand some such relief, and it is with public opinion at my back that I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. There may be some portions of the Bill which may be useful in considering the Bank Act, but there are some features which are very debatable and as to which I shall reserve my judgment. I would suggest that my hon. friend should follow the same course as that adopted by another gentleman, that he should allow the Bill to pass the second reading and then go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce in order that it may be considered at a later stage when the government measure for the revision of the Bank Act is brought forward. I would be happy to let the Bill go with the understanding that it be considered with other legislation before the Banking and Commerce Committee at another stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WINDING-UP ACT.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 65) to amend the Winding-up Act. He said: Not having anticipated that this measure would be reached this evening, I do not see that I can add anything to the explanation I gave on the first reading. The Bill is not one which requires much explanation. It supplies an omission in the Winding-up Act. In the Act amending the Winding-up Act, it is provided that appeals from a single judge may go to to the new Court of Appeals in Manitoba instead of to the Court of King's Bench en banc as formerly constituted. The new Court of Appeals in Manitoba took the place of the old King's Court Bench en banc, and consequently appeals from the single judge would go to the former instead of to the latter. In the Winding-up Act there is a provision providing that appeal from the King's Court en banc might go to the Supreme Court of Canada. In the amending Act that clause was not amended, so that as there is no longer a King's Court en banc, there is no appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. It was of course intended by the government that this defect should be covered, but by inadvertence it was not.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In the Winding-up Act which the hon. gentleman proposes to amend would no doubt be the better by the change, but it occurs to me that there is no reason why the amendment should not include also the Court of Appeal for British Columbia. The Court of Appeal for Ontario has jurisdiction, under the revised statute as it stands. The hon. gentleman is proposing to amend by including the Court of Appeal for Manitoba, but that will still leave British Columbia not provided for. It would be well to include British Columbia. It occurs to me that it would be better to have the matter dealt with by a select committee of say five legal gentlemen than by a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I have no objection on principle to the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Justice, but at present litigation is pending which will require this amendment before it can be finally determined. I would not like to see the Bill referred to a special committee if that would retard its passage. As to the Court of Appeal in British Columbia, any amendment including it will not be objected to by myself, but would it not be possible to include that at once and have the Bill passed through the Committee of the Whole House?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are perhaps a couple of other sections in the Winding-up Act which would require to be amended to make them correspond with this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I move that this Bill be referred to a special committee to consist of Mr. Carvell, Mr. H. H. McLean, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Meighen and myself.

Motion agreed to.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. LEWIS moved second reading of Bill (No. 71) respecting assaults and offences against the person. He said: I would ask that this Bill and Bills Nos. 13 and 14, all relating to offences under the Criminal Code, be given a second reading without comment and be sent to a special committee.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Possibly the best course would be a similar disposition to that just made of the Bill to amend the Winding-up Act. There are some propositions in this measure that I should not be willing to see adopted. My hon. friend is proposing to make the special offence of rape on a girl under the age of fourteen punishable by the death sentence. Our law already provides the death sentence as the punishment for any rape, and I do not know why it was thought necessary to single out this particular class of that crime. But we all know that although rape is a capital offence, no instance exists in this country where the capital sentence has been carried into execution. Whether there is any object in legislation specially on this particular subject in the way my hon. friend proposes, I feel some doubt. But there are other provisions of the Bill in regard to which there is, no doubt, merit, and probably the best disposition would be to send the whole to the same committee, if that suits my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and referred to committee on Bill (No. 65) to amend the Winding-up Act.

Mr. LEWIS. I move that Bill (No. 13) respecting injuries to persons due to motor vehicles, and Bill (No. 14) to amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive weapons and capital offences be referred to the same committee.

Motion agreed to.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 73) to amend the Interest Act. He said: I introduced a Bill in the earlier part of the session having the same object as that

which I seek to accomplish by this measure. Some question was raised as to whether we had jurisdiction, and I withdrew that Bill and introduced another, the one now before the House, to which, I am sure, no such objection can be made. This Bill provides, in effect, that a mortgagor may repay overdue principal on a mortgage at any time by giving one month's notice, or by the payment of one month's interest by way of bonus in lieu of notice. I think that this is a perfectly fair provision and one that no mortgagee or other person can reasonably take any objection to. The Bill as I have introduced it is not retroactive. It provides, however, that though the terms of the contract of mortgage may stipulate that overdue principal cannot be repaid except upon payment of a bonus, yet, notwithstanding that, the mortgagor may pay on giving one month's notice or by paying one month's interest by way of bonus. Now, principal on a mortgage can only remain past due, the mortgage can only be permitted to remain in arrears, by the consent or action of both parties, the borrower and the lender. And, if both parties agree to allow a mortgage to remain in arrears, I think their rights ought to be as nearly as possible equal. What are the rights of the mortgagee? He has the right to take action against the mortgagor to recover payment of his principal without notice at all. Usually, he has power to sell under the mortgage on giving one month's notice. However, most of our loan companies in the province of Ontario—and I think in the western provinces as well—say that if the principal remains overdue for a certain longer period of time the right of sale may be exercised without notice at all. The mortgagee may take foreclosure proceedings without notice. He may bring suit, without notice, for the recovery of past-due principal under the covenants of the mortgagor to pay. The mortgagee, having power to call in his overdue principal without notice, ought to extend the same privilege of repaying overdue principal without notice. I am not asking to go as far in favour of the mortgagor as that, but only that he may be permitted to pay on one month's notice. In the province of Ontario we have a law of the legislature permitting the mortgagor to repay overdue principal on giving three months' notice or on a payment of three months' interest by way of bonus. I seek to shorten that time to one month. Private parties lending money on mortgage in Ontario do not exact the three months' notice or three months' interest by way of bonus. It is, however, the common practice of the loan companies. I may be told that in this Bill I seek to interfere with the contracts of parties and that we ought not to interfere with contracts which parties have chosen to enter into. I say, in reply to that, that a great deal of our legislation does interfere with contracts between parties. Besides, I would point out the manner in which the contract is usually entered into by the mortgagor. He applies for a loan. He usually wants the money at a certain date; he wants to pay off a mortgage, to buy property, or to meet a maturing liability. There is not usually the condition in the application that he would have to pay three months' interest or give three months' notice in repaying overdue principal; he does not discover that condition until he comes to sign the mortgage a few days before he is to use the money. The mortgage form usually used by loan companies is a long form containing many covenants. It would take a long time for a mortgagor to read his mortgage, and the chances are only one in a hundred that he would understand the contract even if he took the pains to read it over. But suppose that if he did read and understand the contract, yet if he refused to execute it would mean delay in getting the money of which, perhaps, he is urgently in need at the time. And he would probably be told, if he refused to sign because of that clause that he would have to pay the expenses of the inspection of his property and of the solicitor in preparing the mortgage as well as the commission to the agent to obtain the loan. So, to avoid expense and delay, and as the misfortune—if it turns out to be one—is five years in the future, he usually signs the mortgage. In reply to this contention that I am interfering in contracts between parties, I would point out that we have on our statute-book a law, introduced by Hon. Edward Blake in 1880, now and for thirty years the law of Canada, that, if the mortgagor borrows money it may be upon mortgage for twenty, fifteen or ten years, yet, notwithstanding that he has contracted to use the money and pay interest for that length of time, after he has used the money for five years, he may repay it by giving three months' interest by way of bonus. So, we have the example of interfering with contracts in exactly the same way. As matters are to-day, a man borrows money: When the principal becomes due, the loan company, if they cannot at the time lend the money in some other place at better advantage, allow the mortgage to remain in arrears until they can call it in and lend the money at a higher rate of interest. Then, at a time when it will be of great disadvantage to the mortgagor, the money is called in to be lent at a higher rate, and the mortgagor, of course, must renew t the higher rate, or get the money from some one else. Now if this Bill becomes law,

the practice then will be that mortgagee loan companies will attend promptly to the renewal of their loans as they become due, and then the mortgagor and the mortgagee will have equal chances, whether the rates of interest go up or go down.

When I introduced the first Bill it was objected to on the ground of lack of jurisdiction, and in order to get over that objection I have used in the Bill I am now discussing the exact language of the Hon. Edward Blake, and it is found in section 10, chapter 120 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906. In the Bill I first introduced I said that the mortgagor might pay off the mortgage upon giving one month's notice of payment, or upon paying one month's interest. But in this Bill I say, as Mr. Blake said in his section, that upon the payment, or upon the tender of principle money with one month's additional interest, or one month's notice, if it be refused, thereafter no interest shall be collected, which is in effect saying that the mortgagor may repay and the mortgagee must accept. But the wording I have used brings the Bill clearly within the jurisdiction of this House, as I am sure the Minister of Justice will say, because under clause 19 of section 91 of the British North America Act, we in this House have the right to deal with the question of interest. I have talked to many members of the House, some of whom are not here to-night, and I met with scarcely any one who has any objection to the Bill, and most of them are warmly in favour of it. Therefore I trust it may receive the support of the House.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When my hon. friend moved the second reading of the Bill for which the present one is substituted, a good deal of objection seemed to be offered by several members of the House to the proposition, and a grave question was raised by eminent legal gentlemen as to the right of this House to legislate upon such a subject. It was urged that what was really being done by the Bill then under consideration, was to make a new contract for the lender and borrower, and to substitute that new statutory contract for the one which, by the instrument of mortgage, they had entered into. I think there was considerable doubt on the phraseology used in that Bill, whether what was legislated about did fall within the subject of interest, in regard to which of course this parliament has, under the British North America Act, the exclusive right to legislate. No doubt my hon. friend was so advised, because he withdrew that measure, with the leave of the House, and has substituted this one for it. Now, so far as the wording of the present Bill is concerned, I think every one will be compelled to agree that it legislates only with respect to interest, and therefore it would be competent for this parliament to pass the legislation in question, if it was thought right to do so. But while that is probably the case, I think we cannot close our eyes to the fact that the effect of this legislation, if it becomes law, will be to substitute a new contract made in virtue of this Act of parliament, for the contract which the lender and borrower have entered into at the time the money was loaned; and then the question is whether the House is prepared to take that step; or, having the power to do it, whether it is expedient to exercise that power. Now, I quite agree that time was when, under the hardships of usurious contracts, gross impositions were practised upon needy borrowers at the hands of greedy lenders. I doubt if that time is still with us. I think we have come to such a state of things in this country, perhaps in all civilized countries, that at this date money is simply a commodity, and the man who has it charges for its use just what it will bring in the money markets of the world. The man who needs it knows that he is not in any way restricted to one lender. If he cannot get what he wants upon the security which he has to offer in one quarter, he will go to another. No doubt, just to the extent to which the security which he has may be poor, just to that extent he will have to pay a higher price for the accommodation which he desires in the shape of a larger rate of interest. I think it would not be wise to try to control freedom of contract as to the amount of interest, at any rate an amount within reason, which a borrower who requires to use money for a little time, is willing to pay and contracts to pay to the lender. Now, it seems to me that this is a proposition practically of a similar character to a proposition to regulate the rate of interest which a borrower should pay or which a lender should take. It does not seem to me that it is anything unconscionable for a lender to stipulate, when advancing his money to the borrower, that if it is not paid when it is due, he shall have three months' notice before being compelled to take it. I think experience shows that an investor who lives by lending to others the money which his labour, it may be, has accumulated, finds that he cannot secure a new investment, upon the average, in less than three months' time. He may be fortunate in being able to lend his money almost immediately after it is paid, but he is quite as likely, it seems to me, to have to wait longer than three months before he finds a new investment for that money as to find one within less than that time. But, however that may be, if he says to the borrower openly and fairly when negotiating their contract of repayment: Now if you cannot pay me, if you do not pay me on the day that you agree to pay, if you let it

run any longer, you must give me three months' interest, or the equivalent of three months' interest, in lieu of the notice; and if the borrower says, I am quite content, and makes that contract with his eyes open, I do not see why parliament should step in and say: No, we won't allow that bargain to have its course, we force you, Mr. Lender, to take one month's interest, or one month's notice, upon penalty that if you do not do it, you shall get no more interest at all.

That is exactly the substance of my hon. friend's proposition. He says that if the money is not paid when it is due, then, notwithstanding any agreement that the parties may have made between them, if the borrower gives at any time thereafter one month's notice to the lender that he is willing to pay at the expiration of the month, then, if the lender will not take payment, he forfeits all further interest. It is a question whether the House is prepared to interfere to that extent with the freedom of contract that ought to obtain, and which it is in the general interest should obtain between men in ordinary business transactions. For myself, I should doubt very much the advisability of doing it. It seems to me it is going to make money harder to get on the part of the borrower. It seems to me that when the lender sees before him this provision of the law he will say to the borrower: I will not let you have the money at all, or if I let you have it, I will charge you a higher rate of interest, say one half per cent, or something of the sort, by reason of the fact that I shall forfeit all interest unless I take my money at a month's notice. It would strike me that it would be better to leave things to the play of actual business conditions and competition between lenders who are anxious to find places where they can make their money earn interest, and bring them in a return. I am quite aware that we have at present upon our statute-book a provision which my hon. friend has adapted and followed very closely in the framing of this clause. In our present Interest Act there is a provision applicable to mortgages of real estate which have five years and more to run, that whenever any principal money or interest secured by such an instrument is not payable for more than five years after the date of the mortgage, then, if at any time after the expiration of that period, any person liable to pay tenders or pays to the person entitled to receive the money the amount of principal and interest to the time of payment, together with three months' further interest, no further interest shall be chargeable.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether or not the section he has just referred to is not in effect a much greater interference with contracts between parties than the Bill which I am discussing and which I have introduced.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Very possibly it is, but that is not the point. I am saying that I am quite aware that this section is on our statute-books. It gives the lender three months interest or three months notice. My hon. friend proposes to reduce that to one month and to extend his legislation to all mortgages, whereas the present enactment is limited to mortgages of real estate. But whether or not the present provision of the law is a greater interference with the freedom of contract, I was intending to point out something as to the circumstances under which that provision of the law found its place in the statute-book, as it seemed to me to illustrate the inadvisability of putting anything else upon the same line on our statute-book. That provision of the law was introduced nearly thirty years ago, in the session of 1880, and, referring to the debate upon the subject at that time, it appears that the Bill, introduced by a private member, a supporter of the government of the day, was opposed apparently by every single member of the government. It met with strong objection, with a great deal of opposition and criticism just upon the ground that I have indicated, because it was considered an unwarrantable interference with the freedom and sacredness of a contract solemnly entered into. It was passed, however, notwithstanding the opposition of the members of the government in a body over their votes. It has been law ever since. I do not know what influence it may have had in the framing of contracts since that date, but I think it is very probable that the presence of that enactment upon our law books has been the reason for the very general term of three months' notice or three months' bonus which is to be found to-day in most of the mortgages that are current. Parties have contracted to correspond with that provision of the law, and parties having so contracted, if you are now going to say in regard to future contracts that the time has to be shortened in the interests of the borrower and against the interests of the lender, it seems to me that the result can scarcely fail to be what I have tried to point out.

Let me just say one other thing. I think the conditions were to a marked degree different in 1880 in respect to the ease or difficulty with which money could be borrowed from what they are in the year 1910. At any rate in the part of the country from which I come I know that in those years one great evil which every borrower felt and which was very widespread was the habit which lending companies or building societies had of disguising the true rate of

interest they were exacting from their borrowers by the manner in which they framed their mortgages. Their mortgages calculated the interest along with the principal for the full period the mortgage was to run; then adding the total amount of the interest to the principal, they were in the habit of dividing it up into as many payments as the borrower desired, four per annum, perhaps, and, so dividing it up, they took from the borrower each quarter, from the time that he borrowed the money until he had paid the whole of that money, except the last instalment, the same amount; so that a man, after he had practically paid off the whole, or the greater part of his principal, was in reality paying perhaps fourteen, fifteen, or eighteen per cent, instead of the six, or seven, or eight per cent that he thought he was agreeing to pay, and which upon computation he would appear to be paying. That was an evil and this legislation cured it. There are no more of such mortgages. Now, a man borrows money, whether from a private individual or a company, upon plain straight payments of simple interest calculated at a fixed per cent and payable either annually or semi-annually. If a man, entering into a contract for repayment with his eyes open and in perfect freedom, agrees that he will pay three months' interest in case he is not able to pay at maturity, or give three months' notice, it does not seem that such a man needs the protection of legislation to change his contract and where there is no great evil to be met by the legislation my hon. friend is proposing, it would seem to me to be contrary to good policy to pass it.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). When this question was up earlier in the session I took strong ground that the proposition then made by my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) was ultra vires of this parliament, but I am satisfied that the present Bill is intra vires. That is admitted by the Minister of Justice, and I presume it will not be controverted by any member of the House. It, therefore, becomes a question of policy whether this Bill shall become law or not. And, while I am very diffident in dissenting from the judgment of so mature a mind as that of the Minister of Justice, yet, when it is a question not of law but of policy every member of the House has a right to exercise his judgment. The Minister of Justice has advanced somewhat strong reasons against the passage of the Bill, but there are reasons equally strong on the other side and which I think outweigh those given by my hon. friend. The Minister of Justice puts forward the proposition that this is a contract and that we have no right to interfere with it. I admit that if it be purely a question of contract between two parties this parliament has perhaps no right to interfere, although every session of parliament since I have been here we have passed legislation which has interfered with contracts. The lending of money has become so much concentrated in the hands of loan companies in Canada that it is almost a necessity to go to these companies to obtain a loan. They have become practically a public utility, and if the loan companies make unreasonable contracts I see no reason why they should not be curtailed the same as unreasonable contracts made by public utility companies. For instance, within the last year or two the Railway Commission has found it necessary to interfere with contracts made by railway companies and the shippers of goods all over the country. The shipper was compelled to sign an application on the back of which were laid down conditions which for the most part never were read, and which the ordinary man could not understand the legal significance of, and as a result of that contract if the goods were lost or damaged in transit the shipper had no redress against the railway company. These contracts have been interfered with and modified by the Railway Commission. In the same way when one sends a telegram he has to accept a certain contract, and I venture to say that not one member out of 50 in this House has ever read the terms of it. When we go to these public companies they compel us to accept contracts, the true intent of which most people do not realize, and to a very great extent it is the same with a loan company. I may be prejudiced against loan companies. When I first commenced practising law I was looking after all the dollars I could earn, and I accepted the solicitorship of a loan company, but I resigned after a year because in my judgment its proceeding was the most unfair proposition I ever was called upon to sanction. I will not mention any name, but that loan company compelled the borrower to sign a contract and give a mortgage along the lines of equal payments. I admit that a great majority of loan companies at present, or possibly all of them have abolished that form of contract. It was a most unfair contract and the borrower was compelled to sign conditions without knowing their true legal import. The Minister of Justice says it is not fair that a man who has made a contract that he shall not be compelled to take his money without receiving an advance of three months' interest should be compelled to receive an advance of one month's interest. I would like to know wherein a loan company differs from a bank. The loan company lends its money to the public on long terms and the bank lends on short term loans. But what would you think of a bank which would say that because the borrower did not pay his note yesterday when it was due he would have to pay a month's interest in advance be-

fore being allowed to redeem it. A cry would go up against such a stipulation which would soon be heard in this parliament. You know, Sir, the hardest thing in this world is to take from the privileged classes privileges which they have enjoyed in the past. We meet it every day; they are meeting it now in the old country, but from time to time these privileges are curtailed and no great damage is done, and the only wonder expressed is that they were not curtailed long before. If this Bill becomes law now I have no doubt that a year hence people will wonder why such legislation was not passed years before. I do not think a loan company or any one else suffers if a reasonable advance is given when money was not paid on the very day it was due. I do not know whether any members in this House have had experience in trying to get these loan companies to release a mortgage before it became due. It will be found that in many cases where a man may have an opportunity to dispose of a part or the whole of his property, he cannot do it until the mortgage is taken off, and some of these loan companies in order to relieve the property will ask not one month's interest or three months' interest, but I have never known a case where they took less than six months' interest, and I know numbers of cases where they wanted a year's interest. I do not think the loan companies are entitled to very much pity from this parliament if the Bill should pass. I believe in even-handed justice and in treating them fairly, but if ever there was a measure advanced in this House which appeals to my sense of justice and fair play it is the Bill we are now considering and I shall have much pleasure in voting for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Before making some very brief remarks on this Bill I wish to premise by giving my interpretation of it, which, I think, does not conflict with that of the Minister of Justice, although it possibly does with that of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell). It does not appear to me that there is any retroactive feature in the Bill. The first sentence strictly confines the operation of the Act to such contracts as are hereinafter entered into. I do not think the placing of the comma in the third line before the word 'after' instead of after the word 'Act' has any other effect. If I thought it had any other effect, and if I thought it had in particular the effect of making this Bill retroactive I could not support that feature of it. Therefore, premising that the Bill can only operate as regards mortgages or renewals of mortgages entered into after the passing of the Act, I wish to state to the House my reasons for supporting it. It seems to me that the principal that should govern this House with regard to all these Bills is that we should ask ourselves whether or not the legislation is in the public interest. If it is in the public interest, then it seems to me this House is justified even to the extent of breaking into contracts already existing. It would, of course, in such instances, take much more to convince this House that such a Bill would be in the public interest, but that is all that should in the ultimate determine any member in his choice. How far does the Bill go? It says that once a mortgage falls due, and is not paid, thereafter, unless the mortgage company or mortgagee says to the mortgagor: Come out into the open daylight, sign a new contract knowing its terms, they must accept the money on one month's notice. If the mortgagor is not in a position to pay, he is subject to the remedies of the mortgage and the mortgagee can insist on those remedies or make it uncomfortable for the mortgagor. If the mortgagor does not pay at the time the payment falls due, the mortgagee is compelled to go to him and explain the facts to him and say: Unless you are ready to pay, you must enter into a new contract. If the mortgagee lies silent, sits by and lets things run, he has to take the consequence and has to say: I must take my money on one month's notice. There is no hardship there; what is the benefit? It strikes me there is a very considerable benefit. In the first place the Minister of Justice argues that conditions now differ very materially from those that obtained years ago when the Act introduced by the Hon. Edward Blake to which he referred was passed. It may be that in Ontario, and particularly within the clientage to which the Minister of Justice was in some degree confined, such conditions have changed, but out in western Canada I do not think I am going beyond the mark in saying that the conditions referred to by him, as existing at that time exist now in even a more marked degree. The average mortgagee throughout the newer parts of western Canada is no more on a par with the mortgagee, and particularly with a mortgage company than the average mortgagor was at the time of the introduction of the legislation referred to by the Minister of Justice with the mortgagee of that day. In a very great number of cases the mortgagor in those parts of the country is now a foreigner. I doubt not but in four cases out of seven the man who signs a mortgage on his land in western Canada has no real appreciation whatever of most of the clauses of the mortgage, and it is impossible for him to form an intelligent idea particularly of the penal clauses of the mortgage. Consequently it is not only within the power but I think it is the duty of this House, wherever it can with advantage, to step in between these parties and make it impossible for an unfair contract to be perpetrated. The Minister of Justice has stated that we

should not stand between the mortgagor and the mortgagee and say to them: You must not enter into a contract whereby you shall penalize a mortgagor and compel him to give three months' or six months' notice in case, on the very day the mortgage is due, he finds he has not paid it or is not able to pay it. I do not see that any great injustice can be done by this. So long as all the remedies exercisable under that mortgage are still allowed the mortgagee, there can be no injustice to him, and at the same time we say that if the mortgagor, who is generally not on a par with the mortgagee, runs over the time he can pay it off on one month's notice unless the mortgagee informs him of all the facts on the day it falls due or shortly after and says: Come and enter into a new agreement. There is no hardship on the mortgagee that I can see. I do not think this House is likely to go too far in protecting the mortgagor. The different provinces have invaded the very field which the Minister of Justice holds so sacred. Throughout Canada, at all events in the province from which I come, recent legislation was passed affecting the relations between lender and borrower, and I must say that that legislation has worked out very favourably in the public interest. To-day in Manitoba any contract whereby the borrower undertakes to pay a greater rate of interest than 12 per cent is declared usurious, penalties are imposed on the lender, and he is unable to collect. That is the field the Minister of Justice holds sacred from invasion. This legislation is along the same lines as the legislation quoted by the Minister of Justice which certainly has been in the public interest, and when the minister acknowledges that in his long experience he has not seen any detrimental effect from that legislation, it seems to me that acknowledgment should go a long way to establish in our minds that no such detrimental effect has ensued. Surely the legislation referred to was in the public interest, but would it be in the public interest to-day to permit mortgage companies to tie up properties for 20 or 40 years, to make it impossible to give clear titles to property for great length of time? The legislation has been taken advantage of on many occasions and very properly, and with good effect. This is along the same lines, a step in the right direction. It does not go very far; I would like to see it go further to the extent of compelling mortgage companies either to take instalments as they fall due or to take payment on one month's notice. If it went to that extent it would seem to me more advantageous than it is, but going to the extent it does, I think it will work for the general advantage of the people and that it should receive my vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford). Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I am going to support the Bill as it is. As it was before, it was retroactive and, as I told the mover, I could not support it for that reason. I do not think it will work any particular hardship; on the contrary a good many mortgage companies and trust companies do not put those clauses in their mortgages. I know that many mortgagors do not read mortgages carefully enough. The difficulty is that they trust to the people from whom they are getting the money to a very large extent, and they do not read the mortgages through at all, but just the amounts and the interest. I do not think it will work any hardship, because lenders will accommodate themselves to this law after it is passed. As my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has stated very clearly, when the mortgage is due, if they cannot pay it, it is the lender's option then to make them renew the debt so that he can protect himself in that way. So far as I am personally concerned— and I have a good deal to do with lending money—I have never in ten years asked a mortgagor to sign a mortgage which had a penalty clause of that kind in it, without thoroughly explaining it, and when I explain it, the mortgagor will not sign. There is too much competition for the lending of money now, and consequently, in my section of the country at least, no need for borrowers to sign contracts containing any such clause. If a loan or trust company will not loan to the individual without such a penalty, the borrower can easily get the money from some one else. So far as the people I represent are concerned, they would be satisfied with the Bill as it is, and for that reason I shall certainly support it.

Mr. MILLER. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says we have no right to interfere with contracts entered into by people with their eyes open and with perfect freedom. I have tried to point out that these contracts are not entered into openly and freely. In 99 cases out of 100 the mortgagors are entirely ignorant that the contract signed contains any such provision. The hon. minister fears that one effect of the passing of this legislation will be to make it harder to borrow money on mortgage and raise the rate of interest. Well, I do not think we need apprehend any danger on that score because there is too much competition in the lending of money. The loan companies are the only ones that insert such a clause as I object to. It is not inserted by the trust companies, the life insurance companies and private lenders, so that there is no danger of any increase in the rates of interest. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that we have no

right to interfere with contracts, and he pointed out that the hon. gentleman who introduced section 10 of the Interest Act, which enables a man to pay off a mortgage any time after five years, no matter how long he may have contracted to keep the mortgage alive, was introduced by a private member and carried against the votes of members of the government. But the private member who introduced that Bill, which is still in our statutes, was the Hon. Edward Blake. He introduced it thirty years ago, and it has been the law ever since, and most excellent law it has proved. And although that law was passed in opposition to the votes of gentlemen then composing the government, if any government wanted to repeal that section 10, there would be a row that would cause them a good deal of trouble. If that law be right, then there is no reason why we should not pass the legislation I am submitting. What is the difference between section 10 introduced by Mr. Blake and section 10a of the same Act which I am submitting? Under Mr. Blake's amendment, although a man may have borrowed money for a term of twenty years and agreed to keep paying the interest during that term, and not pay off the capital, he was given the privilege of paying off his debt at the end of five years in spite of his agreement, and thus getting rid of the mortgage. Compare that with the amendment I propose. By my amendment, section 10a, I provide that if the money borrowed be not paid at the time stipulated, the mortgagor may give one month's notice of his intention to pay or pay one month's interest as a bonus, and the creditor is obliged to accept the same. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Portage La Prairie (Mr. Meighen) this is not interfering with an existing contract at all, but simply provides that certain contracts should not be entered into in the future because they are contrary to public interests. We are passing similar legislation from year to year both in the provincial legislatures and this parliament. In Ontario, and no doubt in the other provinces, we have the Mechanics' Lien Act, which provides that although a mechanic enters into a contract to waive his rights to a lien for the work he has done, that contract is void and null because contrary to public interest. In our Act regarding the water carriage of goods, introduced as a government measure this session, it is provided that although shippers may enter into certain contracts and sign certain bills of lading, they shall not be bound by the same. If, as we have been told to-night by the Minister of Justice, section 10 of the Interest Act was introduced 30 years ago by Mr. Blake, then a private member, contrary to the wishes and passed contrary to the votes of the then members of the government——

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend is doing an injustice to another by saying that legislation was introduced by Mr. Blake. My recollection is that it was introduced by Dr. Orton.

Mr. MILLER. Possibly, but it was fathered by Mr. Blake and is commonly called the Blake Act. If that Act, which was introduced and passed against the wishes of the government, has produced excellent results, it is a very good precedent, and I have no doubt that should the Bill I propose become law, excellent results will likewise follow.

Mr. BARKER. Is there anything in it to apply to mortgages now existing or renewed or does it apply only to those hereafter created?

Mr. MILLER. I have no wish to make the Bill retroactive. It will only apply to mortgages hereafter made or renewed.

Mr. BARKER. Better express that more clearly.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call the attention of the mover of this Bill to this point: What would be the effect of it where there is no agreement at all? It seems to me that the courts would interpret the section to mean that if a man failed to pay his mortgage on the very day it was due he could not redeem it at all without giving a month's notice or paying a month's interest. Surely that cannot be the intention of my hon. friend (Mr. Miller). The section ought to be amended to make it clear that it is intended to apply only to cases where there is an agreement in the mortgage preventing the mortgagor repaying overdue principal without paying three months' interest or giving three months' notice. In the province from which I come a man is entitled, ordinarily, to pay his mortgage at any time after it becomes due, unless it runs on year after year with interest paid on it, in which case the courts hold, that an implied agreement has arisen between the parties which would prevent the money being paid off except upon notice, in some cases of three months, in some cases of six months according to the periods when the interest is payable. But, under this section, as I have said, it seems to me the courts would hold, in the absence of an agreement, that the mortgagor could not pay off except by giving a month's notice or paying a month's interest.

Mr. SPROULE. If the mortgagor does not pay when the mortgage is due, the company can exact the interest for a further term, and they do exact it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But suppose there is no agreement about three months' notice or

interest, yet the mortgagor neglects to pay the mortgage when due, leaving it to run for a week. Then, under this section he could not redeem except on paying a month's interest. That is a hardship, and I do not think it is the intention of the mover of the Bill to make that the law.

Mr. CARVELL. Could not the object be accomplished by inserting another subsection, providing that section 10a shall not apply to any mortgage in which there is no agreement requiring three month's notice?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Another question which strikes me is whether the section, as framed, would really cover a case where there is a contract. Would not the courts hold that, as the section says nothing about a contract, parliament did not intend to cover a case where there was a contract between the parties? In that case, the section would be barren of results in the direction the hon. member (Mr. Miller) has in view. I may be wrong, but that is the view that presents itself to my mind at this time.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot take that view. The whole tenor of the section is that, in any case, if the money be not paid when it is due, then, by tendering a month's interest or by giving a month's notice, the payment may be made. It seems to me that would be the case whether there was a contract requiring three months' notice or not. I am inclined to think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is right in his suggestion that this would apply to contracts where there was no penalty as well as to contracts in which there was a penalty.

Mr. MEIGHEN. As to the first suggestion, with all due deference—for I know the opinion of the Minister of Public Works in a matter of law would be accepted before mine—it seems to me that that hon. gentleman is right and that the courts would be very likely to hold this clause to imply necessarily that notice would be required under all conditions. As to the suggestion that it is doubtful that the courts would hold the section to apply as against express stipulation, I cannot say that I have the same view as the minister. In any case, I think both these points are capable of remedy, and I would suggest the following: —After the word 'then' in the sixth line of the section, add the following words:

Notwithstanding any stipulation to the contrary in such mortgage or renewal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would cover it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then, to meet the other objection add the clause:

Provided nothing herein contained shall be held to require the giving of notice or paying of interest by the mortgagor which he is not required to give or pay at the time of the passing of this Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Or it might be:

Where he is not required by the mortgage or any agreement in respect thereto to give.

It requires careful drafting.

Mr. MILLER. I think it would be as well for the committee to rise and report progress, and we will consider the Bill at another meeting.

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 75) to amend the Criminal Code. —Mr. Harris.

BOUNTIES TO VOLUNTEERS IN SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. TURRIFF moved second reading of Bill (No. 87) to amend an Act to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.

Mr. FIELDING. I question whether my friend (Mr. Turriff) can introduce this Bill dealing as it does with bounties. In the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), I would prefer that he should let it stand.

Mr. TURRIFF. There was no objection taken when I introduced this Bill. I introduced another Bill at the same time, which was allowed to stand, and in which the same question was brought to your attention and to the attention of the law clerk, who decided that it was a Bill that a private member was competent to introduce. This Bill is exactly on the same line.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want a formal decision of the Speaker on the point, but in the absence of the Minister of the Interior, I would prefer if my hon. friend will let the Bill stand for its second reading.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill

(No. 101) to provide for the investigating of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers.

Mr. HENDERSON. Carried.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the hon. gentleman give any explanation?

Mr. KING. The somewhat lengthy title of this Bill may help to explain its scope and purpose. The short title is the Combines Investigation Act. As human ingenuity has devised a great many forms of combination for the purpose of effecting an increase in prices, or the restriction of competition, an effort has been made in this measure to give a definition of the word 'combine' sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all forms of combination which may have this effect, and in particular to make it clear that this measure shall have reference to all such forms of combination as are popularly known as monopolies, trusts, mergers and combines. The legislation differs in some particulars from legislation of a like nature which has been introduced in other countries in that it is not aimed against combines or mergers as such, but rather against the exercise on the part of combines, mergers or monopolies, in an unfair manner, of the powers which they may get from that form of organization. This is an age of organization and not merely of local or national competition but of world-wide competition and any industry or any nation which wishes to hold its own in the field of competition must do much in the way of perfecting organization. A highly organized industry should, from the facilities it has of improving production, lead to greater efficiency and economies of one kind and another, which should, on the whole, benefit the consuming public. But, we know that in other countries, and possibly also in this country, organizations have not always used their corporate powers to the advantage of the consumers, but have taken, in some cases, possibly, an unfair advantage to themselves. This measure seeks to afford the means of conserving to the public some of the benefits which arise from large organizations of capital for the purpose of business and commerce. It is organized society which alone makes the organization of capital and industry possible, and the people have a right to expect, and to look to the government to see that their rights shall be conserved and that their liberties shall not be curtailed by privileges which they permit others to enjoy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is to initiate the investigation?

Mr. KING. Perhaps it would be well if I were to explain somewhat in detail the procedure suggested by this measure. It is provided that the Act shall be under the Minister of Labour and that in connection with the administration of the Act a registrar of boards of investigation shall be appointed.

In all measures of this kind that affect private interests and at the same time public rights there are two factors which have to be kept constantly in mind. There is first of all the desirability of securing the minimum of interference with private business where that business is conducted in a fair and proper way, and on the other hand the desirability of providing a ready and efficient means for individuals or the public to secure their due rights where these rights are interfered with or encroached upon by any corporation. These two objects, have, it is hoped, been kept in mind in the drafting of this measure. It is believed that the Bill as introduced will afford a ready and convenient means whereby parties who have reason to believe that any combination is unduly enhancing prices or unfairly restricting competition, may obtain an investigation, and an effective remedy against evils which may be found to exist. This, it is sought to obtain in the first place by providing that six or more persons who feel that a combine exists and that prices have been enhanced or competition restricted by reason of such combine to the detriment of the consumer, may make application to a judge of the high court for an order to grant an investigation. The judge may, if he so desires, call before him witnesses, but all that is necessary is for the judge to assure himself before granting such order that a prime facie case has been made out. The judge, if satisfied there is reasonable ground for believing that a combine exists which is injurious to trade or which is operating to the detriment of consumers, and that it is in the public interest an investigation should be held, may direct or rather shall direct an investigation under the provisions of this Act.

When the judge issues an order for an investigation the order is to be directed to the minister who is thereupon to call each of the parties concerned to name a member on the board of investigation. The Act in this particular proceeds along lines somewhat similar to the procedure under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. The parties who have made the complaint are called upon to name a representative on this board of investigation, the parties concerned in the alleged combine are called upon to name a representative on their behalf, and the two gentlemen thus chosen are given opportunity of confering together with a view of selecting a third person (who

must in this particular case be a judge) to act as chairman of the board of investigation. Failing agreement the minister appoints the chairman. The board thus constituted shall have all the powers of a court of record; it shall have power of summoning witnesses, of ordering the production of documents, of taking evidence under oath. When the board has duly investigated the matters before it, it is the duty of the board to draw up a report and submit that report to the minister who is obliged to give it publicity by publishing it in the 'Canada Gazette,' by sending copies to the parties concerned, by distributing copies to the press if so desired, and by supplying copies to any other parties who may make application. Perhaps it would be well to read the section which refers to the board of investigation:

The board shall expeditiously and fully and carefully inquire into the matters referred to it and all matters affecting the merits thereof, including the question of whether or not the price or rental of any article concerned has been unreasonably enhanced or competition in the supply thereof unduly restricted in consequence of a combine, and shall make a full and detailed report thereon to the minister, which report shall set forth the various proceedings and steps taken by the board for the purpose of fully and carefully ascertaining all the facts and circumstances connected with the alleged combine, including such findings and recommendations as in the opinion of the board are in accordance with the merits and requirements of the case.

There are certain classes of evils in the remedying of which it is believed publicity is more effective than penalty. It may not be that publicity will in all cases prove an effective remedy, but certainly in industrial matters it has many times in the past proven to be effective. While this Act provides machinery of a nature calculated to let in the light on the workings of these large corporations when it is believed they are operating in a manner unfair to the consumer, and while it is believed that much good will be accomplished in this way, the legislation does not rely entirely upon publicity to bring about the desired remedy. There are other remedies proposed, and one is the remedy already existing in connection under other legislation with respect in certain cases to such articles as are protected by the tariff. The statute in this particular gives authority to the Governor in Council where the board reports that prices have been unduly enhanced or that competition is being unfairly restricted in virtue of the protection given to a particular article to reduce the tariff on that particular article or to remove the duty altogether.

Then, there is another class of combination which it is hoped this measure may be the means of preventing. I refer to the case of persons holding patents and who exercise their exclusive rights and privileges to restrict competition. In section 22 of the Act there is this provision:

In case the owner or holder of any patent issued under the Patent Act has made use of the exclusive rights and privileges which, as such owner or holder he controls, so as unduly to limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any article which may be a subject of trade or commerce or so as unduly to restrain or injure trade or commerce in relation to any such article or unduly to prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any article or unreasonably to enhance the price thereof, or purchase, barter, sale, transportation, storage or supply of any article such patent shall be liable to be revoked.

The clause then sets forth the steps that may be taken for the revoking of the patent where an adverse report has been made by a board in such a case.

Then there is a further clause which provides that where a board finds any combination has been guilty of enhancing prices or unfairly restricting competition to the detriment of the consumers, if the guilty parties persist in the conduct which has been reported against, they shall be guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $1,000 and costs for each day that they continue to offend after the expiration of ten days from the date of publication of the report of the board in the 'Canada Gazette.'

These are the main features of the measure, Mr. Speaker. A good part of the Bill is taken up with the setting out the machinery for investigation, a part of it relates to the meetings of the board, the remuneration and expenses of the board and the taking of evidence, and there are a few miscellaneous clauses. I think, however, what I have said will be sufficient as an outline of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LONG SAULT RAPIDS.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I would ask the government if the rumour is true that a deputation from Montreal waited on the government yesterday to ask that they be granted the privilege of placing a dam across the St. Lawrence river. If so, has any decision been arrived at?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a deputation consisting of representatives of the company which proposes to develop the power, and that deputation presented certain statements to the Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was any decision arrived at?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was understood that they would present the modified plans to the International Waterways Commission, and that commission would give an opportunity to the navigation interests and those who might naturally be opposed to any obstructions to navigation, to be heard. After that the matter would come again before the government for consideration.

Mr. LALOR. Has a day for hearing that deputation been arranged for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the commission will arrange that.

MANITOBA FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Referring to the request preferred yesterday that the report of a certain fishery commission should be laid on the table, so far as I understand the case, it is this. Three commissioners were originally appointed. One of them was afterwards elevated to the bench and consequently ceased to act as a commissioner. Another was appointed in his place, and these three commissioners, duly constituted, made their report. The cause of the delay, as I understand it, is that the commissioner, who was elevated to the bench, has not signed the report. I do not see that he has any jurisdiction to sign, and therefore the reason given by the Prime Minister yesterday is not a good one for withholding the report.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not personally familiar with the matter, but will draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad my hon. friend will do so because there has been unreasonable delay.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When does my hon. friend the Minister of Finance expect to introduce his Bill for the continuance of bank charters and the revision of the Banking Act?

Mr. FIELDING. The matter is very well advanced in the department, but could not at present fix a date. It will however, be early in the session.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Ways and Means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The House has been favoured with a very gratifying budget statement this session, much the same as statements presented in sessions gone by. I think it has given universal satisfaction to the House and country to have heard and read the truthful recital of the favoured conditions of trade and commerce and the prosperity throughout this country. There is no difference of opinion regarding the fact that we are in this respect a highly favoured people, but there is this distinction between the members on the two sides of the House. Our opponents claim that this prosperity in which we all rejoice, is not due in any measure at all to any action or policy of this government. As the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, our Finance Minister is not to be credited with any portion of the benefits we are enjoying, as none of these benefits is due to his management of our financal affairs, but is due solely to the good harvests and the industry of our people. No one will doubt that we have had good harvests; no one will doubt that we had a good harvest last year and that we have an industrial people. But what puzzles one is this. If these are to be accepted as the sole reason for our prosperity, and if the government have had nothing whatever to do with bringing about the condition of things which prevails, did we not have good harvests when our Conservative friends were in power? Did we not have fruitful fields then as now? Did we not have an industrial people then as now? Therefore, if the prosperity now abounding in Canada is due to these causes alone, how is it that we had such a period of depression, when precisely the same causes were at work under the old Conservative administration? That there was stagnation and depression and anything but a feeling of buoyancy when our friends opposite were in power, every one knows. That there is a buoyant feeling now and abundant prosperity every one likewise knows. How then do you account for the depression which then existed? How do you account for the prosperity which now prevails? The difference can only be due to the fact that the Liberal party know better how to utilize the benefits which a kind Providence has given us than did our opponents. I know of no other reason. If there be any other, will hon. gentlemen opposite give it?

Mr. LALOR. Did the same conditions prevail?

Mr. PATERSON. The same conditions prevailed—good harvests and an industrial people.

Mr. LALOR. Did the same conditions prevail from 1874 to 1878?

Mr. PATERSON. We had abundant harvests and an industrial people and yet

under the Conservative regime we had depression. We had not then the buoyancy we have now or the prosperity. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh. I do not object to their having a little pleasure, but I would like to have a little myself. I do not just see where the joke comes in, but they are able to see jokes sometimes where no one else can.

Mr. FOSTER. The joke is right ahead of you.

Mr. PATERSON. And the principal joker seems to have got frightened and gone out —not an unusual sight in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite make statements, broad statements, which they cannot verify, and which ought not to be made by responsible men. What are they? You have heard the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), on more than one occasion, say that the Liberal party had violated every plank in the platform which they adopted in 1893.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Hear, hear, an hon. gentleman says. He is of the same belief yet, every one of them? If hon. gentlemen rejoice in their ignorance of the facts of the case I cannot help it, but I propose to read to the House the planks of the platform of the Liberal party adopted in 1893 and in the light of what has transpired I am going to ask this House and the people of this country if the men who dare to say that we have violated and broken every plank in that platform are not men who have told what is not true. Thus, after this, if any man endorses the statement that we have carried out none of the planks that we laid down, he sins with a full knowledge of the facts. Ten resolutions were adopted at that grand Liberal convention, which they termed ten planks. I have taken them off from the official record of that convention of which there is only one copy that I know of. That is in the parliamentary library and the librarian wants it to be handed back to him because it is the only copy and it is in demand. It may be that, not having seen this and having listened to what men like hon. gentlemen opposite have told them, there is an idea among the people, even among friends of the government, that we have proved recreant to the principles laid down at that convention. The first resolution had reference to the tariff. I intend to take that up later because I shall dwell longer upon it, as it is more particularly under discussion now. The second resolution was:

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining a fair and liberal reciprocity, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles,

With the United States. Was that plank carried out? Certainly it was carried out. A man will write himself down ignorant of the history of his own time if he says it was not carried out. He knows that it was carried out and honestly carried out.

An hon. MEMBER. Explain?

Mr. PATERSON. Explain? Why the hon. gentleman does not need any explanation. He knows that representatives of the Canadian and United States governments sat first in Quebec, and subsequently in Washington and made every honest attempt to secure reciprocity. That they did not secure it does not mean that the plank was not carried out; the plank did not pledge them to secure it, it told them to try for it.

The third plank declared:

That the convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditures of public moneys.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that carried out?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it was carried out at that time and that is the reason the resolution was put. It was a protest against the state of things then prevailing, and therefore that resolution was adopted and that resolution should be carried out. Whether hon. gentlemen say it has been or not, it should be carried out, and I claim it has been carried out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In the same way as reciprocity, no change.

Mr. PATERSON. Would hon. gentlemen have any objection to replying to me when I have finished?

The fourth resolution read:

We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

What are the facts?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. They are evidently not cheering the facts but because I have not recited them yet. When this resolution was adopted great increases were being made to the public debt. The trade and commerce of the country was almost stagnant, public works were not being carried on. The Canadian Pacific railway was being built. While they were not collecting under the system of taxation they had in force enough money to pay the ordinary expenditures of the government, they

had to borrow, absolutely borrow money to meet the ordinary expenditures, without expending a dollar on public works or on capital account, and therefore it was that the public debt went up and up and up, till in their 18 years of power they had increased the public debt to $118,000,000 and odd, with nothing to show for it, for they had not carried on the public works. I mean nothing to amount to anything outside the Canadian Pacific railway. That resolution was adopted, but that resolution, you say, should be enforced by us. Deploring this evil in the late government have we fallen into the same mistake? Have we added to the public debt? Is there any cause for alarm in that respect now? As the Finance Minister points out to you, at the end of this present financial year, after 13 continuous years in power, if you leave out what has been borrowed on the Transcontinental railway, a great national undertaking, we shall have paid all our other expenditures, ordinary and on capital account, running into the tens, yes the hundreds of millions of dollars, without adding a dollar to the public debt of the country. These are the facts. Why do hon. gentlemen opposite not cheer the facts? They are cheering the facts by contrasts. One hundred and eighteen million added to the public debt, and nothing to show for it, scarcely. Tens and tens, running into the hundreds of millions, expended on capital account, beyond the ordinary expenditure of this government, at the end of this financial year, outside the Transcontinental railway, and not a dollar added to the public debt. No cause for alarm now.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman desires to be perfectly fair, when he leaves out the expenditure on the Transcontinental, why does he not leave out the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific railway in making his comparison?

Mr. PATERSON. I alluded to the fact that the Canadian Pacific was being built. But what about all the other expenditures that we have made?

Mr. SPROULE. The increase of the public debt. I wish merely to say this, that the increase of the public debt included money to be spent on the Canadian Pacific railway in the one instance, and does not include the money borrowed to be spent on the Transcontinental in the other. Therefore, the comparison is not fair.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh yes, it is quite fair, the House well understands what the point is. We leave out both those undertakings. Take all that has been done by the Liberal government in digging canals, in bonuses upon iron and bonuses to railways, in all the directions in which we have spent ten and tens of millions, running up to hundreds of millions more than those gentlemen spent on similar works, and we have done all that without adding a dollar to the public debt, while they had to borrow money for such works. Now I think that resolution has been carried out. We deplored, we viewed with alarm, the great increase in the public debt, and so we have endeavoured to keep it down, and we have succeeded admirably.

Resolution No. 5.—That it is the ancient and undoubted right of the House of Commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against ministers of the Crown.

I am glad to hear that that is the principle on which both sides of the House agree, I am sure.

Resolution No. 6.—That in the opinion of this convention the sale of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

That plank was adopted—the very reverse of the policy that was being carried out by our Conservative friends when in power, and which we viewed as contrary to the well-being of the country. That plank we carried out, and every fair-minded man must say that it has been carried out in its entirety.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the land sold to the Robbins Irrigation Company?

Mr. PATERSON. Is that denied?

Mr. SPROULE. It is a fact.

Mr. PATERSON. A fact! Why, if any man wants to deny that these lands have been sold for the settler—talk as the hon member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did about the Saskatchewan lands that were sold to these people! These lands were sold, but they were not sold in contradiction to that resolution, for they were sold with terms of settlement. Do you mean to tell me that that resolution was not carried out?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes, no, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Then all I can say to you is this, that the united voices of 250,000 happily settled homesteaders give a denial to the statement. I take their word in preference to an objection of——

Resolution No. 7.—The repeal of the Franchise Act, and that we should revert to the provincial franchise.

Was that carried out? Is that upon the statute-book now? No. Gentlemen may laugh, and try to be merry as they may, and deny it as bravely as they may, but they cannot say that that plank has not been carried out, because the Franchise Act has been wiped out.

Mr. BURRELL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? While we admit that it was carried into effect in 1898, did not the government try to reverse that action and adopt a Dominion franchise?

Mr. PATERSON. No, we did not. If I were to answer the hon. gentleman courteously, I say no, I say no; because my hon. friend alludes to the circumstance that took place in this House where there was a little question about the list in unorganized districts. That don't bear out what he says.

Mr. BURRELL. Not only in unorganized districts, but I think there was a a similar attempt made in British Columbia.

Mr. PATERSON. We wont enter into an argument on that point.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Ha, ha, ha!

Mr. PATERSON. Really, they are the happiest lot of gentlemen in opposition that I have seen in a long time, rejoicing in the good times brought about largely through this government. No, Sir, that plank has been carried out.

Resolution No. 8.—To make the House of Commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable that the conformation of the electoral division county boundaries should be preserved, so that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

Has that been carried out? Certainly it was carried out. A redistribution measure was brought in, and that resolution was carried out. You know that county boundaries were respected, you know that there was no gerrymander by this government, there was a perfectly fair division of these counties. And yet hon. gentlemen say we have not carried out any of the planks of our platform. There it stands. The counties are before their eyes, their own counties are there, and many of those gentlemen opposite know that the counties they now represent are within county bounds, and are not the same counties represented by their predecessors, when there were parts of two or three different counties thrown together in order to give a majority to one party against the other.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. What had the government to do with that? Were not the electoral divisions fixed by a committee of this House?

Mr. PATERSON. I believe they were, and my hon. friend I think was on that committee. But that just shows the superiority of our redistribution. When the gerrymander was put through in 1882 by Sir John A. Macdonald's government, was it not done in secret? A committee of their own met in a room, a dark room, and there, in secret, unknown, the men they were attacking, every Liberal that had been prominent in the fight in the House against them, was marked out for political destruction by these men, by virtue of an Act of parliament that they were getting passed with their majority. David Mills, one of the ablest men in this country, was singled out for political slaughter. Alexander Mackenzie—I leave myself out, though there was not a more infamous cut up anywhere in the Dominion than there was in my county;—John Charlton, Thomas Bain, and many others. Men who had been fighting them for the rights and liberties of the people of this country were marked out for political destruction by a committee that met in secret—marked out to be slaughtered by Act of parliament. And this was carried into effect so far as the decision of a majority in this House could carry it into effect. Let me illustrate by my own riding. They took from my riding two Liberal townships, giving majorities totalling three or four hundred, and threw them into South Oxford, where, even without them, there was a Liberal majority of six hundred. Then they took from another riding a Tory township and put it into mine. Thus they sought to put me, politically speaking, to death. And one thing that kind of makes me have a warm side for my Tory friends—or many of them—is that, while their friends in this House did that infamous act, there were men on the Conservative side in that riding who said: 'This is not fair play, and we will not stand it; we will vote for the man you are trying to kill.' And they did. And so some of us got back—some of us did not. And now my hon. friend (Mr. John Haggart), in the innocence of his heart, asks if that is the way that the Redistribution Bill that we passed was prepared. And he was on the committee with some of his colleagues; the work was done in open daylight, with arguments heard, and a unanimous decision was reached as to what was fair and desirable. And now he thinks the opposition ought to have credit for it.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) appeals to me, may I ask him to point out the distinction between the Bills that we passed and the ones passed under the government of Sir Oliver Mowat in Ontario?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) wants to lead me on to a subject that is not under discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. There they are again. Can you, Mr. Speaker, see the appropriateness of that laugh? We are discussing the legislation of the Dominion parliament. And the hon. gentleman wants me to agree

that the credit for the Redistribution Bill passed under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) should go not to the government, but to the opposition.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Paterson) if he can show anything more shameful in the Act of 1882 than the gerrymander of Central York by the Liberal party of 1903?

Mr. PATERSON. I refer the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) for an answer. That hon. gentleman says that the Bill was a fair one and that they prepared it.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The member for South Lanark was overpowered by superior numbers in the committee.

Mr. PATERSON. Why, the committee were unanimous.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask a question?

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to answer the hon. member's (Mr. Hughes') question, as he is so courteous, but I think it would be better to wait. The point is that we laid down the rule that county boundaries should not be disturbed; and, though there was the temptation to return upon the heads of hon. members opposite that which they had visited upon us, Sir Wilfrid refused to act upon such an idea, but carried out literally and absolutely this plank of the platform.

Mr. HUGHES. Now, may I ask a question?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. minister give the population of West Northumberland and also the population of Victoria and Haliburton to show how the principle of representation by population is carried out?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not those figures. But I would ask the hon. member was not the rearrangement of the riding he represents fair to him?

Mr. HUGHES. The rearrangement made no difference to me——

Mr. PATERSON. Was it fair?

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman has asked me a question; I will answer it in my own way. The rearrangement made no difference to me; I would have been returned no matter how the county was gerrymandered, and no matter whether it was made into one or two ridings. But the hon. gentleman opposite could not have done better in order to produce a split in the Conservative party than to gerrymander Victoria and Haliburton as they did in the last revision.

Mr. PATERSON. But will the hon. member say that he was not satisfied with the arrangement at the time?

Mr. HUGHES. The evidence before the committee will show that I fought for two ridings.

Mr. PATERSON. But I am speaking of one riding.

Mr. HUGHES. But there were two in Victoria and Haliburton formerly. I fought for two; I stood in this House alone in favour of two ridings in Victoria and Haliburton.

Mr. PATERSON. I know that the Bill went through with very little discussion, and that it was admitted, even by Conservative newspapers, to be eminently fair. And it carried out the resolution of the convention in favour of maintaining county boundaries. I come to the ninth resolution. The first I have yet to speak about. But here are seven which, it cannot be denied, have been carried out. The ninth resolution has not been carried out. It is a difficult question. I do not know that the views of the Liberal party have changed concerning this resolution that there should be some change in the constitution of our Senate to bring it more into harmony with representative institutions? But the debate and vote yesterday, together with all that has transpired since this resolution was passed, go to show the difficulties with which this question is hedged about. They go to show that though this resolution is desirable in itself, as it was then in the eyes of the Liberal party, and apparently is now in the eyes of many of our Conservative friends, yet it has not been possible to carry it into effect. But there has been an honest desire to do it. Still, here is one resolution that has not been carried out.

Now, I come to the tenth and last resolution. At the convention, so far as I remember, there was no objection on the part of any one to any of the resolutions save this. Let me read it:

> That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

I say, objection was taken to that resolution. The late Speaker Anglin voiced that objection and declared that he would not be bound by the resolution. Nevertheless, the resolution prevailed, and so became one of the planks in the platform of the party, making it incumbent upon the Liberal government to give effect to it, notwithstanding that some of the members of the party might not agree. And what was

done? You know that the plank was carried out and that the plebiscite was held in its entirety. So, these planks of our platform have been carried out in as fair and honest a manner as could be desired by the Liberal government elected on the platform of which these were planks.

Now, I have read these resolutions which, in the opinion of hon. members opposite, if I am to judge by their scornful laughter, we have not carried out. But I think that fair-minded people, considering these resolutions and considering the action taken with regard to these matters by the present government, will say hereafter that if any man in this House or out of it declares that this government has been recreant to the resolutions of the Liberal convention, he is to be held as one sinning against the light, and as guilty of that of which no public man should be guilty—stating that which is not true of his opponents.

Now, I come back to the first resolution, and there is where our friends on the opposite side have time and again denied that we have carried out our platform in reference to the tariff. They say that the platform of the Liberal party at that convention was a platform of free trade as it is in England. Nothing harped on more, no statement made oftener than that, no statement more untrue—I was going to say—than that statement. I have that resolution. What is it? Is it a resolution for free trade as they have it in England—free trade and direct taxation, free imports of goods into this country? Was that the policy? No. Here is the sense of it:

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now, upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service; . . . . that the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade, and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

Here is the affirming part of it:

That to that end, the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government. That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or bear as lightly as possible, upon the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

Is there anything in that resolution instructing a Liberal government, when it came into power, to depart from the principle of indirect taxation and to adopt the principle of direct taxation? Nothing of the kind. A tariff is spoken of, a customs tariff is to be maintained and the revenues re to be raised by a customs tariff. There is not a word in the resolution that the Liberal party instructed the government, when they came in, to abandon the basis that had hitherto prevailed of raising taxes in the direct manner of customs and excise duties and resorting to direct taxes, whether upon land or in any other way, but they were to continue to raise a great portion of their revenue by a customs tariff. We have continued the customs tariff. That is the way we are raising our revenue now. We are raising our revenue by taxes on the imports into this country. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved that resolution. I seconded it. Sir Wilfrid, the night before, had addressed the convention. He had spoken at that convention, and when, next day, the convention came down and offered this resolution, Sir Wilfrid in moving it, said:

It will not be necessary for me to say much in reference to this, inasmuch as I am glad to observe that the Committee on Resolutions have followed largely the lines that I advocated in my speech last night.

What were they? Free trade as it is in England, to which these gentlemen say he pledged himself? You have heard it said time and again that he pledged himself that our policy was to be a policy of free trade as it is in England. While he is moving that resolution he speaks about a tariff on imported goods, and here is what he says——

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman deny that the right hon gentleman stated that the goal of the party in reference to the tariff was free trade as it is in England, and did he not again and again repeat it?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not deny it; I am going to read it.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. You do not deny it?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not deny it; I am going to read it, but I am going to deny that Sir Wilfrid Laurier pledged himself that the Liberal party would adopt direct taxation and do away with the tariff.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Who ever said that?

Mr. PATERSON. You are saying it or you are trying to infer it.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Not at all. The majority of taxes are raised in England by a customs tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I beg your pardon. Tobacco and whisky imported into the country are subject to tariff and excise taxes.

Mr. PATERSON. Some articles are. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. A large number of articles are subject to a customs tariff.

Mr. PATERSON. Will my hon. friend be content to hear what Sir Wilfrid Laurier did say?

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Let us have it.

Mr. PATERSON. I will let you have what he says because I want to give you the full judgment. You must not take a sentence or two out of a man's utterance and judge him from that. Sir Wilfrid said this, among other things:

I say, the policy should be a policy of free trade such as they have in England——

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Now then when hon. gentlemen say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that and try to draw from that the inference that he gave the people to understand that he was going to do away with the customs tariff and substitute direct taxation they do not do what is right because why?—

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. No person ever alleges that. No one would be so foolish.

Mr. PATERSON. I see that you are hit pretty hard when you begin to deny what you have been saying outside. If you want to know just what Sir Wilfrid Laurier did say it was this:

I say, the policy should be a policy of free trade such as they have in England, but I am sorry to say that the circumstances of the country cannot admit at present of that policy in its entirety, but I propose to you, from this day forward, that it should be the goal to which we aspire. I propose to you from this day, although we cannot adopt the policy itself, to adopt the principle which regulates it; that is to say, that, though it should be your misfortune for many years to come to have to raise a revenue by customs duties, those duties should be levied only so far as is necessary to carry on the business of the government.

Again he says in describing the difference between the two parties:

Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade; their immediate object is protection; our's, a tariff for revenue only.

And again he says, and this is another point that I want to allude to when I come to discuss this resolution more fully:

Nothing is more difficult—that is one of the evils of protection—than to wipe away protection because, under it, interests have been established which every man who has at heart the interest of all classes must take into consideration. It is always easy to increase the tariff because by so doing you increase the private fortunes of certain individuals, but whenever you decrease the tariff, it has always to be done with careful consideration, and I am sure that when the Liberals are in power they will not be indifferent to this primary truth.

This was Sir Wilfrid's position with reference to this matter. These gentlemen have said that he pledged himself that we should have free trade as it is in England, but they do not tell you that his tariff was a tariff for revenue only, they do not tell you that he himself, though he admired the policy that they have in England, said distinctly that it could not be adopted here for many long years to come, but that the principle which would guide us in framing a tariff should not be the principle of protection but that the tariff should be founded on the necessities of the revenue.

And these gentlemen pretend to say they cannot see the distinction, and they tell you betimes that we have taken from the old National Policy, and that it is because of that there is prosperity in the country. Well, all I have to say is that men who talk that way do not understand anything about political science. The ideal, and the immediate object of the Conservative party is protection; protection is the policy of the Tory party and revenue is only an incident of it. But the Liberal party, the Liberal party were instructed to found their tariff on the principle of providing the revenue necessary to carry on public enterprises, and if there should be protection found in it—as there must always be protection where you have customs duties—that protection was an incident of the fiscal policy of the Liberal party and not the principle which was sought. That is the distinction between the two, and it is plain to be seen. And, any man who says that the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier or the policy adopted by the Liberal convention was free trade, free imports, is stating what is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not suppose any gentleman inside the House would say it and in supposing that it has been said outside the House, I am not transgressing parliamentary rules when I say that it is untrue. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy was tariff for revenue, and not free trade as they have it in England, although Sir Wilfrid did state that he admired the fiscal policy of England. That Liberal convention was a very large convention and it was attended by hundreds of representatives from all parts of Canada, except I think British Columbia. It was a convention such as I suppose our Conservative friends will have in the fall, and it is perhaps apropos that I should now point out that when a party convention adopts principles, that party when it attains power is expected to carry out these principles, and if a platform is laid down at the coming Conservative convention, then I will tell our Conservative

friends that they will be expected to carry out that platform just as the Liberals gave effect to theirs. Now, in further proof that the principle laid down by the Liberal party at the convention was a tariff for revenue, I shall quote from the speech made by Mr. Gardiner, then editor of the Hamilton 'Times,' and one of the ablest journalists that Canada ever had. Mr. Gardiner is not in the journalistic line at present; he has accepted a position; he expressed his views in reference to trade matters at that conference. He was an advanced Liberal, and after Sir Wilfrid Laurier had moved that resolution, and I had seconded it, Mr. Gardiner was called upon to speak and these were his words:

Mr. Gardiner said: We of the younger generation—for you see I am but a youth—honour and admire the men who have gone before us. We glory in the achievements of Papineau, Baldwin, Lafontaine, Dorion, Brown, MacKenzie and others whose names are not inscribed upon yonder scroll. There is one name there that attracts my attention, Dorion, one who, when I was a very little boy, about 40 years ago, started out with the advanced wing of the Reform party. He was, if I mistake not, one of those original clear Grits, who about the year 1850 adopted a platform of principles, not so elaborate as the one to be presented for your consideration to-day, but one for which I have great regard, because one of the planks was free trade and direct taxation. For my own part I believe, and fully believe, that that position of the platform of the clear Grit party of 40 years ago is just as good to-day as it was then, and nothing could have been better then.

Now, I do not say that I am disappointed that the resolution does not go as far as I think it ought to go—I am not disappointed—so long as the resolution is in the right direction I am ready to acquiesce in it.

Now, there are, I have no doubt, in the ranks of the Liberal party, many advanced thinkers who, like Mr. Gardiner, believe in direct taxation and the abolition of all import duties; but they recognize that the platform laid down by the Liberal party was a wise one under the conditions and they did not expect to have their own views carried out. If it were possible they think their views should be carried out, but they believed it was not possible, and so they gave their adhesion to the policy of protection for revenue. I shall not argue that question; I do not believe in direct taxation and free imports. I do not think that in the present condition of the country, it would be a wise policy, but I do say, and I think I have given proof, that the policy laid down by the Liberal party was that the revenue should be raised by customs duty. And, if the time should come when, under altered conditions, the Liberal party and its leader may think the policy of indirect taxation should be abolished and direct taxation substituted, then representatives of the party will be summoned together again, and their views shall be taken as to whether a change shall be made or not, but until that time comes the policy of the Liberal party is such as I have stated and this government will stand by the principle which it is expected to carry out. At all events, it was well understood that when the Liberal party should come to power they would be expected to lower the duties which then existed, and I think it is easily capable of demonstration that the Liberal government did that. In the tariff of 1894, the tariff of the Conservative government, there were on the list 481 dutiable items, 297 free items, and some 70 or 80 of these dutiable articles had been placed on the free list. Of these, some four used principally by the farmers, namely, indian corn, wire for fencing, binder twine, and cream separators, would have paid, under the old tariff, about a million dollars—or, to be exact, $976,000. But these four items were put on the free list and consequently that much money was saved to our farmers, yet hon. gentlemen opposite will tell us that we have the same old National Policy that they had. In addition to these 70 or 80 articles put absolutely on the free list, some 150 dutiable items in the old tariff were charged a lower duty in ours. And after that reduction had been made, twelve and a half per cent more was taken off on those brought from Great Britain, and the following year twenty-five per cent was taken off, and two years later thirty-three and a third per cent was taken off. So that on $54,000,000 from Great Britain last year there was, under the preferential tariff, a reduction in the duties of twelve and a half per cent in the one year, twenty-five per cent in the next year, and thirty-three and a third in the following year.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How then is it that the average percentage on dutiable goods from Great Britain is greater than on dutiable goods from the United States?

Mr. PATERSON. That cannot be, that cannot affect the case in the slightest degree, because if goods are put on the free list, we are in that way giving as great a benefit to the consumer as is possible. That is better than lowering the duty. The only way by which you can judge the arrangement of the tariff is by combining the total of dutiable and free goods.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How is it the same percentage applies on dutiable and free goods?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a conundrum. That is one of these things difficult to answer, because such a state of things does not exist. The hon. gentleman has made a supposititious statement which is not correct. As I was saying, we wanted to make trade freer with the whole world,

but more especially with Great Britain and the United States. I have shown you how in our general tariff we made reductions, and how we made still greater reductions by giving the British preference, first of of 12½ per cent, then of 25 per cent, and then of 33⅓ per cent. Just on that point, I might say, with reference to the tariff on dutiable and free goods, that my hon. friend, with all deference to him, was all wrong, and that is not to be wondered at so much in his case as in the case of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who spoke actually of the bounties we pay on iron as being taxation and added them to the rate of taxation. But these hon. gentlemen must take the average rate of duty on goods dutiable and free in order to estimate the benefit to the people from this reduction. It is an easy sum worked out by the Customs Department, as you will see by the table on page 3 of the Customs report. You will find that in 1876 the average rate of taxation on all goods, dutiable and free, was 18·28. That is that on every $100 worth of goods there was paid on an average a customs tax of $18.28. Look at that same table and you will find that last year there was only $16.11 charged on every $100 worth of goods, thus making a reduction of $2.17 per $100. But that is not, as hon. gentlemen opposite think, a reduction of $2.17 on the $100, it is a reduction of $2.17 from $12.28, or a reduction in the rate of taxation of 12 per cent. Now, if a farmer sold his wheat one day at a dollar a bushel and the next day was only offered 88 cents, he would think that was a pretty big reduction. If a mechanic got paid for his day's work $2 and the next day found he was only getting $1.73, he would think that a pretty big reduction. Thus the reduction this government has made has been made on the imports dutiable and free.

Let me point out the distinction between the two parties in reply to the cry that we have taken up their policy. I have read you our platform. What is the platform of the Conservative party? Is there any distinction between the two? Mr. Borden, the leader of the oppostion, in the budget debate of 1903, moved:

> That this House, regarding the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures and industries as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians.

There is the principle of protection. The rates of duty are to be so high as to shut out from this country any goods coming from any other which would interfere with the goods to be made in this country, irrespective of the effect on the revenue. But that surely is a different policy from ours. That was a resolution of non-confidence. It was an invitation to the people to turn us out of office because our tariff was not right. There must, therefore, have been a distinction between the two. What was that distinction? The principle of the Conservative party is that protection is the principal thing to be considered and not revenue. Listen to an extract from a speech made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), as given in the 'Mail and Empire' a few years ago:

> So long as we import into this country $1,500,000 of agricultural implements in less than a year, every one of which might be made by the artisans and labourers of this country, and import that amount from the United States, a market from which our products are shut out by an almost prohibitive tariff; so long as our binder twine is largely made for us in that country: so long as $11,000,000 manufactured iron and steel are brought in from the United States, whilst in Canada the great natural vaults are bursting with iron and coal, and Canadian brawn and intelligence is chafing to unlock them and set these riches and resources loose; so long as our pulp and paper resources are sacrificed in another market, and we import millions of dollars worth of their manufactured products; so long as the lead smelters of the United States grow rich, whilst they put 1½ per cent duty upon lead in ore and 2⅛ per cent upon lead in bullion; so long as these things are unredressed, there is a reason for the existence of the Liberal-Conservative party.

Sir, one and a half million dollars worth of agricultural implements were imported into this country last year. This terrible state of affairs, in the hon. gentleman's mind, by which the people are bringing in one and a half million dollars worth of agricultural implements, is waiting to be redressed when the Conservative party comes into power by their putting on a tariff so high that even if any man be so deluded as to think it is right to buy the goods which he wants, there would be a barrier put in his way that will effectually stop him.

Mr. MACDONALD. Is that their policy in the west?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh yes, this state of things remains unredressed, and it is waiting until the Tories come in to redress it. I suppose when they get together and lay down their policy, to be consistent they would have to adopt a policy of adequate protection. These goods can be made in the country and therefore it will be their policy to put on a duty so high that no one can import them into Canada. I know that in a revenue tariff there is involved as an incident a certain amount of protection. You cannot have it otherwise, unless you put on an excise duty equal to your customs duty—and no one would sug-

gest that—or else give one line of manufacturer a protection under the raising of revenue that would make his article of manufacture so high in price that another manufacturer using his article as his raw material could not carry on his industry because the man before him would have taken the entire benefit of the duty.

Mr. LALOR. How do you reconcile a revenue tariff with a surplus of $12,000,000?

Mr. PATERSON. By making trade freer. We do not have large surpluses if we are paying all the capital expenditure as well as all our normal expenditures of carrying on great public works. Last year when our revenue fell off $12,000,000 we came very close to coming within the requirements of the necessities of the country.

Mr. LALOR. Then you admit that it is not a revenue tariff but a protective tariff?

Mr. PATERSON. Think of a man asking me if this is a revenue tariff! When the Conservatives were in power they raised $17,000,000 and we are going to raise $60,000,000 and they ask me if it is a revenue tariff!

Mr. FOSTER. Well, is it?

Mr. PATERSON. Does it not look like it?

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Taken out of the pockets of the people?

Mr. PATERSON. That is a favourite argument of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and those who follow him. If we took $60,000,000 into the treasury by customs last year and the Conservatives took only $17,000,000 or $18,000,000, then they say we have wrung it out of the pockets of the people. Not at all. A government is responsible for what? For placing a law on the statute-book that says that for every dollar's worth of goods on the dutiable list brought into this country so many dollars and cents shall be paid into the treasury.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Who pays that, the man who sends it in or the man who buys it here?

Mr. PATERSON. You are getting now on a question about which there is a diversity of opinion.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What is your opinion?

Mr. PATERSON. I think sometimes it is divided, sometimes the consumer pays the whole, and sometimes the producer has to pay a part of it. What do you think? If you bring goods into this country, you will pay the duty in the first instance out of whomever it may come in the ultimate. We take care it is paid by the man who brings the goods into the country. We collect through customs this year $60,000,000. That will be paid by the people into the treasury to carry on the affairs of this government. Under the previous government the people of the country paid into the treasury only some $17,000,000 or $18,000,000. The paying in of a larger amount now is due to no action on the part of this government. All a government can do is to say what rate of duty shall be levied. Having done that, the duty and power of the government are ended, that is the rate of taxation. Under the Conservative government that rate of taxation was $18.28 on every $100 of imported goods, dutiable and free, on the average. That has been reduced by this government to $16.11, a reduction of $2.17 on every $18.28 or a reduction in the rate of taxation of 12 per cent. Under that reduced taxation you have this extra $60,000,000. How does it come? Through no action of the government.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. You have given one-half the market to the foreigner.

Mr. PATERSON. Through no action of the government has that $60,000,000 come in. It is paid by the people of this country. No government can compel a man or a lady to go into a store and buy a dollar's worth that the person does not want. The people do it themselves, they assess themselves. If they buy they pay, if they do not buy they do not pay. But, if they do buy, then, as far as the government is concerned, it is taking less from them than the late government did.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would not the increase in the value of the goods at the ports of entry over what it was in 1896, account for much of that difference? Has the minister calculated that part of it?

Mr. PATERSON. Why should I do that now? That does not affect my argument at all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That increase in the values has been the means of bringing into the treasury a largely increased revenue has it not?

Mr. PATERSON. That does not affect the rate of taxation. If the rate of taxation is $16.11, no matter what the price of the goods may be, that is all the people pay. If they bought more they would have to pay more, but the rate of taxation is not affected. The extra revenue is paid owing to the fact that the people assess themselves, not through any action of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Clear.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I could pardon some of the hon. gentlemen opposite for a laugh such as that I hear from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), but I had supposed that he would be able to see a distinction between the action of the government and the action of the people themselves.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I was amused at the clearness of your argument.

Mr. PATERSON. A merit that is lacking in the hon. gentleman's own argument and, therefore, I suppose, he admires it the more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. According to that argument, when the farmers of the old days were said to be 'bled white,' they bled themselves.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why not?

Mr. PATERSON. There is an example of ignorance of finance that I should not have looked for in the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). The government imposed the rates of duty that caused the hard times.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps I may be allowed a question. The minister says that it was in the choice of the people to buy or not, and if they did buy they were burdened by their own action. Why was not that as good an argument then as now?

Mr. PATERSON. It was. But under the management of that government the people were not able to buy—they could not pay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, how were they bled?

Mr. PATERSON. By the rate of taxation and the restriction on trade. You have an illustration before you. The hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has more than once used the argument that if you are receiving larger revenue it means that the government has, by its own action, taken more money from the pockets of the people. And he has before him these facts: In 1896 there was a revenue of $3,000,000 from the post office, that representing the tax on carrying letters and papers. Last year over $6,000,000 came in from that source. According to the logic of my hon. friend from North Toronto, that extra $3,000,000 has been taken from the pockets of the people by raising the taxation. According to his argument, the letter that was carried in Canada for three cents in 1896 must be carried for six cents now, and the letter that was carried to the old country for five cents must be charged ten cents now.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Will the hon. gentleman——

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, keep quiet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I wish to ask a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. A. Currie) must remember that if he wishes to put a question it is only courteous that he should do it not exactly in the very centre of an argument that a speaker is making. There is a courtesy in the time in which a question is asked.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I only wish to ask——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I have to go over my whole argument again because of this uncalled for interruption. I say that, according to the argument of the hon. member from North Toronto, the $6,000,000 raised through the post office now as against $3,000,000 in 1896 means that the letter that cost three cents then must cost six cents now, and the letter that cost five cents then must be taxed ten cents now. That is inevitable from his logic. But what is the fact? The three-cent letter is carried for two cents and the five-cent letter for two cents. And, though the rate of the tax has been cut in two, the revenue has doubled.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I outside the centre of the argument now? If so, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman where he can find the argument which he has attributed to me?

Mr. PATERSON. In the hon. member's utterances.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman cite an utterance of mine bearing that out?

Mr. PATERSON. I can find it in this very debate.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it would be better for the hon. gentleman to cite it before making an inference from it.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman deny that he has stated, time and again, that the increased revenue from customs is due——

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member (Mr. Paterson) was not talking about customs tariff but about postage stamps.

Mr. PATERSON. I was using that as an illustration; the hon. member (Mr. Foster) is not so dull as not to see that.

Mr. FOSTER. He attributed the postage stamp argument to me, and I am not aware

that I ever used it. If he wishes to use the postage stamp argument that is up to his capacity and he can do it.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not attribute the postage stamp argument to the hon. gentleman. I used it to illustrate his statement that if more money comes into the public treasury through the customs duty it must of necessity have been because the government have wrung it from the pockets of the people by increased taxes? Does he deny that?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the hon. minister using that argument, but I do not wish him to attribute it to myself.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not done it. Now, as we are cross-questioning one another, will he tell me what lesson he draws from the fact that, whereas with rates of three cents and five cents on letters a postal revenue of $3,000,000 was raised in 1896, now, with rates reduced to two cents all round $6,000,000 is raised? Does he draw from that the lesson that it is possible to lower the rate of taxation and yet greatly increase the income?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. member wishes to know my idea, I have to clear the ground a bit by asking whether or not he looks upon the postage rate as a tax? I myself do not.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to know what else it is. You cannot get a letter carried unless you buy a stamp, and that stamp represents a tax.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the fares on the Intercolonial railway a tax?

Mr. PATERSON. No. They go to defray the expenses of the railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The same way with the postal revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. But there is a tax represented by the stamp on a letter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman explain why the cost of carrying a letter is a tax, and the cost of carrying a passenger or freight is not a tax?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, in both cases; the man that travels on the Intercolonial pays, and the man that gets a letter carried pays. But here is what the government does. They say, if we carry that letter for you, you have got to pay two cents for it; and we say to the other man, if we are going to carry you on the Intercolonial you have got to pay us so much for it; and if we lower the rate on the Intercolonial it is the same as lowering the rate on the letter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But why is the one a tax and the other is not a tax? I understood the hon. gentleman to say that one was a tax and the other was not a tax.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, of course, whether it is of set purpose, to break up my argument, that I am interrupted. I can only say this, that I think what has been done is not the most courteous thing in the world, and I do not think it is the most dignified. I am not taking any offence at it. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot put me out of my argument, whether it be right or wrong, with all the interruptions they may make. But for hon. gentlemen occupying the front benches, men who ask to be entrusted with the affairs of the country, to say that because there are sixty millions of money going into the public treasury by way of customs, when there were only eighteen millions before, and that that is due to the action of the government, when the only action the government can take is to lower the rate of taxation which determines it, the purchase being wholly voluntary on the part of the people that buy the goods, is something that I think—well, at any rate I would not like to build my reputation upon it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not interrupt the hon. gentleman again.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule is that no hon. member has a right to interrupt an hon. member having the floor except on a point of order, or with his permission. If the hon. member having the floor objects to the interruption, that is an end to it, according to the rules of the House.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. You will please remember, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman asked me to wait until the end of his argument, and then he would answer me, and that I have done. I wanted to know now if he will answer the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must resume his seat.

Mr. PATERSON. I decline to answer it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I just wanted to know——

Mr. SPEAKER. I will have to name the hon. gentleman if he continues in his present course.

Mr. FOSTER. Ah, this is the first time we have heard anything about naming a member.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen will acknowledge that I have been very indulgent so far, hoping that hon. gentlemen themselves would observe the rules of debate. Every member in this House has an interest in seeing these rules observed.

Mr. PATERSON. I decline to answer the question, not on my own account, not because my argument may be wrong, but because they are not going to prevent me from making my argument. I take it as a

compliment, because hon. gentlemen do not make this noise and these interruptions unless they feel hurt by the argument. But when I find the leader of the opposition taking part in these interruptions, then it is the dignity of the House that I am concerned for; for they are distinctly lowering it by their continued interruptions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I rise to a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to allude to me in that manner. I asked him three or four questions, I understood with his consent. If he had declined to permit the questions he should have said so. I certainly understood that I had his consent in asking them. I think he ought to withdraw the expression he has used. The mere fact that he was not able to make good his distinction should not cause him to lose his temper.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. PATERSON. I would be happy to withdraw, I do not want to give the least offence to my hon. friend opposite, if he will promise to be good from this out. Now, Sir, I was pointing out the difference between the two. I was saying that the resolution of the leader of the opposition was a declaration of want of confidence in the government, asking that the government be turned out because it did not adopt what he called adequate protection. I read an extract from a speech of the hon. member for North Toronto in which he pointed out the large agricultural imports into this country, and I was alluding to the claim of hon. gentlemen opposite that we have carried out their National Policy, and that whatever success has attended the administration of affairs by this government, is due to that policy. I pointed that out as a distinct difference between the two parties. Their policy has been the protective principle, that is, to make their tariff wall high enough to shut out goods from coming into the country; whereas we arranged a tariff so as to produce a revenue necessary to carry on the affairs of the government; and while there is protection wherever there are customs duties, if it be only 5 per cent or 10 per cent, that protection exists only as an incident and not as a principle. The principle of protection carried to the extreme for which these hon. gentleman stand, was illustrated by one of their speakers the other night, when he was giving the history of the protection of the woollen industry in England. He went away back to the time of King Edward the III, and he told us what was done in those days to protect the woollen industry. He told us that if a man wanted to ship wool out or to bring woollen goods in, the law was that he was to be fined; and if fining him did not stop him, then they were going to kill him according to law, he was to be put to death. Well, that would be extreme protection, it would be adequate so far as that man was concerned, no doubt about that. What is adequate protection? Why, it is one that will shut out this million and a half dollars' worth of agricultural implements that the hon. member for North Toronto tells us about, that are coming into this country. Therefore, he says there is need for the Conservative party. Now, I was going to point out to you that the object of our tariff plank was to make trade freer with the whole world. That I have shown we have done, by increasing the number of articles on the free list, by reducing the duty of those on the general list, and by the heavy British preferential tariff. But we have done more than that. We were to have the tariff so arranged that trade should be freer, that it should promote domestic and foreign trade. Well, it has been so arranged. Under it the domestic trade has grown to enormous proportions; we cannot tell until our census is taken again how great that proportion is. With reference to our foreign trade, we know it has been so arranged as to make a marvellous change. In 1896 our total imports were $118,000,000, and our exports $121,000,000. In 1908 there were $370,000,000 of imports and $280,000,000 of exports. It was so arranged that the foreign trade of this country has sprung from less than $240,000,000 to in 1908, $650,000,000. Have we carried out the platform in that respect? We were instructed to so arrange the tariff that it would hasten the return of prosperity to our people. Did we do it? Scarce had we accomplished it before prosperity was in sight and it has been going on ever since. The people know that is the case.

Now, then, I want to touch upon another thing. The hon. member for North Toronto the other day asked the question: Have you made trade freer? Where have you made trade freer? That was one of the things laid down in your platform. I answer: We have made it freer for the whole world in the reductions that we made in our general tariff. We have made it, in addition to that, still freer with Great Britain, still freer with New Zealand, still freer with South Africa, still freer with India, still freer with the West Indies, still freer with Guiana, still freer, lately, with France, and we have made provision for freer trade with other countries if they desire it by our preferential tariff. There has been a continual carrying out of the principle which was laid down by the Liberal convention. Every principle laid down by that convention with reference to trade matters has been followed out by this government. I want to just touch

barely on one of the statements that the hon. member for North Toronto made in regard to some advice that he gave to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. He said that when the revenues are buoyant the Finance Minister should lay aside some of the revenue for lessening the debt. That may have some merit, but let me tell the hon. gentleman he has lost sight of the fact that it was better for the Finance Minister not to do as he says he should do. Why? Because the very expenditures that he has made have secured in a large measure the great prosperity that you have in the country. That is easy to be seen by any one who gives the subject any thought. If you have taken your surplus funds and have made an investment of them that will bring you back ten, fifteen or fifty-fold it is better than laying them aside. He says that out of your abundant revenues you should lay something aside, and he takes it for granted that if these expenditures had not been made we would have had these abundant revenues all the same. But, you would not have had them? The money is coming back as the result of the wise expenditures that have been made by this government. Do not lose sight of that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Like buying sawdust wharfs.

Mr. PATERSON. No, not by buying sawdust wharfs; no, no. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. G. Taylor) wants to know I will touch upon that for a few minutes. Where have the large expenditures been? The hon. member for North Toronto asked us to state what we have got that stands and is useful to this country, and is either productive or stimulative for the expenditures of these millions of money that he was alluding to at that time. I will tell you some of the things we have; it would take too long to give the whole list.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Commence with the Quebec bridge.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I will tell you where I will commence; I will commence, first, with the statement that we have secured population through the expenditure of many millions by our immigration department. Is there nothing lasting or beneficial in the immigrants that are coming into this country by hundreds of thousands? We spent seven or eight millions, it is true. But what are the returns? Half a million of people coming into the country—we are told, in one year—and bringing with them $80,000,000 or $100,000,000. Is that a wise expenditure? Who says it is not? Second, our Intercolonial railway has been improved. You say there is no net revenue to-day, but is there no benefit to the people who use that road, no convenience, no advantage given by that expenditure? More money to be expended by the local governments through the increased subsidies given. Some millions have gone in that. Is that any benefit? It has gone back to the people, it has gone to the governments of the different provinces to be expended for the benefit of the people, and these people are the people of the Dominion. Has that money been wisely expended? It has gone to the iron and steed industries through bounties. There has been an expenditure of millions in that way. Has there been any resulting benefit from it? I am not going to enter into a discussion of that question. The Finance Minister spoke in reference to it. There may be different views, but I want to tell you that these bounties came to be raised to what they are because we lowered the tariff on iron and steel, and it was made up in that way. We were enabled to reduce the duties on these articles through the bounty and the reduction of these duties meant a reduction in the raw material to the men who make the implements the farmer uses and to the industries in which iron is used, and in that way we have got the benefit. Just in passing let me say, because I am not going to argue or enter into a discussion of this question to-day, that we certainly do not give bonuses just for the fun of the thing.

I might remind you of another statement that the Prime Minister made in speaking of that policy. He said that we were to lower the rate of taxation and we were to do this without doing injustice to any classes. He emphasized that in the speech which he made by saying that when duties have been in force once it is not a very easy matter to reduce them because new industries have sprung up, but when you want to reduce them it ought to be done with great consideration and he was sure that when the Liberal government came into power they would not be indifferent to that primary truth. We found the iron and steel industries in existence and the duties that were upon their products under the tariff of protection was $4 on pig iron and $10 on steel. We reduced the duty on pig iron to $2.50 and the duty on steel to $7. If we had done that without giving them increased bounties we should have done the injustice to them that was pointed out by the Prime Minister when he spoke at that time. That was our reason for doing this and it has been done. Now then if the steel and iron bounties, or any other bounties, are given for the advantage of some individuals alone, and have no national importance, they cannot be justified. That is the test that must be applied. If you give bounties they must rest on the principle of the national importance of in-

dustry. We may differ in our views on this point, but I hold that these industries are of national importance. I hold that they are of such great benefit, so widespread in their ramifications, that the whole country is benefited by these industries being in existence. I was struck when I was at Sault Ste. Marie by a statement which was made by one of the gentlemen who was connected with an institution there. I did not undertake to verify it, it may be an extravagant statement—I cannot say—but it struck me as an extraordinary statement when he told me that that industry located at the Sault employed more shipping tonnage than all the tonnage employed on the inland waters in moving the whole crop of the Northwest down to the ports of exit. I have not verified it, but it gives an idea of what strength there is in this. Perhaps the same cannot be said of the oil industry, but at all events it was an industry which had been kept in existence by all the governments from confederation down, and in order to lessen the duties which were paid by our people on this article of prime necessity in the rural parts of the country especially, the duty was reduced and the oil producer was compensated by a bounty. The lead industry was the same. Cheaper transport for our products through improvements of our harbours: Montreal, Toronto, Fort William, Port Arthur, Port Colborne, St. John, Halifax, Quebec and our lake and open ports generally; (6) enlarged canals and free canals; (7) improvement of the St. Lawrence river route; (8) cheaper transport on ocean steamers through a bonus; (9) cheaper transport through aid to railways by bonus; (10) the Crowsnest Pass railway through a bonus; (11) the Transcontinental railway through local expenditure and guarantee; (12) the South African expenditure (a direct expenditure); (13) the place we occupy to-day in the thoughts of other nations. These are assets; these are all contributing sources to the magnificent prosperity we have in the country now. Why, Sir, the sending of these volunteers to South Africa raised high the fame of Canada. That is an asset and though it may not be direct it has been of vast indirect benefit to the country. Why did we improve the St. Lawrence route, and why did we enlarge the harbour of Montreal? I represent a rural constituency in part, and we are 400 miles from Montreal and several hundred miles further from the mouth of the St. Lawrence, but I am voting to deepen and to light and to buoy the St. Lawrence river and to enlarge the harbour of Montreal. Is it because I like the people of Montreal better than I like my own constituents? Certainly not. Is it that for the pleasure of the thing I vote to spend millions of money, some of which was contributed by my rural constituents, to improve our navigation facilities? No. Why is it then? It is because, as I have often told my people and they agree with me, I want the harbour of Montreal enlarged because I want more ships to come to that port. I want more ships because the more ships the keener the competition for cargo, and the keener the competition the lower the ocean freight rate, and because every cent reduction in the cost of transportation is a cent in the pocket of the producer. Who can tell the amount of permanent benefit that has come to the farmers of this country from the expenditures we have made on the harbour of Montreal and the improvement of the St. Lawrence? That route has been made so safe that ocean liners can come up there through the dark hours of the night as well as in the daylight. Time has been saved, risk has been lessened and freight has been lowered to the consequent profit of the producers of our exports. That is an improvement which is paying good interest on the investment to all the people of Canada. And so with the improvement of the harbours on the lakes: Fort William, Port Arthur, Midland, Victoria Harbour, Goderich and all these. That work is not done for the benefit of the people living in the locality alone; it is done to reduce the cost of transportation and, I say it here that if there is any benefit to be given to the agriculturist by way of lowering the tariff, just and equitable, the agriculturist is entitled to it. But, I hold that more can be done to benefit the agriculturist of Canada by reducing to him the cost of getting his goods in the market than by a reduction of the tariff. A reduction in the tariff is all right so far as you can go, but the farmer is vastly more interested in the wise expenditure of all the money that comes into the public treasury, contributed by all classes as well as by himself, in bettering the facilities for transport and cheapening its cost. If by improving our transportation facilities we can reduce by two or three cents a bushel the cost of landing produce in the consuming market, fancy what a benefit that is to the producer in the west, not only on one year's crop but on the crop of every succeeding year. Take, for example, the $3,360,000, contributed to the treasury by all the people of Canada, which this government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build 330 miles of a railway from Lethbridge to Nelson. Our opponents spoke of it as the Crowsnest deal or the Crowsnest steal, and they tried to magnify it into a scandal although I notice that this year they have dropped it. They do not refer to it any longer. There was an expenditure of some millions, concerning which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked what had we accomplished by it. What did we accomplish? Sir, we secured the building of that

road. We have had a tract of 330 miles of undeveloped country opened up, in which there are towns, cities and villages and a mining population, producing wealth, adding revenue to the treasury by the taxation they pay. But that is not all there is in that bargain. One of the conditions on which we paid that $3,300,000 was that the Canadian Pacific railway was to give us 50,000 acres of coal land which they had acquired from the British Columbia government. That is our national asset to-day; and the fact that we have fixed $2 as the maximum price of the coal that may be sold there, is of untold benefit to the people who have to buy coal in the Northwest. That alone is an item which would justify the transaction. But what more did we do? It will be remembered that in the bargain made by the old government, the Canadian Pacific railway were not obliged to reduce their rates until their road earned 10 per cent net. Well, Sir, that was a contingency very unlikely to happen, and therefore this government, when they made the bargain with the Canadian Pacific railway to give them $3,300,000 to build that road, stipulated for a reduction in the freight rates on their whole system. By that means, we obtained a reduction which we could not have got otherwise. Among other reductions in freight rates, was a reduction of three cents per 100 pounds on all grain coming out of that country. What did that amount to? Figure it out, and you will find that the farmers, within four years, got back the whole of that $3,300,000, and they are reaping a proportionate and like benefit until this day and will be for all time to come. And yet we are asked in what manner we have promoted the prosperity of this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Might I ask a question? How many bushels of wheat are freighted over the Crowsnest Pass road which the hon. minister is speaking of?

Mr. PATERSON. The reduction I speak of applies to the whole system.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has any wheat ever been freighted over that road?

Mr. PATERSON. No, but there has been wheat freighted over the other portions of the Canadian Pacific railway system.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thought the hon. gentleman was speaking of the Crowsnest Pass road and of the expenditure on it.

Mr. PATERSON. There has been no wheat freighted over that road.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then I do not see where the minister's argument comes in.

Mr. PATERSON. That is because you did not rightly grasp the bargain. Under that bargain, grain all over the Northwest territory which comes out on the Canadian Pacific railway system is carried at a reduced rate. If there be 40,000,000 carried on the Canadian Pacific railroad, that is carried at the three cents per 100 pounds reduction. Just think of it. The direct recipients are the men who grow the grain. It might be said that in fairness some of that money ought to have gone into the public treasury, but the farmers are the ones who get it directly. When they come to market their wheat, the buyer knows the ultimate price in the market to which the wheat is going. He has to figure the freight and insurance charges and all the other expenses in order that he may know what margin there will be for him and what price he can afford to pay. And when he knows that he gets a reduction of 3 cents a hundred pounds on the freight, he is able to give the farmer the benefit of that at once, and it goes at once into the farmer's pocket because he gets it in the extra price which the wheat buyer is enabled to pay him. What does that mean to the people in the Northwest? While I do not undervalue their request for a lower tariff, what is that in comparison with the benefit they can derive from the wise expenditure of money out of the public treasury to which all the people in the country contribute? It means millions. Whenever you can lower the insurance or the freight rates by deepening the St. Lawrence, by lighting it, by enlarging the harbours—every time you can take a cent off the cost of the transportation of the produce of this country, that is a benefit to the men who raise the crops. While I give every credit to my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture, for the steps he has taken and is still taking, in order to benefit the producers of this country, that is only a minor matter as compared with a wise expenditure of the public money in improving and cheapening the lines of transportation, and in this way giving our farmers money far in excess of what they would get had not these additional facilities been provided out of our public revenue. The great producing class of this country is the farmer, and therefore every reduction in freight is a reduction which goes into their pockets. More than half the total exports of this country are the products of the farm, so that the man who raises those products is the one who gets the benefit of the reduced rates secured to him by the expenditure of public money.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Might I ask another question? Do I understand that owing to this legislation in reference to the Crowsnest Pass railway the freight rates on produce in the northwest were reduced three cents to the farmers?

Mr. PATERSON. Three cents a 100 pounds, yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is the first time I understand that because it is not the case.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the hon. gentleman will be obliged to me for telling him.

Mr. CAMPBELL. For the information as it comes, but not for the fact.

Mr. PATERSON. I think my hon. friend will find it is correct. That was one of the conditions of the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific railway. We gave them $11,000 a mile for the building of 330 miles of railway. That was larger than any bonus given to any other company, the bonus generally being $3,200 a mile, and in some cases $6,400 through very difficult country. That subsidy was given not to build the road alone, but to secure to the people of the west the great boon of having a reduction in freight rates of three cents a hundred pounds for all time to come. In addition to that, lower rates were to be given on goods imported into that country, coal oil, agricultural implements, &c., so that, taking these things into consideration and remembering that the money has been paid back—although of course it went to farmers it was still paid back—and on that one item in four years there has been an immense relief to these people. I give it as an illustration of all the other expenditures. By wise expenditures of that kind you are benefiting the country, you increase your revenue, you have one of the greatest resources of the prosperity of this country. I have spoken at length. I do not apologize for it. I do not mean to say that I have spoken longer than I intended. When I rose I felt, whatever others might feel, that there were some things I wanted to say, things that in my judgment should be said, and I made up my mind I would take up as long as it required me if my physical force enabled my voice to reach your ears. I recognize the fact that in the ordinary session, deducting the time devoted to routine proceedings, there is only between two and three hours of time for each member of this House to occupy the floor. I quite recognize that the large part of the time that might fairly be allotted to me has been consumed by me on this occasion and I therefore will endeavour to keep as quiet as possible during the remainder of this session.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I am sure no hon. member of this House begrudged to the Minister of Customs the time during which he has diverted us this afternoon by the somewhat extraordinary utterances to which he has just given voice. We have welcomed it as a very pleasant diversion, one of those rare treats which he accords us about once in every two years. Sometimes they are received with cheers from my hon. friends opposite, sometimes they are not received with such enthusiasm, but just now, as my hon. friend has said, there appears to be some necessity for him or some member of the Liberal pary to go into the flights of eloquence and to paint in roseate hues the imaginary virtues and achievements of the Liberal party. The virtues of the Liberal party are shortly to be tested in the city of Ottawa, and looking at the situation for myself, I should say that the party seems to be in rather a tight place, very hard up for campaign literature. It appears to have devolved upon the Minister of Customs, to furnish the class of campaign literature which has been so prevalent generally in elections of that party. The minister's speech goes back to ancient history. It starts with virtues of which we hear every session in this House. Then it touches upon ancient history and then the minister's vivid imagination furnishes all the rest of his argument. But it is a sad thing that although my hon. friend's imagination be fickle, although it be lofty, although it be refined, he has allowed his memory—I suppose on account of the large expenditure he is at, and the amount of strength he expends in his efforts—to wander from the strict line of truth to which I know otherwise he would rigidly adhere. What does my hon. friend say? He starts off, as he does in every brilliant oration, with this expression: 'Having regard to the prosperity of this country prior to 1896: Did we not have fruitful fields and industrial prosperity prior to 1896?' My hon. friend does not always say that and his followers may some day, when brought face to face with his words on some platform, wish he had not spoken out in this way in this House. But my hon. friend wanted to serve a purpose, and that purpose is disclosed in the next sentence. 'It must be, can only be, that the prosperity which is enjoyed by this country to-day is due to the wise policy of the Liberal party as applied to the condition of affairs to-day.' It suited my hon. friend's argument to make use of that expression. He forgot that he has been in this House a long time, that he has addressed himself to budget speeches year after year when he did not sit on the treasury benches. I shall jog his memory by reading a sentence from the debate of March 29, 1894, when he occupied a seat on your left:

I feel that we are more indebted to Providence in giving us the products of our

natural resources than to their management of the finances of the country.

What position does my hon. friend take now in regard to Providence? Providence is surely at fault now. Under the Conservative government, Providence was doing all the work. Now my hon. friend says, with his right hon. leader, that our prosperity and the wonderful progress this country has made are due to the wise policy of the Liberal party. Then my hon. friend touched upon a very interesting feature of the history of his party, the Liberal convention of 1893 at which he and some other hon. members on that side were present and the official report of which I hold in my hand. And this he did quite without any necessity, because I do not know that the subject has been raised in this debate. He takes upon himself the somewhat onerous task of justifying the planks of that platform and of proving that each one of them has been kept by the party and not broken and disregarded. Well, Sir, there was a Liberal convention in Ottawa in 1893. These hon. gentlemen having been then about fifteen years out of office, and, hungering for the sweets of office, they desired a platform upon which they could come into power. And so they met in solemn council in Ottawa to provide means by which they could satisfy the electorate that they ought to be elected to office. They, apparently, did not meet with many disagreements as among themselves and they parted after expressing by suitable resolution confidence in the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who now leads this House, and singing 'For he's a jolly good fellow.' I can only say that, especially with regard to carrying out this platform and the promises which he made at that convention and afterwards made in the province of Quebec and in the west, there never was a 'jollier fellow' in the history of Canada. For, as a 'jollier,' the right hon. gentleman is most successful. In the art of 'flim-flamming' the electorate the right hon. gentleman is a past master as a 'jolly fellow.' The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) forgot some things concerning the carrying out of the principles of that convention, especially with regard to free trade. By reading the records of the convention, he tried to show that what the right hon. Prime Minister meant was not free trade as they have it in England—that that never was promised by the Liberal party of Canada. He read a certain portion of the hon. member's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier's) speech declaring that he would apply the principle as nearly as he could to work out the beneficial results which he expected would flow from it. Either the Minister of Customs is losing his memory or he did not see fit, when he was going into ancient history, to tell the House all he knew about the statements made by the present leader of the House on the principle of free trade. He forgot to tell us that all that the right hon. gentleman said on the subject of free trade was not said in the convention hall. The right hon. gentleman had to satisfy parties in the west, and people down by the sea, and manufacturers of Ontario, upon that question. Arguing the matter years after the event the Minister of Customs forgets what the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself cannot forget, and what he dare not and cannot deny—his own utterances to the people of Manitoba in the city of Winnipeg in 1895. Let us see what he said and compare that with his attitude as interpreted by the Minister of Customs. The right hon. gentleman has heard these words time and again, but it would be a pity should he forget them:

> I come before you to-night to preach to you this new gospel of free trade. I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage. Yes, bondage. And I refer to bondage in the same manner in which American slavery was bondage. Sir, our policy is freedom of trade such as exists in England, such as is practised in Great Britain. I propose that we should follow England's example and open our ports to the products of the world. In the city of Montreal, the Liberal party believes in free trade on broad lines such as exists in Great Britain, and upon that platform, exemplified as I have told you, the Liberal party will fight its next battle.

The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) forgot that expression, as he forgot some other matters, one of which is very fresh in our memories. He forgot the very interesting debate upon the Senate which we had yesterday and on which, I believe, the hon. gentleman cast his vote. He will remember the words of Sir Oliver Mowat, chairman of the Liberal convention, and he will remember the speech made by the Right Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright on that occasion in which he said:

> I think, Sir, we all agree——

That is the great Liberal party of Canada agree.

> I think, Sir, we all agree that the constitution of the Senate as it at present exists is a blot upon popular government and upon free institutions.

And there was a plank in the platform to reform the Senate and remove that blot upon popular government and free institutions. But what has the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite done to remove that blot? Time after time discussions have taken place in this House on the subject of reforming or ending the Senate. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) lifted up his sonorous voice in favour of making good

that plank of the platform of the Liberal party? I do not think so. I certainly have never heard the hon. gentleman speak on that question before. The hon. gentleman dealt also with the question of expenditure. He says that the Liberal party promised at that convention that the extravagance which they said was rampant under the Conservative party then in power should be checked and that there should be economy, wise economy, in the expenditure of the people's money. Well, I think my hon. friend's memory must be equal to the task of remembering some of the instances in which that plank has been violated. I think he remembers several instances in which motions were made in this House, and matters were brought to the attention of the government, in which an unwise expenditure, a very dishonest expenditure was the subject of very severe criticism, sometimes defended by my hon. friend, sometimes allowed to go in tacit silence. But we can refer to one or two instances of unwise expenditures. We have been treated lately to an incident of unwise expenditure—I refer to the Sawdust wharf which has been mentioned this afternoon; and there are others which make up the history of the life of this government, with mentioning which I will not weary the House at this time. But this remains, that whereas, under the Conservative government there was economy of administration, there was an attempt made to keep those who were handling the people's money down to the letter of their duty, and to see that every dollar of money was employed in the proper channel, yet how has that been swept to the winds by this party who promised to see that every dollar of the people's money should be wisely, honestly and economically spent. I will just quote one instance that occurs to me, and that is an instance where an official of this government were not exactly, what one might call, living up to the letter of honesty, I refer to the case which was the subject of a resolution in this House two or three years ago, a case in which an employee of the Immigration Department of the government was convicted of stealing from a person with whom he came in contact as search officer. He was sentenced to a term in jail, he spent the term in jail, and when he was released, largely by the very wise, the paternal act of the Minister of the Interior, he was rewarded by being put back in the position, with his salary raised, and the scope of his duties extended. That is an incident of how the Liberal party has carried out that plank in their platfrom.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

UNION LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 36) respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

On section 1,—first instalment on shares.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the meaning of that clause? I do not see the promoter of that Bill in the House; neither do I see the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee. It seems to me that we have no one here to vouch for this Bill. Certainly, if we are going to proceed with the Bill the promoter of the Bill at least should be here. This, to my mind, is a very important Bill and one which I thought should not have passed the Banking and Commerce Committee. I know there are others of the same opinion as myself. We were not at all satisfied with it and before we proceed with this Bill I think we should have the promoter of the Bill, or the chairman of the committee, to explain what the various clauses mean and why the company is asking for them. Some very peculiar things came up in the Banking and Commerce Committee in regard to this Bill, and the House is entitled to a great deal more light on the Bill than what we are going to get to-night, in the absence of the two gentlemen who are especially interested in promoting the Bill. I do not know what the government thinks about it; the government is very weak to-night, very lame. We have no one here to take charge of government measures except the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). He is usually in his place. I commend him for it. I wish I could commend some of the others for diligence just in the same way, but I am sorry to say I can not do it. I do not know whether they have gone down to the city to take part in the election that is going on at the present time.

Mr. TALBOT. They have gone to the hockey match.

Mr. HENDERSON. They have gone to the hockey match. Well, if it has come to this that ministers of the Crown, when important measures are before the House, have nothing better to do than attend a hockey match, I think we had better adjourn parliament until the hockey matches are all over.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I will send for the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the leader of the opposition is very well oc-

cupied to-night and possibly my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals will find out on the 29th of this month that he is doing mighty good service. The leader of the opposition is a free commoner. He is not bound to be here every night. He has lieutenants to look after the interests of the opposition, but the government is always supposed to be here. Here is a Bill respecting the Canadian Pacific railway and I am glad to see the Minister of Railways and Canals in his place. Here is another respecting the Canadian Pacific railway. The minister is in his place to see to that also, but there is another Bill respecting trust and loan companies.

Mr. LAVERGNE. The Minister of Finance is here.

Mr. HENDERSON. Just arrived in time to escape castigation. I am delighted to see him. The Finance Minister is one of those men against whom we can say very little for non-attendance. I commend the minister for it. You will find him here late and early attending to his duties. I never knew him to go away to a hockey match when important business was on hand and I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) was too fast when he informed us that the ministers of the Crown, except the Minister of Railways and Canals, had all gone off to the hockey match. I hope that before the committee rises the hon. member for Bellechasse will rise in his place and do the Minister of Finance the justice of saying that he made a mistake and that he was not well informed, as he is nearly every time.

Mr. TALBOT. It is quite true that I made a mistake, but I did not think that my hon. friend's swallowing powers were as good as they are.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. member for Bellechasse has anything worth swallowing he can depend upon it I will open my mouth. I am here to listen, I am here to take note of what is going on, I am here to watch legislation and if men are not here who ought to be here to attend to matters of this kind I am obliged to express my opinion of them. This is not the first time that I have prevented a Bill from going through simply because the promoters of the Bill and the chairman of the committee were not present. I feel very much like taking that stand to-night. I am not going to boast of my power because I may not have a sufficient number behind me if the government should choose to divide on the question and call upon their friends to put the measure through with or without consideration, but I believe the good sense of the minister will cause him to reflect and say that the course which I have taken is the proper one to pursue. I remember that on former occasions the Minister of Finance has agreed with me that it is a proper thing to object to a Private Bill going through when the chairman of the committee or the promoter of the Bill is not in his place. I feel like appealing to the Finance Minister to-night to support me and I am inclined to think that if I do he will be gracious enough to do it. He may go wrong sometimes, like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) who addressed us this afternoon for nearly two and a half hours, when he undertook to show that the ten planks in the platform of the Liberal party, as laid down in 1893, had all been carried out. I do not think the Minister of Finance would get up in his place and support the Minister of Customs in that. I think he would modify his language somewhat, but I think the Minister of Finance would support me in the contention I have raised that we should not proceed with this legislation in the absence of more information, the information that can only be given by the promoter of the Bill or the chairman of the committee that had it in charge. Now, I am going to appeal to the Minister of Finance if I have not taken the proper stand, if this is not the proper mode of procedure. This is a very important Bill, a Bill that passed through the committee, and I say now, and I appeal to the judgment of other members of the committee, that we were not satisfied at all. We had our doubts about the Bill in the Committee of Banking and Commerce and I am rather inclined to think that the Minister of Finance will give me some support in stopping the progress of this Bill until the men come in who have the right to vouch for it and whose duty it is to explain it. I appeal to the House to prevent this bad example being set. I ask the Minister of Finance who is leading the House this evening to assist me in not letting Bills go through in this way.

Mr. A. M. MARTIN. In justice to the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee it is only fair to say he is engaged at present at a meeting of the committee on the race track gambling Bill. He has been in that committee since seven o'clock and may be there until nine o'clock.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I just left the committee and I saw him there.

Mr. FIELDING. Although the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is known to be a great athelete, I am sure he has no intention of neglecting the progress of the Bill. I do not think there is anything to be gained by pressing the Bill if objection is taken, and there will be no trouble at all in letting it stand over.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that is proper. Shall we say 'stand.'

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company—Mr. Tolmie.

VANCOUVER, VICTORIA AND EASTERN RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

On the order being called for the second reading of Bill (No. 99) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member in charge of this Bill is not present and perhaps the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) will intimate that it should stand over as he did in the case of the other Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is only a second reading.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the second reading of the Bill, and the House will have an opportunity of dealing with it later on, so that I hope the rule laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will not be enforced too severely.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it should be invoked on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. I have heard the hon. gentleman invoke the rule against the second reading. I would not like to think that he has any partisan feeling in the matter; I would not like to think that he objects to a Bill because it is in charge of an hon. member on this side of the House, while he would wish to jolly along a Bill which stands in the name of one of his political friends. That would take away from the character for impartiality which my hon. friend wishes to maintain.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thank the Minister of Finance for his very kind expression. All I had in view was to give my hon. friend time to get his wind. I had no intention of delaying the Bill, but there was an object in just wasting a little time. The Minister of Finance knows how that works.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that the Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (Algoma) (resuming). Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair I was commenting upon the somewhat extraordinary speech which the Minister of Customs treated the House to. I was referring to the contention which the hon. gentleman made with a great deal of vehemence, that the pledges of the Liberal convention of 1893 had all been honourably carried out by the Liberal government. I do not see the Minister of Customs in his place to-night, and probably the remark that some of the ministers had gone to the hockey match applies to him. I am sorry he is not present that I might remind him of the speech he made at that convention. The hon. gentleman spoke there, and the report tells us that he was received with loud and continuous applause and that he had to tell the people to keep quiet because even he could not make himself heard above the din. He spoke especially with reference to the trade policy of the Liberal party in support of the resolution denouncing the principle of protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and declaring that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country laboured. I quote from the words of the Minister of Customs:

> You have laid down and emphasized again the principle held by the Liberal party in this matter of trade and commerce, that in the levying of the taxes of the country, regard should be had only to the necessities of the revenue and that the government should not seek by tariff legislation to favour any particular class in the community. I say this is no new principle. A revenue tariff was in force when our late leader, Alexander Mackenzie, who has gone to his long rest, held the reins of power; and he and his government fell because he would not yield to the cry for a protective tariff. From that day to this the Liberal party have not ceased to proclaim that they believed that it was not right or just that protection, as a principle, should be recognized by the government of the country, and that they believed that the duty of the government was to raise the necessary revenue to discharge the duties devolving upon the government and to leave the people free to work out their own destiny, giving no undue advantage to any one portion of the community over another. And to-day, Sir, you have embodied that principle in the resolution now before us.

So that the hon. gentleman's memory was slightly defective when he tried to make out that the tariff for this country was not a protective tariff. His colleague, the Minister of Finance, will not deny that it is. How does the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Customs, reconcile the language he used in supporting that resolution which formed one of the ten planks of the Liberal platform, with the remarks he made to-day and with the budget we are now de-

bating. In that language he said he was in favour of a tariff for revenue only, whereas to-day he is lauding to the skies what is a moderately protective tariff and a tariff in some respects a great deal too high to suit some hon. gentlemen opposite.

These are anomalies with regard to which the hon. gentleman was very weak, and it seemed to me he was rather gratified when he was interrupted, as the interruption gave him the opportunity to assume the semblance of wrath and some little time to consider how he could best square himself with his former professions.

My hon. friend spoke about another platform—the platform of prohibition. Did his party carry out their promise with regard to that platform? They passed a resolution on the question of prohibition. Did they carry out what they promised in their speeches on that resolution? We know what the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) said. He said that if his party were elected, it would carry prohibition if such a measure had a majority in the country. Well, a plebiscite was taken and there was a majority in favour of prohibition, what has my hon. friend to say now? These hon. gentlemen, who were so lavish in their professions, took on themselves the responsibility of saying that the majority in favour of prohibition was not large enough to carry such a measure into effect.

There is one feature of the hon. minister's (Mr. Paterson) speech to which I cannot help but refer as it touches the question of the franchise law. I have no intention of discussing the amendments made by this government during the session of 1908; but if there be any more striking evidence of the desire of this government to secure unfair elections, to gag the majority of the people and prevent the will of the electors from being known and acted on, than the amendments to the Franchise Act put through by this government in 1908, I should like to know where it is to be found. They were simply intended to put a muzzle on the voters in the constituencies of northern Ontario, and they stand to-day as a monument greatly to the discredit of this government. The Franchise Act in 1908 created new regulations for making votes which resulted in a most outrageous state of affairs. That state of affairs I shall not enter into now, because it will form the subject of another discussion, but the people resented that outrageous condition. The opening of the Printing Bureau on Sunday by order of the Secretary of State, the running of special trains at the expense of the government, and a large expense it was, to carry voters' lists and constables, and the mounting of polls out in the bush by constables—all these things testify to one of the greatest outrages ever committed against the electorate. In order to carry out an election in the riding of western Algoma, in order to enable this government to secure a majority in that riding and in the riding of East Algoma, there was a special train run from Ottawa starting on a Sunday. The Printing Bureau was opened by order of the Secretary of State on Sunday in order to print those voters' lists and send them on that special train and give to the government candidates whatever advantages might thus be gained. That was one of the results of the working out of these splendid franchise amendments to which my hon. friend pledges his support. All I can say is that when the true facts of the working out of that Act are made known, my hon. friend and the Prime Minister will realize that what was said when that franchise amendment was before this House in 1908, had a great deal of truth in it, and this amendment did work an outrage on the rights of the people.

We are gratified by the condition of affairs as shown by the speech of my hon. friend on the budget. We know that this is an era in which Canada is enjoying great prosperity, that our resources are being developed, that our coal and oil lands are being developed, and that our timber resources are growing, but no man in his sober senses—certainly not the Minister of Finance—will say that for all these good things we must thank the Liberal party. The Minister of Finance may say that the Liberal party have made the most of what Providence has so abundantly endowed the country with, but he will not go as far as the Minister of Customs did and say that while, under Conservative rule, Providence was responsible entirely for what little prosperity he grudgingly admitted the country then enjoyed, the prosperity of these late years, our great wheat fields, our grand mineral resources, are due to the policy of this government.

We have heard from time to time of the expenditure and it struck me that the Minister of Finance in speaking was rather proud to be able to say that we had reached what he called the hundred million dollar mark. It seemed to strike a peculiar note, rather a jarring note to any person who had heard the minister and his colleagues in days gone by denounce an expenditure of $40,000,000, aye $38,000,000, as not only extravagant but as a crime and a shame. Four million dollars, three million dollars less would be quite enough to carry on the government in this country. I shall not draw a sharp contrast between the condition of affairs when we had an expenditure of $38,000,000 and $40,000,000 and to-day, when we have reached what the Minister of Finance, very proudly calls the $100,000,000 mark, but I can certainly say some things with regard to the method of making expenditures of public money. Contemplating an expenditure of $100,000,000 per

annum one cannot but feel that there are expenditures which may have been greatly misdirected, and that the whole scheme of expenditure for public buildings and public improvements calls for the careful revision by the government in the interest of the public welfare. What is the position now with regard to public buildings? Is there any governmental or departmental arrangement whereby when a post office building is necessary for the public service in any part of Canada, the Postmaster General makes a requisition on the Minister of Public Works and the building is put up? No, Sir, the very last man to be considered when a post office is needed in a constituency is the Postmaster General and the very last consideration which is given to the question of the erection of that building is whether it is required for the public service and for the convenience of the public. We have many instances of that. The Minister of Public Works will not say that when a requisition is made for a post office building or a customs building he consults and acts on the endorsation of the Postmaster General or the Minister of Customs nor does he refer to the post office returns at that point. Otherwise we would not find in the estimates such an outrageous amount as $25,000 for the erection of buildings in places with a postal revenue of $700. But the Minister of Public Works has a peculiar method of getting rid of this enormous expenditure of $100,000,000, a peculiar method of spending the peoples' money. As I understand it is the bounden duty of the minister as a trustee of the people of Canada to spend the money taken from the people of Canada by taxation in the interest of the people of Canada for their purposes and for their services. Does he do that, does he pretend to do that? Instance after instance has been quoted in this House where the hon. gentleman has not done that, I believe that it has been proved to his satisfaction in this House that he has not done it, yet the hon. gentleman makes no comment, he simply persists in that method and in that line of expenditure, flattering himself that in doing that he is winning over the majority of the people of Canada who can be effected in the different ridings by the expenditure of public money. May I ask when the Minister of Public Works took the right to spend government money on private property? When did he become vested with the power, without the consent of the owners or the exercise of the right of eminent domain, to improve another person's private property with the money of this government? My hon. friend possibly knows to what I refer. During the last election he was very busy with his appropriations in the riding of West Algoma for wharfs, &c., doing his best to curry favour by paying out of the peoples' money in order to win the peoples' votes for the government candidate. I do not mind the hon. gentleman adopting that petty and miserable form of bribery in my riding; it suited him and I am sure there was not one vote in that riding which was affected by the expenditures he made in it, but I did resent his action when in fulfilment of a pre-election promise he appropriated $3,000 to alter, repair and generally improve a wharf which the government did not own, in which the government had absolutely no interest, and with respect to which the minister had no correspondence with the owners. This was a direct bid for votes, it was a payment for votes of the peoples' money for a work the profit of which went entirely to the benefit of private individuals. Does my hon. friend deny that? Does he state that the government had any interest in that wharf or in the approaches to it, that the government was ever requested by any one interested in the wharf or the approaches to expend that money upon that private property? No, I tell my hon. friend and he will not deny it that the Liberal candidate during or after the last Dominion election requested the Minister of Public Works to expend $3,000 upon that private property, and, docile in such matters, absolutely careless as to what the conditions are, wilfully ignorant and blinding his eyes to the fact that nobody had requested him to spend money on that private property, having no other reason than that he was asked to do it by the person holding the Liberal patronage in that riding and for the purpose of making, as he thought, a few votes by the expenditure of a few miserable dollars, filched from the chest of the people of Canada. There, Sir, is the grand, broad principle of economic expenditure of the peoples' money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I may be allowed for a moment: I have not the slightest idea of the property to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) refers. If he would be good enough to name the place, I shall make it my duty to inquire into the circumstances. I may say, it is not the policy or practice of the department to spend money on private property.

Mr. BOYCE. I am glad the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) has said that. He says it is not the practice of the department—

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would the hon. gentleman please give a little further information. When was the work done?

Mr. BOYCE. Improvement and repairs. The hon. minister has an item in the estimates for it—$3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no. I understood my hon. friend to make the statement that the work had been done—

Mr. BOYCE. I did not make that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He said the work had been done by the government upon that wharf and wanted to know what warrant there was for spending the public money on private property. I can say to my hon. friend—and he ought to have known it—that, with regard to this wharf, no moneys have been expended upon it; and, knowing that, I think he ought not to have made the statement he made to the House.

Mr. BOYCE. I am in the judgment of the House: What I stated was that the minister had appropriated $3,000 for the purpose of repairs and additions to that wharf, and that he had made that appropriation simply at the request of the defeated Liberal candidate in the last election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will pardon me again: He says that I have made an appropriation. Any appropriation must be consented to by parliament, and, before a single dollar will be expended upon the property the title must be acquired and vested in the Crown.

Mr. BOYCE. I will take the minister upon that statement. He is responsible for the public works. For what purpose does he put $3,000 in the estimates for a wharf in which, according to the language used in this House by myself, the government had absolutely no interest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend not know that before the title to a property can be acquired, parliament must vote the money? Only after that is done are the necessary steps taken to acquire the property. Those steps will be taken, as they always are in such cases, before a single dollar is spent upon the property.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. minister is getting still deeper in the mire. He is on record in this matter, yet apparently he does not know it. He told us in this House that absolutely no negotiations had been entered into for the purpose of acquiring that wharf and that the government had no interest in it. And I have letters from the owners to the effect that they have not been approached by the minister, and, if they were, had no desire whatever to allow the minister to acquire any interest without their permission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will not be approached until parliament votes the money for the purpose.

Mr. BOYCE. For what purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To acquire the property.

Mr. BOYCE. There is no vote for acquiring the property. That is where he has mistaken the proposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman knows what the minister intends better than the minister himself does, all right.

Mr. BOYCE. What the hon. minister proposes to do is to repair and add to property owned by private individuals without consulting those individuals. That is on record in 'Hansard'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No such thing.

Mr. BOYCE. I regret that the hon. minister's recollection of what takes place in his department is so meagre. But I shall take occasion before I resume my seat to put before him his exact words in that connection. It is futile for the hon. minister to try to draw a red herring across the scent. That appropriation speaks for itself and his own language speaks for itself. There is an appropriation to prepare and add to a wharf, and there is his statement that that wharf is private property and that the government never had any interest in it. And here is one of the votes of item 148 of the estimates:

Kensington wharf—additions and repairs, $3,000.

Yesterday, my hon. friend was questioned and gave answer as follows:

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Is the Kensington wharf, near Desbarats, West Algoma, the property of the government of Canada? If so, when was it acquired, how much was paid for it, and from whom was it purchased?
2. How much land was conveyed with the wharf to the government?
3. If the wharf was not purchased by the government, is there any contract in writing between the owner thereof and the government with regard to the use of the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. No.
3. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that entirely correct?

Mr. BOYCE. Yes. There was an earlier question answered by my hon. friend. He stated that there had been no negotiations for the acquisition of that wharf. He stated also that the government engineer had reported, not that it was desirable to purchase the wharf, but that repairs and alterations to the wharf would cost $3,300. And he puts $3,000 in the estimates for repairs and additions to the wharf belonging to private parties who never asked for it, his only reason being, I venture to say, that the person who has the patronage of the riding as defeated Liberal candidate asked to have it put there

for political reasons—to influence votes. And for that reason the minister filched out of the appropriations, $3,000——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call the hon. gentleman to order. I think your ruling would be that he must take back that expression.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the expression 'filched' is unparliamentary.

Mr. BOYCE. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call attention to this further:

Members may discuss various questions on a motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair, without moving any amendments thereto, a great latitude being always allowed on such occasions; but they may not refer specifically to any vote which has passed or is about to be discussed in committee.

If this has been referred to Committee of Supply, it cannot be referred to on this occasion.

Mr. BOYCE. Then, I will leave the Kensington wharf to the tender mercies of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. member is tired of it himself.

Mr. BOYCE. By no means. These are refreshing instances, and I notice that they arise much more frequently during the hon. gentleman's term of administration. Let me refer to another item which assists in making up the expenditure of this country to the splendid total of a hundred millions. I refer to the dredging on the Nipigon river during 1908. That is such a beautiful transaction. In years gone by, there has been a great deal of comment on the method on which dredging contracts were let, especially dredging contracts on the Great Lakes. I do not know any more startling example of contracts being let for political purposes on the eve of an election, and at rates so wholly disproportionate to the value of the work, without advertising, without notice to the persons who receive the contracts, than the Nipigon dredging. I will only refer to it shortly. Just before the election of 1908, without a contract, my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works set the Great Lakes Dredging Company to work dredging out the Nipigon. I say without contract, because the contract was not signed until some time after they had been set to work. There were no advertisements for tenders for that work. My hon. friend, of course, will not deny that. The work was commenced on the 8th of September, 1908; no contract had been signed then. There was $57,459.45 paid between that and December, 1908. The price per cubic yard, scow measurement, of rock was $3, other materials 45 cents. He says:

Q. Were tenders invited for the work?—A. Yes.

Q. If so, how many tenders were received, who was the successful tenderer, and was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?—A. There were no tenders ever invited for this work. There were tenders invited by public advertisement for other work which did not include the Nipigon dredging.

Later on, in answer to a subsequent question, my hon. friend said that after advertisements had been inserted it was noticed that the Nipigon work had been omitted from the advertisement, and he remedied that by sending a private intimation to certain dredging firms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. To all the dredging firms operating on the Great Lakes. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. BOYCE. Quite so. It was intended to include this. These are my hon. friend's words.

It was intended to include the name of Nipigon river in the advertisement calling for tenders for dredging required at Bowmanville, Green Shoals, Jack Fish bay, Leaf, New Castle, Rainy river and Spanish river, which was published in the newspapers between the 3rd and 17th July, 1908 (list of newspapers annexed). But the name was inadvertently omitted, and, as soon as this was discovered, the following letter was sent to—

Giving the names of the firms.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman says that the notice was sent only to certain firms; hadn't he better give the names?

Mr. BOYCE. If my hon. friend will allow me to finish the sentence, I will satisfy him. He says that notices were sent to such and such persons. The House will remember the answer my hon. friend made just now, that the notice was sent to all the firms. But it is a significant fact that no notice was sent to the Great Lakes Dredging Company, and their name is not included in the list of firms to whom notices were sent. But they got the contract just the same, and they got $58,000 paid during the election year, and they got 45 cents per cubic yard for digging out sand from Nipigon harbour, where the same firm only got nine cents in Port Arthur.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They did not got 45 cents per cubic yard, the hon. gentleman is entirely in error. That is 27 times too much.

Mr. BOYCE. For the same stuff in Port Arthur they got nine cents, the same firm, but without any notification, and on the eve of an election; without a contract, because they did not have a contract, they were set to work in such a hurry. They got 45 cents per cubic yard for sand; for other materials the rate in Port Arthur harbour, 9 cents, the same as the same firm got by public advertisement. That is a sample

among many. That firm has been paid now upon that work $107,650.83. That is a very small percentage of the splendid expenditure of $100,000,000 to which the Finance Minister refers—on the Nipigon river work alone, and most of it was paid, a good percentage of it was paid, just during the months in which there was so much need in that wide and sparsely settled country to convince the electors of the purity of the administration and of the progress of the party represented by the hon. member for Thunder bay and Rainy river (Mr. Conmee.)

Now, Sir, I have heard my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works speak with reference to the necessities of a post office in the town of Steelton. I have heard him say in public that it was a necessity, and that it was very strongly urged. It is an important town. The revenue of the postal department and the requirements of the public service demand that such a building be erected. I say to my hon. friend now that he had better employ the public money in the commencement of a public building in Steelton, the town within the corporate limits of which are situated one of the greatest steel industries in Canada, rather than fritter away the money by repairing and altering, and improving other people's property. I give him that slight hint, and I hope he will take it from me in the spirit in which it is given. I also suggest to him that he immediately take some of the money which he is squandering at the extravagant price of 45 cents per cubic yard in Nipigon harbour, paid to the Great Lakes Dredging Company, and build the rest of the post office at Steelton, and so give to the public there the service they stand sorely in need of, as the minister has been made aware of by petition and by deputation, and has substantially acknowledged the justice of the request. We have other examples of the splendid expenditure of $100,000,000, and some of them have been referred to in this House. There is no better example that occurs to me at the moment than the splendid waterway which in future will be a monument to the great progress, at any rate to the great expenditure, of this government, and that is the Newmarket canal. My hon. friend, I quite believe, concurs in the magnificent utility of that work, a work that must make this government a laughing stock to both Liberals and Conservatives alike.

Now, Sir, I desire to refer for a moment to the expenditure on the Militia Department, and I regret that the Minister of Militia is not in his place. An hon. gentleman suggests that he also has gone to the hockey match. But perhaps not. With regard to the Militia Department I have but little to say. The militia of Canada costs us $6,000,000 a year to maintain. About a million dollars a year, in round figures, is expended for the upkeep of agriculture. A comparison is not very much to the credit of this government. There have been criticisms, Mr. Speaker, about the manner in which the Militia Department has been administered, and those who did venture to put their nose into the department and begin to lift lids and turn things up went and wrote down about it that it was top heavy, that there was too much expense at the top, that it was overpaid, and I think there was some suggestion made that there was need for reform. There is certainly need for some reform all along the line. The Minister of Militia was anxious to mimic the English system in regard to the government of that department, but it did not turn out as satisfactorily as he thought it would and the sooner he drops that system and gets down to some practical one, and one which will conduce to the best interests of the country, the better it will be. I speak feelingly upon this subject. I speak with a view to local considerations because it seems to me that it was a mockery that with this expenditure of $100,000,000 a year by the government and an expenditure of $6,000,000 a year for the militia, when the town of Sault Ste. Marie got into dire straits, when men were rioting, turning over street cars and committing disorders of that sort, it could not have the protection of the militia without being called upon to pay dearly for it. The militia was called out, they sent up these gilded gentlemen with their clanking swords and spurs, they paraded through the town, went through their little drills, came back to Ottawa a day or two afterwards and the department sent in a bill for $8,000. This government is now suing the town of Sault Ste. Marie to recover this sum for services that were absolutely required in defence of life and property and in a time of danger and emergency. It seems to be an extraordinary circumstance that the Militia Department can make regulations by which the already heavy burdens of the town of Sault Ste. Marie are made much more grievous by this claim which is made for policing the town in an emergency like that. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that when Canada is maintaining, at an expense of thousands of dollars a year, this Militia Department, a lot of gilded mummery, as far as I can see, disturbances, such as I refer to, cannot be quelled except at a rate per diem or at the rate which the government claim from the town of Sault Ste. Marie, amounting in all to $8,000. What is the use of our paying for a police system if every time the policeman is sent out to discharge his duty there is an extra amount payable while he is at work over that which he is entitled to receive when he is idle? I earnestly hope that there will be some practical reform in this direction,

and that the whole of the department which, from the little experience I have had of it, seems to be greatly in need of reorganization, will be thoroughly investigated and reorganized. I believe that if these reforms are put into practice a better state of things will result.

The districts of northern Ontario from which I and some of my fellow members have the honour to come as representatives in this House, have developed tremendously during past years. As we know, since 1904, the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway has opened up tremendously rich deposits of gold and silver—more silver than gold up to date. The extension of the line has further developed the tremendous clay belt tributary to its junction with the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific now under construction, and it will make a capital channel of communication when that road taps the Transcontinental. I should like to have seen the attitude of this government towards that railway a little more generous than it was. It is a railway that has abundantly given returns for its expense. I certainly think that this government, in view of the splendid purpose that it was to serve in the development of the country, might have given to that road the assistance which it was suggested at one time should be given. The Algoma Central railway, another railway which is projected to Hudson bay, will cross the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway, when it is built across the continent, and the Grand Trunk Pacific and will reach Hudson Bay. The Bruce Mines and Algoma railway is another railway projected to Hudson bay and these two railways, as the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, will run through a country which is rich in mineral and timber. The building and government assistance of these roads are very much to be wished for at an early date. With regard to the Algoma Central railway we have every assurance that within a short time it will be in connection with the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway. This leads me to make the comment that the prosperity of Ontario during the last, say five years, has greatly contributed to the coffers of this Dominion. I never heard hon. gentlemen during the last Ontario election say that the increased revenue of Ontario which flows from the natural resources of the country was due to the wise and economical management of these resources, but on the other hand they declared it to be simply a matter for which Providence was responsible, although they claimed that the growth and development of the resources under the jurisdiction of the Dominion government were due to the economical manner in which they had been administered.

There was a reference in the speech of the Minister of Finance to the steel bounties, and I listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. gentleman had to say. I know something about the history of these bounties as applied to the town of Sault Ste. Marie. I remember being in the town before the bounties were applied and I know something of the history of these industries. The steel works of Sault Ste. Marie are, I believe, second to none in Canada as far as their capacity and equipment are concerned. I believe their output is not the largest in Canada at the present time, although I am not sure about that. I think it is not as great as that of the Dominion Iron and Steel company, although it is growing almost daily under our present conditions. Some hon. gentlemen object very strongly to the paying of bounties to steel and iron industries. The subject, of course, is one upon which there is a great difference of opinion, and I have heard hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House express opinions against bounty-fed industries. But we have practical results up there from these industries and we have practical results from the stimulus given to iron and steel industries all over Canada. As far as I can see, both from theory and the practical results which I have seen, the granting of bounties on iron and steel has not been a detriment to the progress of Canada, but it has been a stimulus to the great iron and steel industries as, I think, the returns, which I propose to refer to presently, will show.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who I am sorry is not in his seat, denounced bounties upon purely theoretical grounds and he quoted some noted political economists in support of his contention. But political economists differ with regard to the bounty system, and where you find that without any drain on the people of Canada a great industry is started up, and prospering, and increasing almost daily under the encouragement of bounties, that is the best practical answer to the theories of the economists. However, I desire to deal with practical things and I shall not discuss theories with the member for Red Deer further than to quote for his information what Professor Marshall says with regard to bounties:

> Principle of economics:—
> It might even be for the advantage of the community that the government should levy taxes on commodities which obey the law of diminishing return, and spend part of the proceeds on bounties to commodities which obey the law of increasing return.

It is an undoubted fact that the steel and iron industries—I speak especially in

regard to the Sault St. Marie industry has been the parent of minor industries; it has caused the increased importation of machinery which gives a large increase to the revenue; it has brought about general prosperity, increased the population and enabled the people to earn more and to buy more. That beneficial condition during the last two or three years is going to be enhanced greatly in the near future. The Algoma Steel Company which is a subsidiary company of the Lake Superior corporation has recently had invested in it a large amount of English capital and it contemplates great and immediate development. A new merchant mill with a capacity of 600 tons per day or more will be erected as also a new blast furnace, a number of open hearth furnaces and a cokeing plant. Six and a quarter million dollars of capital will be invested in that enterprise and that is no small matter to the country at large. The building of a new cokeing plant means that instead of bringing a train load of coke each day from the United States, the coal will be manufactured into coke at Sault Ste. Marie and the by-products, such as gas and tar, will be extracted and utilized, and employment will be given to 3,000 additional men. That work will now be done by Canadians who will utilize the resources of the country, and in future that money will not be sent to a foreign country to pay for the coke. But more than that, it means cheapened cost of the finished product and with an output of from 800 to 1,000 tons of steel rails per day, 50 cents per ton less in the cost of production means a tremendous advance in the industry. The Sault St. Marie company realizes, as I think the country realizes that the day must come when the fostering care of bounties will be withdrawn, but for the present at all events I sincerely trust the Finance Minister will not reverse the policy of the government in granting bounties to the iron and steel industry. This is a critical time in the history of these industries; there are 5,000 or 6,000 people employed directly and indirectly in the enterprise and it is not an industry that can be created in a day. It has had a somewhat chequered career; it has had to contend with serious difficulties at the outset, and I can assure the Minister of Finance that it is only now that the dark cloud is being dispelled and that the company is getting on a solid basis. For the next two or three years that industry will need the stimulus which the bounties give and it is in the interest of all Canada that they should be continued. Let us see how the steel trade of Canada has grown in recent years. I do not want the Minister of Finance to understand that I am giving his government the credit for the great growth that has resulted from the bounties on iron and steel.

Mr. FIELDING. I would never suspect it.

Mr. BOYCE. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am frankly prepared to do him justice and to give him and his government the credit that I believe is due them. In that respect I might mention that the making of coke from soft coal is rendered a great deal cheaper by the draw back included in the tariff of 1907. In 1881 the value of the products of iron and steel was $16,943,321; in 1891, it was $29,874,437; in 1901, $34,878,402; and in 1906, $53,125,265. So that there has been a steady substantial growth in the steel products of Canada, and my hon. friend will see that the growth between 1881 and 1891 was much greater in proportion than the growth between 1891 and 1901.

Then with regard to the average production, according to the tables, each iron and steel worker produced in 1881 on an average $1,237 worth; in 1891, $1,365 worth, an increase of $128 per man; in 1901, $1,409 worth, an increase of $34 per man; and in 1906, the average production per man amounted to $1,752. The bounties paid by the government upon steel alone during 1908 amounted to $1,019,201, and on pig iron to $863,819; and on the manufacture of steel to $347,135. The manufacture of pig iron is in itself a very important industry in this country. It gives employment to a very large number of men and keeps going a large number of subsidiary industries. The Lake Superior corporation is now putting in a plant for the manufacture of pig iron which will, when completed, furnish enough pig iron to carry out its own work without having to import pig iron from any other country or concern. We, therefore, look forward to the day when Canada will supply iron and steel for her own manufactures. There is the Dominion Iron and Steel Company in the east, and there are the Soo industries immediately on the great lines of transportation to the west which find a ready market for their products in the great west. Therefore, I hope that durng this period of transition in which these plants are being strengthened, the government will be lenient, paternal and progressive with regard to these bounties upon steel and iron products.

Before I take my seat I must refer to a matter which is possibly the most important that has ever come before the Canadian people. I refer to that paragraph in the speech from the Throne regarding Canadian naval service. When the fathers of confederation met within these walls to lay the charter of this great commonwealth, there were many misgivings expressed as to the outcome of confederation. My hon.

friend the Minister of Finance had very great misgivings. They were so acute that he moved a resolution in Nova Scotia in 1884 asking that that province be taken out of the union and made into an independent province. One hon. gentleman in 1867 spoke with much trepidation about the defenseless condition of the country. He wanted to know how it was going to be protected against foes by land and sea, and he pointed to the large extent of border that lay exposed to an attack from the country to the south of us and the immense coast line on the west, east and north absolutely undefended. Other hon. gentlemen, but to a lesser extent, expressed their apprehensions on this point, but there was an hon. gentleman on the government side in those days. Dr. Tupper, now Sir Charles Tupper, who gave a quiet, calm and dignified reply, to the effect that when this country was confederated it would not lose its status as an important colony of the British realm, it would not be divested of its allegiance to England, but would stand for everything British and imperial, and in time of danger England would protect this country as she had always done and we had nothing whatever to fear. That was England's guarantee at that time. England stood by Canada in the days of her youth when Canada could not protect and provide for herself. We have since had occasion to face difficulties and crises, and on every occasion Canadians have emphasized their desire to stand by the mother country, have burned with indignation when she was insulted, have mourned with her when she mourned, and fought with her when she was attacked.

That has been the sentiment of Canada's sons, that has been the sentiment that dominates Canada. Canada from ocean to ocean from south to north, is exclusively and exceedingly loyal and nothing that Canada can do to cement the ties that bind her to the mother country, will, in my opinion, be left undone if the Canadian people are allowed to have their say. There has recently arisen an alarming condition in respect to war against England. We have not simply idle rumours, we do not bring to this House merely the talk of the man on the street, we are face to face with what we are told by the greatest authorities on that subject in the empire, and the British people have been warned by these authorities, that the day is not far distant—some one suggested twenty years, and Lord Roberts' reply was twenty months—when you will find a directly hostile attempt to question England's supremacy of the seas. Other statesmen have spoken on the same question and given the same warning. I notice that an American magazine recently sent to a writer to Germany to make a personal and critical examination of the conditions in Germany, to ascertain whether the rumours with regard to the preparations there and her intention with regard to British supremacy had any foundation. The report made and published in the magazine was by no means re-assuring to the people of Great Britain. It was shown that Germany was, to the limit of her resources, building vessels of the highest class of efficiency whose only use could be that they should be placed in commission in the German ocean and the North sea to challenge England's supremacy in that sea. I do not wish to refer to the subject matter of the Bill now before the House, but the question is what is Canada going to do in this matter? The Prime Minister proposed a policy of a Canadian naval service which will mean the gradual education of men for the navy, their enlistment and training so that they can take their place on the ships which it is the policy of the right hon. gentleman to build. His reply to the call from the other side is that we shall start now to build a training school and gradually work up so that in fifteen or twenty years we will be in a position to meet the crisis which threatens us in twenty months. The right hon. gentleman's policy further is that Canada shall in the future build war vessels to defend our coasts; but when you contrast the class of vessel which the right hon. gentleman announces this government will construct with the vessels of foreign nations, you are struck by the fact that not only can these vessels not be put into commission in time to meet any such emergency as we are told is threatened, but when it is put in commission, it will not be useful at all as a fighting or defensive factor, because all of the proposed vessels together will not have power enough to meet one vessel of the type which the German empire are building as rapidly as they can. I feel very keenly the necessity of Canada at once doing something to emphasize her position in this matter. The position of the leader of the House is not an answer to the situation, there is no answer to the call for arms, no answer to the threat of danger, no answer to the threatened attack on England's supremacy of the seas in the proposal to establish a Canadian naval service. It is not a question of what the right hon. gentleman proposes to do—fifteen or twenty years from now—to defend the empire and cement the ties that bind us to the mother country; it is not to emphasize our allegiance fifteen years from now that the people of Canada are crying out. What the people of Canada want is to demonstrate here and now that Canada amongst the foremost nations of the earth, Canada in all her pristine strength, with her magnificent resources behind her, with her splendid expenditure of $100,000,000 of which the Finance Minister so proudly speaks, is able to do, must do, and will cheerfully do her

part now and to-day, in carrying out a patriotic policy and in contributing to the defence of the empire according to her resources and according to the need of the British empire.

Where was Canada when these rumours were brought last year? The Australian parliament met the situation by contributing a 'Dreadnought.' The New Zealand parliament met and they cabled over the desire of that people to place at the disposal of the British government a 'Dreadnought' and if one 'Dreadnought' was not enough, they would contribute two. Little New Zealand, plucky little New Zealand, with not one-tenth the population, not one-twelfth, or one-twentieth the strength and the abounding prosperity that Canada enjoys—but while Australia and New Zealand, were cabling, Canada was silent. She had not a proposal to make. What was the Prime Minister doing then, what was he thinking of? He did not initiate any proposal. Any proposal to provide means to meet the emergency had to come from His Majesty's loyal opposition in the form of a motion by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The right hon. gentleman did nothing, he sat silent, he was carrying out exactly the policy he had laid down in 1907 at the Imperial Conference when he refused point blank to join in the contributions for naval defence.

It is said that history repeats itself. As I have said, it was not because the prime minister was anxious about it that action was taken. His hand was forced. That reminds one of the condition of things a decade ago, when England was face to face with a war with the South African republic, and the right hon. gentleman, then in office, and having the power to send our boys to the front to do their duty as part and parcel of the empire. His answer first was: 'Not a man, not a gun.' He was telegraphed to by Sir Charles Tupper, then the leader of the opposition, and strongly urged to send out a contingent or even two contingents. His hand was forced on that occasion. Popular opinion ran so strongly against his own professions and his own expressed disinclination that he had to give way to the feeling which swept Canada from end to end. And Canadians went and fought, and some of them died—died to the glory of Canada and to the cementing of the British empire. In 1909, there was another resolution, and again he took hold of it and favoured its adoption. But it looks as if he thought that when that resolution was passed it was as good as fifty Dreadnoughts. For nothing more was done; there was silence until the correspondence began to come from the Colonial Office. Not in consequence of anything that Canada has done, but in consequence of the telegrams that went in from Australia and New Zealand offering immediate assistance, the Colonial Secretary got into communication with Canada and invited this country to join in a conference on the best method to provide a contribution by the colonies to imperial defence. Our delegates, the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) attended that conference. I have read the reports of their doings there, and I must confess to some considerable disappointment at the attitude they assumed. When the representatives of two lesser among the important parts of the empire, Australia and New Zealand, were willing and anxious to afford immediate effective assistance at the cost of millions, the Canadian representatives offered nothing at that time, nor until Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty, brought down a memorandum based upon the views that had been given by the colonial delegates as to what they thought would be proper. In these proposals—and I commend the correspondence to the reading of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as being very interesting—you will see that what the admiralty suggested was a fleet unit from the colonies. What reply did they get, what comfort, what assurance, from the ministers who represented Canada? They got practically the question how much could be got in the way of a fleet that would cost £600,000 a year to maintain—not how much they could give but how little they could give and satisfy the suggestions made by the admiralty. The admiralty made a suggestion of a fleet unit, the most important part, the actual fighting force, of which is the Dreadnought. Our friends asked how much it would cost leaving out the Dreadnought, the part that will do the fighting, that will strike terror into our foes and will satisfy the people of the earth that Canada is doing her part and can build Dreadnoughts as Germany can. And now we have the proposition in the Bill to build vessels that will take considerable time, vessels of the Boadicea type, of the Bristol type, and destroyers and torpedoes. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they are going in to the fighting business, going to establish a Canadian naval service, whether they think that the people of Canada will be satisfied with that, if their proposals will be sufficient if—which God forbid—the time of need should come? I say no. These proposals which the right hon. the Prime Minister makes are not satisfactory to the people of Canada either in one way or in the other. They may be satisfactory to the right hon. the Prime Minister because they do so little—they promise a great deal, but they carry into effect so very little. We had a right to expect that, when the Bill

was brought down, the hon. gentleman would face the question as it ought to be faced, in a broad, fearless and practical manner. I reserve a criticism of the details of the Bill until the Bill itself is under discussion, and apply my remarks merely to the inactivity and evident reluctance with which the right hon. Prime Minister deals with this question. He seems to be afraid of the subject; he seems to think, notwithstanding its urgency, notwithstanding its world-wide importance, notwithstanding that the credit and the prestige of Canada is at stake, that this is a question that ought to be allowed to simmer, ought to be delayed. I should like to see the Prime Minister meet this situation in a firm manner, and meet it now and here. He is all-powerful at the present time, and if he thinks it in the interest of Canada that there should be a Canadian navy of the type which his proposals involve let him go on and build it. If he thinks the government are behind him, and the people behind the government, all he can do is to go ahead—provided the people of Canada approve. Before he goes that far it is his positive duty to ask the sanction of the people of Canada to the policy he proposes. With regard to that, he has no mandate.

He had no mandate when there was a crisis in 1889, but the contingents were sent. Is there any disposition on the part of the right hon. gentleman to-day to meet this crisis, and to ask parliament to vote an amount which will be necessary to save the honour of Canada? What are his proposals to that end? His proposals for Canadian aid certainly do not go far enough; in the opinion of some they go a great deal too far, as being an experiment in a Canadian fleet altogether too expensive. But the right hon. gentleman is not always so dilatory in bringing forward great measures, he is not always content to let them wait. It depends upon the political results which are likely to flow from any particular measure he is bringing forward. We all remember when he was introducing his Bill for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. That was a measure of great importance and naturally every one was listening to what he had to say. But I say there is no comparison between the importance of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, great as it is, and the importance of Canada maintaining her prestige before the whole world as the chief factor in the British empire. This is a time when, if rumour be true, my right hon. friend cannot afford to wait in order to provide for an emergency which is likely to arise. I say that if the right hon. gentleman will listen to the statements of those across the sea in whom he has confidence, there is already, within the meaning of the Military Act, an emergency sufficient to require him to act with promptitude, instead of laying plans which cannot become effective for at least fifteen years from now. When my right hon. friend was introducing that Bill for construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, he was afraid of losing time, he was afraid that some one else might get an advantage with regard to the trade of Canada —that trade Canada, not the patriotism of Canada, not the strength of Canada, not the loyalty of Canada, but the trade of Canada. This is what he said in this House:

> To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow, to those who tell us, wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No. This is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flow of the tide is upon us that leads us to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass, the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait.

The right hon. gentleman proceeds:

> Such is our duty, it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour, and of this minute. Heaven grant that it may not be already too late.

I commend to my right hon. friend his eloquent words upon that Bill, and under these circumstances, I commend them to him with regard to the present situation, with regard to the call upon Canada to do her duty as the principal factor in the British empire. I say it would be a gratifying sound indeed if my right hon. friend would repeat those words in this House, in the present emergency when Britain's supremacy on the seas is menaced by a foreign power. I regret to say that my right hon. friend has always seemed to be reluctant in matters of this kind, and that his present attitude is merely consonant with his past. As far back as 1891, when my right hon. friend, then leader of the opposition, was smarting under defeat upon the question of reciprocity with the United States of America, he spoke in no uncertain sound with regard to the position Canada ought to take before the mother country. It will be remembered that during the election of 1891, the right hon. gentleman, then leader of the opposition, stumped this country in favour of closer relations with the United States, of unrestricted reciprocity, of commercial union, or at any rate a reciprocity treaty, a policy which would bring us much closer to the United States, and which, the general opinion was, would lead to annexation. At that time the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was leader of the government and in a speech in Massey hall, Toronto, he made a very effectual and conclusive answer to the campaign that my right

hon. friend and his party were making. On that occasion Sir John A. Macdonald concluded his eloquent speech by the memorable words: 'A British subject I was born and a British subject I will die.' My right hon. friend, as leader of the opposition, came into this House, and in the debate on the address delivered himself in the words that I will quote, and I commend them to him in the light of some of his recent utterances:

Sir, I am free to admit, that I, for one, when I made up my mind in favour of this policy, looked up first and last to the interest of Canada, and not to the interest of England. I am a British subject and I never forgot it yet, but while I am a British subject I remember that I am also a Canadian and I sit in the Canadian parliament. Let the British subject who sits in the British parliament look after the interests of England. When this confederation was organized (and no one knows it better than the right honourable gentleman himself) it was organized with a view of forming a nation of this United Canada. The honourable gentleman must have foreseen, since this was to be a nation, that some day or other the interest of this young nation would come in conflict with the interest of the motherland.

The hon. gentleman further proceeds:

It is absurd to suppose that, situated as we are, the interest of Canada will always be identical with the interest of Great Britain. Some day must come when these interests will clash.

Well, Sir, I sincerely hope that the day has not come when, in the opinion of the right hon. gentleman, the interests of Canada clash with the interests of Great Britain upon so great, so vital a question as the protection of the empire. I cannot believe that the right hon. gentleman would yield to the application of any one of these sentences to the present crisis. But why does he not meet the situation, why does he not do something to satisfy the people of Canada that he is at least as ready as New Zealand and Australia, very much weaker parts of the British empire, to help the mother country? I do not wish to suggest that the right hon. gentleman is desirous of serving the exigencies of party politics. I sincerely hope that the right hon. gentleman will free himself from all those bans and stand free and broad and all powerful as representing the free Canada that is behind him on this subject. If he will only speak and speak now and express the same willingness that other less powerful colonies have done to do their part I am sure that he will not lack in that applause from the people of Canada which he loves so much to hear. On the general ground and having regard to the general scheme, I do not like the proposition that the right hon. gentleman makes at this juncture in regard to the creation and organization of a Canadian navy service. I do not like it. I do not think that it will redound to the credit of Canada. I do not think it is an answer to the question that Canada is called upon to answer I think, and I say it with much respect, that the right hon. gentleman is evading that question and I hope he will recover from his indisposition to speak and that he will speak to the issue and speak freely and clearly. This proposition will not raise Canada's reputation in the eyes of the world. It will not give to Britain's foes that greater respect which otherwise they would have had if Canada had taken, or if she would now take, a different stand. It will not strengthen the loyalty of Canada's sons, it will not strengthen the ties which bind us to the motherland, but there is the crying danger that it will serve political expediency and that it will shelve a very difficult question and one which the right hon. gentleman in times past has shown reluctance to face. It will satisfy some wavering followers who do not like to touch questions such as this and who would be better satisfied by a policy of masterly inactivity rather than by a policy of instant activity. It will provide in its working out a great many public works in constituencies where they will be most useful and it will provide for patronage and all the other public evils from which this country has suffered under this administration. These are greater questions even than the question of supply and demand, than the question of revenue and expenditure, than the question of an expenditure which has reached the hundred million dollar mark. This is a question as to what is going to be done, a question of the duty of the moment, a question of whether Canada is going to face that duty, or whether Canada is not going to face it and it is not a question that the people, to whom this government has to answer, will allow the government to drop whenever they have an opportunity of passing upon that subject. In 1908 there was a brilliant spectacle in the old city of Quebec, the tercentenary, marking a very important epoch in our history and one in which we all gladly joined. The Prince of Wales as the heir apparent of the British Throne, was there, it was a brilliant assemblage, it was a magnificent scene and a splendid page of history was written for Canada. But of what avail was all that display of loyalty? Of what avail were all those professions at that time, when after the tumult and shouting die, when the captains and kings have departed and when we are face to face, as it were, with wars and rumours of wars, there is absolutely nothing done or nothing suggested that should be done to meet the emergency which may be imminent, or which, as I fervently hope and pray, may be far off.

Is it not enough that it is threatened, is it not enough that it has been the subject of grave fears and alarm in England? Is it not enough that the people of this country are satisfied that something should be done? I cannot help but refer to a speech that was made in this House very recently by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) which contains a very remarkable paragraph upon this very question. The hon. gentleman does not give to the House any information as to his own views upon this subject. He is content with hurling criticisms and snarling at the position of the opposition in regard to it and hoping that the position of the opposition will be as he prognosticates. He says:

I have good reason to fear that the opposition are preparing to raise prejudices in the province of Quebec against this government, and more particularly against its leader, in the coming election, on this very question of naval defence. The Liberal administration and its faithful supporters will be charged with having been traitors to the interests of Canada at large, and particularly with having betrayed the interests of the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. On the other hand, I perceive the argument they will use in some of the other provinces. They will contend that the present government have not gone far enough in their policy of naval defence, and that because the government has not adopted a policy directly opposed to the wishes of the Conservative party in Quebec, it should be driven out of power as unworthy of the confidence of the Canadian electorate.

What does that mean? It means that my hon. friend is constituting himself a prophet and that he is himself raising the ground work for a quarrel that I am constrained to believe he dearly wishes would come along so as to enable him to protect himself and to give argument for the position which possibly he will desire to take later on. I desire to express the hope that the inactivity upon this question of the Prime Minister will not satisfy the Canadian people and will not satisfy the world. I will quote from a poem which has recently been placed in my hands upon the question of a Canadian navy which appears to contain some truth with reference to the situation as it is before the public to-day. I quote this, not because I think this House is fond or hearing poetry, but as an indication of what the Canadian people are feeling and expressing upon this question of instant and immediate assistance being rendered and being effective and ready in case of the emergency with which we have been threatened.

O, for a Man! to stand for us within our Council Hall,
With good red blood in heart and veins—and answer England's call!
To cut the Party questions from This Question all should feel,
And sever Truth from Falsehood with the sweep of polished steel:
Nor prate of 'Finished work at Home,' as though our goal were won!
(Thus should be keep our house, nor leave the wider work undone.)
No Opportunist! but a Man! to give—and Now—To-day!
To meet the danger as it comes, and hold the Ocean Way!
Pour out the millions—Not a Gift—part Payment that we Owe!
Then, build the true Canadian fleet with healthy growth and slow.
Yea! build the linked navies up—in concert—One to be!
To hold that Vital Cord of Life—the Empire of the Sea!

Sir, there is a sentiment in that verse which demonstrates the growing sentiment and perhaps the dominating sentiment of the people of Canada. I gladly place it on record because I feel it contains much with which the people of Canada are strongly in sympathy. I believe, Sir, that Canada will stand firm to the empire. I believe, Sir, the day will never come when the Canadian people will shrink from doing their duty towards the empire. In all her strength and in all her pristine magnificence Canada can do much, and Canadian prestige can do much to stop this war of construction. If Canada as the right hand of England, if Canadians as the sons of England were to come forward and say: We are heart and soul with the motherland in this crisis and a challenge of her supremacy of the sea is a challenge to Canada, what a powerful effect that would have upon the situation. Canada's sons are ready to-day as they always have been ready to answer to the call of the empire, if call there should be, which God forbid, I tell you Sir, that if that crisis ever arises there will be no room for questions of diplomacy, for sunny smiles, for sympathetic words, for motives of political expediency to hold the Canadian people from doing their duty and their full duty and their instant duty to rush to the assistance of the motherland. Only by that magnificent sympathy and only by that great prestige shall the British empire maintain herself and expand and progress with Canada in the front rank; Canada with all her resources, in all her magnificence, in all her wealth; Canada increasing year by year in population and resources, Canada the most important factor in the British empire, in her strength, in her power and in her ability to serve and fight for the empire, demonstrating the truth of the words:

Wider still and wider shall thy bounds be set,
God, who made thee mighty, make thee mightier yet.

Mr. J. G. TURIFF (Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate, it is not my intention to take up at any length of the time of the House. I shall deal particularly with the question of the adverse balance of trade which our friends on the other side have had so much to say about in the debate. But before entering on that subject let me refer to some of the criticisms which have been offered on the naval policy of the government, not only by the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) but by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) who I am sorry is not present tonight. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) made the statement that it was proposed to spend the miserable pittance of something like $2,700,000 a year on the navy Had he listened attentively to the speech of the Prime Minister he would have known that it is proposed during the next two or three years to build a unit which if built in England will cost $11,000,000 and if built in Canada 33 per cent more or $15,000,000 and which will cost about $3,000,000 for its upkeep on the English basis, and possibly $5,000,000 a year in Canada. There is an expenditure of $15,000,000 to start with and an additional expenditure of $5,000,000 a year, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) says that the government proposes only spending $2,700,000 on the navy. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) also told us that he was ashamed to acknowledge that he was a Canadian, and he said that we were sponging on the mother country and would likely sponge on her as long as she would allow us. Well Sir, I am sorry to think that any Canadian is ashamed to call himself a Canadian. We on this side of the House are proud to call ourselves Canadians and we stand as one man for the proposal of the right hon. the Prime Minister in connection with the Canadian navy. Every man on this side of the house bar none, is heartily in favour of the proposition made by our right hon. leader. Can the gentlemen on the other side of the House say as much? No. If the member from Qu'Appelle has anything to be ashamed of at all he should be ashamed of belonging to a party that does not know where it stands on this question. The leader of the opposition is the only man on that side of the House who has taken a pretty decent course on this question and he has supported the resolution which was passed last year and is doing his best to stand by it, but his followers will not stay by him. The other day we had the spectacle of the leader of the opposition making one proposition and then his lieutenant getting up and making a proposition diametrically opposite, and then a supporter from Nova Scotia getting up and making a third proposition.

Mr. BOYCE.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr Lake) would have us believe that the party opposite are ready to do ever so much for the empire. Let me remind him that his party were in power prior to 1896, and I defy him to point to anything they ever did on behalf of British connection or any assistance they ever rendered the British government in any British war. Did they ever organize and pay a contingent to go over and fight the battles of the empire? No, it remained for this government to do everything practically that has been done to better the conditions between Canada and England and strengthen the connection between the two. Who was it sent over the first contingent? It was this government. Who was it that relieved the British taxpayer from the expense of keeping up the forts of Halifax and Esquimalt? Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in office prior to 1896, had the opportunity of doing the same thing. Did they ever suggest anything of the kind? Never. Who gave a preference to British goods in the Canadian market? It was the Liberal party. Who now comes forward with a proposition to spend millions of dollars on the building of a navy and its maintenance? It is this government. Therefore, it comes with very bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite to make the criticisms they have made and such as we have had from the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Boyce). He took up some two hours and a half repeating for the most part the speech he has already made every session during the past four or five years. He criticised in a general way the expenditure of the Finance Minister, but when the expenditure in his own constituency was in question, he came forward with a whine and asked that it be continued and that millions of dollars a year should still be paid out as bounties on iron and steel. I cannot agree with him. I do not propose to discuss what good has been accomplished by the $15,000,000 or $18,000,000 we have paid out in bounties on the production of iron and steel. I listened with great attention to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance when he referred to that question in his budget speech, and I trust that these bounties have had the good effect he says they have had, but taking that for granted, these establishments are now in a very flourishing condition, they are making a great deal of money, their stocks are above par, and their watered stock, which represents nothing at all, is selling at a market value of tens of millions of dollars. In the face of that condition, I trust the Minister of Finance will turn a deaf ear to the hon. member from East Algoma who asked that these bounties be continued. There is this further to be said. If these bounties were being used for the development of Cana-

dian mines and ores, they would not be so objectionable, but for one ton of Canadian ore that is smelted, there are many tons of foreign ore. Practically the whole output comes from foreign ores, so that we are paying millions of dollars for developing mines in foreign countries. The time has come when we ought to cease paying those bounties and let those industries look after themselves, which they are now well able to do.

I wish particularly to make reference to the adverse balance of trade we have heard so much about. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was not quite honest with the House and the country when he tried to blame the government because we bought so much more goods from the United States than we sold them. But if the policy of the government be wrong, it would be a very easy matter to rectify it by taking all these articles from the free list and putting them on the dutiable list. When the Fielding tariff was introduced in 1897, some 75 or 80 items were taken from the dutiable and put on the free list. If we put these back on the dutiable list, and charge them a heavy duty, we would stop a great deal of the importation from the United States which goes to swell the adverse balance of trade which my hon. friend spoke so much about. Well, I have taken the trouble to pick out the different items of the free list which we buy in the United States, and I invite the hon. member for North Toronto or any hon. member to make a motion to put any one of these items back on the dutiable list. Not one of them would dare to do so because, if he did, his supporters would not back him up; or if they did in this House, the supporters of the party in the country certainly would not. Almost every one of these items is required for the farmer, the fisherman or the manufacturer. They are nearly all for the benefit of the manufacturer and incidentally for the benefit of every consumer in the Dominion. The first item on the list is live animals. That is admited free for the improvement of the stock. Then there is the item of settlers' effects, would any one suggest putting them on the dutiable list? The next item is asphaltum, of which there is none in Canada. Would you suggest making every one who wants to use it pay a tax when it is not produced in Canada? Another item is books. What are those books? They are principally educational books, bibles, prayer books and books for the blind. Would any one suggest putting a tax on these? Another item which amounts to nearly $4,000,000 is corn. That is used altogether by the farmers for feed and was made free for their special benefit. No one would suggest a heavy duty on the importation of corn for the feed of animals. Another item that runs up to $15,000,000 is anthracite coal. That comes in free of duty. That comes into Canada from the United States free of duty. We do not mine anthracite coal in Canada to any extent, the only place I know of where it is mined being near Banff. There only a small amount is mined and it is shipped for only a short distance in that western country. Would any one suggest that we should prevent the importation of anthracite coal? There is scarcely a man in the House who does not use it, our people must have it, and placing a duty on it would not stop the importation but simply cause the people of Canada to pay twice what they are now paying for it.

Mr. BLAIN. Is anthracite coal any cheaper in Canada since the duty was removed?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, anthracite coal is cheaper in Canada by just the amount of the duty. If the duty was on it to-day it would be just that much dearer than it is. Another large item is cordage. That is used altogether for binding twine, for the farmers and fishermen. Cotton is another heavy item running up to $7,000,000. Would any one suggest that raw cotton be put on the dutiable list? No one would suggest such a thing. It is for the manufacturers and helping the manufacturer it incidentally helps every one, because there is no one who does not consume cotton to a certain extent. Drugs represent $5,000,000. Those are for the manufacturers altogether. Fertilizers, various articles for the fishermen, such as nets, flax, hemp and jute for the manufacture run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. Then we have green and ripe fruit coming into the country, $3,500,000. While there is fruit grown in Canada this comes in at a time when Canadian fruit is not ripe. In the western country we get carload after carload of that fruit, every little town brings in ripe and green fruits by the carload and to suggest putting on a duty would be absurd. Furs represent $2,000,000. Grasses, fibres and straws for manufactures represent $1,500,000. Rubber not produced in Canada, $2,500,000; hides, $1,500,000; iron, steel, &c., that is manufactured Swedish iron, wrought for horse shoe nails, represents nearly $5,000,000.

Will any hon. gentleman opposite suggest that these articles should be put on the dutiable list? If they cannot suggest that why should they complain all the time that the tariff of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is not in the interest of this country and that we should not buy such an amount of goods from the United States when here on this list I have named of free goods there is over $85,000,000 and they go to make up practically what is called the adverse balance of trade. Not one hon member opposite would move that any o'

these items should be put on the dutiable list.

Oils come in free to the extent of about $2,000,000. Optical and mathematical instruments, paints and colours, plants and trees, resin, rennet, salt for the fishermen, seed bulbs all come in free and settlers' effects represent $5,761,000. This is not money that these settlers bring in but simply the goods they bring in. Would any one suggest that these items should be put on the dutiable list? I do not think so. We are spending money every year bringing in settlers. We are bringing in hundreds of thousands and naturally they bring in their effects. These go to swell the amount of goods we buy from the United States, but it does not show that the condition is not a good condition, that the tariff is not a good tariff and in the interest of the country. The very fact that gentlemen opposite would not move to change any one of these items, is, I think, proof conclusive that the items are in their proper place on the free list, and when we buy more goods from the United States than we sell to them it is because it pays us to do so and because we cannot get the goods as cheaply or as satisfactorily in any other place.

Raw silk for manufacturers, mill stones, turpentine, wood and manufactured wood come in free to the extent of $6,000,000. That affects us very much in the west. We import a great deal of lumber from the United States and all rough lumber comes in free of duty. No one in that part of the country would think of reimposing the duty on lumber simply because lumber is a necessity for the settlers and the cheaper we can get it into that part of the country the better. So I think the criticism levelled against the tariff is not a fair or reasonable criticism, and, as I said before, I do not believe that even the men who make the criticism think that it is right; it is made only and altogether for political purposes.

My hon. friends from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) and Lisgar (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) dealt to a limited extent with the Hudson bay railway. Their criticism was that the road was not being built fast enough. I may say to my hon. friends that they need not worry at all, that road is going to be built. The Prime Minister has stated that the road was going to be built and I would ask my hon. friends to point to a single instance where the present Prime Minister has stated that the government were going to undertake and carry out a great public work, in which they have not done so. He never makes a promise that he does not carry out. The criticism has been that it is taking too long, that this promise was made in 1908. I am as anxious as any member in this House to see that railway built, and built as early as possible. I believe that

railway will be a success, that the Hudson bay route will be a success, but it is not absolutely certain. I am free to admit that there is a certain amount of experiment about it, and if ever there was a case where a government was justified in taking every possible means, every measure it can, to get full information about a route, to get the road built in the proper place, and to have the terminals at the proper place, it is in connection with this Hudson bay road.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE. Have the government tried to find out anything in connection with this road?

Mr. TURRIFF. Yes, I am pleased to be able to answer my hon. friend that the government have been hard at work for the last year and a half finding out the best possible route to Hudson bay, ascertaining the best place to end the road, whether at Fort Churchill or Fort York. It is a matter of great importance to this country to ascertain where the road should go. They have surveyed both routes, and during the past summer they were engaged in finding out whether the harbour at Fort York would be as good a harbour as that at Fort Churchill. If the harbour at Fort York is a good and satisfactory port it would be shorter and would save millions of dollars.

I do not think there is going to be any delay by taking the proper precautions in the first place. A great deal of money may be saved in this way—the spending of $100,000 in the making of proper surveys may be the means of saving millions upon millions. We do not want to be in the same position as the Canadian Pacific railway is in to-day—for that company is spending $10,000,000 every year to change their route. Why, because, in the first place—and I am not throwing any blame on them now—the survey evidently was made hurriedly and not enough time, care or money was expended upon it. Had this mistake been avoided, millions of dollars would have been saved to-day. So, the government, I say, is amply justified in being careful to get full and absolute information. I do not believe for a moment that the right hon. Prime Minister or the government have any intention of delaying the building of that road. Why, even if the Hudson Bay route should not turn out to be as successful as we all hope it will, the road will pay for itself practically as a colonization road. I think we can all be proud of the fact that until you get away up into the polar regions there is no part of Canada in which you can build a road but it will make a traffic for itself. We have that proven by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway which extends from North Bay northward to connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The building of the Grand Trunk Pacific through Ontario and

Quebec will have this result that you will have a new Quebec and a new Ontario that, in the years to come, will rival the older settled portions of these provinces. The same thing applies to the Hudson Bay railway. You talk about sixteen millions of acres of clay land in the province of Ontario—and remember that sixteen million acres is a whole lot of land. Right on the line of the Hudson Bay road towards either Fort Churchill or Fort York, the road will go through a clay belt greater in extent than all the land in cultivation to-day in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta put together, which lands to-day are producing over 200,000,000 bushels of grain. There is a great extent of good land away north of Lake Winnipeg and on to Hudson bay. So, I say, the government is doing well in this matter, and hon. members opposite need not be a bit worried. That road is going to be built, and built as quickly as the government can find the proper place to build it. We shall soon know whether it is to be the great success we all hope it will be. I have no doubt about the matter, and I think that there can be very little doubt in the minds of any, of the ultimate success not only of the road but of the route. The road will afford us a much shorter route to the old country, it will afford us a better market and it will regulate freight rates. And so it will be a benefit not only to the west but to the eastern country as well. I am not going to take up more time. I congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on his budget speech, but I think it is even more to the point to congratulate the country on having a Minister of Finance who is able to give such budget statements as the hon. gentleman has been giving us for the last thirteen years. And I say, long may he be spared to Canada to give just such satisfactory budget speeches as he delivered to the House the other day.

On motion of Mr. Wilcox the debate was adjourned.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 19, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) respecting immigration. He said: This Bill, in amendment of the Act which was passed in 1906, is made necessary principally because of changes of condition that have occurred since that time. While the principles of the Act of 1906 are not altered by this Bill, the law is amended in its method of operation to meet the necessity of adopting active exclusion provisions along the international boundary. When the Act of 1906 was introduced, it was framed with a view of dealing with immigrants from overseas. Although it applied to immigrants from across the line, it was especially framed to meet the other conditions. Now, it has become necessary to make similar provision for the exclusion of undesirables along the three thousand miles of frontier between Canada and the United States that we formerly had carried out at the ocean ports. And, as the Act was drawn with a view to applying to the ocean ports, it is necessary that it should be amended in its definitions and operation so as to clearly and definitely provide for the exclusion of undesirables who arrive in Canada by rail or by road. There has also arisen, since the passage of the Act of 1906, the question of Asiatic immigration. And while in that respect the Act does not require much change, still it has been thought advisable to provide for effectively dealing with that class of immigration, not so much by the introduction of a new principle but to provide specific means for the enforcement of the existing principle. This Bill also provides for relieving the situation as it at present exists in which the government has to exercise an arbitrary authority in the exclusion of immigrants. This Bill provides that, under certain circumstances, a board of inquiry shall sit and decide on the merits of the cases brought before it, a record of each case being kept. When the existing law was introduced, it was not expected that there would be such an extensive enforcement of the exclusion provisions, and practically there was no machinery provided—authority was given and under that authority an order issued. This is felt to be an arbitrary method for this country, so it is deemed advisable that machinery should be provided for dealing with these cases, each case to be on record so that its merits may be understood by the public. While that provision is proposed, there is another which I place before the House now as being important. While we provide for a board of inquiry for the consideration of cases of proposed rejection at our ports or at the boundary line, we also make provision that, until an immigrant has been received into Canada—that is to say until he has passed our officers—he is not able to avail him-

self of the protection of the courts. In other words, until a man has actually and legally entered Canada, he is not entitled to claim the protection of the courts of Canada. I state this provision of the Bill clearly and thus early in the proceedings, that its merits—or demerits—may be understood and every opportunity afforded for discussion. If it does not meet with the approval of the House, of course the Bill can be amended in that particular.

Mr. HUGHES. That is, if an immigrant is stopped by one of our immigration officers at the border before entering Canada—

Mr. OLIVER. He would not have the right to appeal to the courts, but once he passes he is entitled to appeal to the courts. We believe that that is a reasonable and proper provision, and necessary for the better enforcement of the Act. So, while we are making provision on the one hand for a method of inquiry into each case, on the other hand we do not admit the immigrant to the protection of the courts until he has passed that inquiry.

Mr. HUGHES. And who will bear the cost of the appeal to the courts? The immigrant himself?

Mr. OLIVER. Provision is made in the ordinary way that if an immigrant appeals to the court he puts up a certain amount for expense, and if the appeal is successful any unexpended balance is returned to him.

Mr. MAGRATH. Is this the same Bill that was introduced last session?

Mr. OLIVER. To all intents and purposes the same. The provision of which I have just spoken was contained in the Bill of last year. In the interval we have taken advantage of the information gathered, and, we think, have made improvements in the wording of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act. He said: This Bill, if it becomes law, will repeal sections 4 and 5 of chap. 115 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. Let me read these two sections, after which I will state to the House what the changes are which are made by the substitution of the proposed new sections:

4. No bridge, boom, dam or aboiteau shall be constructed so as to interfere with navigation, unless the site thereof has been approved by the Governor in Council, nor unless such bridge, boom, dam or aboiteau is built and maintained in accordance with plans approved by the Governor in Council.

5. Any bridge to which this part applies, which is built upon a site not approved by the Governor in Council, or which is not built in accordance with plans so approved, or which, having been so built, is not maintained in accordance with such plans, may, in so far as the same interferes with navigation, be lawfully removed and destroyed under the authority of the Governor in Council.

It will be seen that section 4 makes provision for bridges, dams, booms, and aboiteau. It is a curious thing that it makes no provision for wharfs or other structures of that nature which might be erected in a navigable water although, by section 2, a work under this chapter is defined to include any bridge, boom, aboiteau, dock, pier, or other structure and the approaches or other works necessary appurtenant thereto. In the drawing of section 4, the work provided for in this section is limited in character to these four classes. Then section 5 curiously is limited to a bridge; it does not even include the other works mentioned in section 4. Another curious feature of these two sections is that they apply only to cases where these works interfere with navigation, and the question naturally arises and has arisen, as to who is to be a judge of what works interfere with navigation. By section 7 it is provided that the local authority, company or person proposing to construct any work in navigable waters, may file his plan and then if the plan is approved of he may proceed with the work.

The change which we propose making in the statutes is to extend the provisions of section 4 so as to include bridge, boom, dam, aboiteau, dock, pier or other structure of any kind. The new section also provides that if such a structure is to be erected in a navigable water the plans must be filed and the usual notice given and the application made to the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—CONTROL OF CABLE RATES.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) to control the rates and facilities of Ocean Cable Companies, and to amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones and the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. He said: Briefly this Bill is intended to bring under the control of the Railway Commission the cable companies and also the cable companies operating in

conjunction with the land telegraph lines of Canada. As the subject is rather a complex one I intend to prepare a synopsis of this and the following Bill and send them to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and then on the second reading of the two Bills I shall fully explain their purpose. Everybody is aware that the railway companies, the express companies, the telegraph and telephone companies are all placed under the control of the Railway Board and we intend to bring the cable companies also under that control.

Mr. HUGHES. Will it include Marconi wireless?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I intend to include under this Bill the wireless companies also. When this Act comes into force, the companies will have four months within which to file with the board their tariffs. In case there are difficulties in filing the tariffs that time may be extended but not to a greater time than one year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TELEGRAPHS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) to amend the Telegraphs Act. He said: The same explanations as I have given in reference to the preceding Bill apply to this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

ANALYTICAL INDEX TO 'HANSARD.'

Mr. FOSTER:

What has been expended each year on the analytical index to 'Hansard' for preparation and printing, respectively, to whom has the amount for preparation been paid, and what number have been printed each year?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY:

—	--	Printing.	Copies.	Preparation.	To whom paid.
		$ cts.		$ cts.	
1904-5	English	1,345 16	2,680	750 00	D. McGillicuddy.
	French	528 52	500	750 00	M. Sauvalle.
1905-6	English	1,935 62	2,925	250 00	D. McGillicuddy.
	French	1,001 65	775	600 00	M. Sauvalle.
1906-7	English	2,255 71	2,750	1,000 00	D. McGillicuddy.
	French	1,039 82	500	450 00	M. Sauvalle.
1907-8	English	1,984 93	2,925	250 00	D. McGillicuddy.
	.....	.....	.....	1,175 00	H. R. Holmden.
	French	1,384 21	775	1,200 00	M. Sauvalle.
1908-9	English	2,239 27	2,925	820 00	H. R. Holmden.
	French	1,334 27	775	750 00	M. Sauvalle.
1909-10	English	*	*	255 00	H. R. Holmden.
	French	814 12	525	750 00	M. Sauvalle.

* In printer's hands.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC ARBITRATION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Was the agreement re arbitration between His Majesty the King, represented by the Minister of Railways, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, of date the 14th of May, 1909, and executed and forwarded by the company, ever submitted to the honourable Minister of Railways? If so, how and when?

2. Did this agreement come before the Transcontinental Railway Commission? If so, what action did the commission take in reference to it, and when?

3. Why was the agreement not accepted by the commission, and to what portions of it did the commission object?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. There was no agreement, but one was suggested by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. A copy of the proposed agreement was not submitted to the minister. See sessional papers, pp. 17, 18, 19 parliamentary return 42a.

2. A copy of proposed agreement was submitted by Mr. H. D. Lumsden, May 15, 1909, who was advised that the execution of such an agreement was unnecessary, as the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the chief engineer of the commissioners had already signed an agreement appointing a third arbitrator, and providing for the arbitration of the matters in dispute, as provided by the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

3. Answered by number 2.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. LENNOX:

Referring to the memorandum re Hodgins, of the Chairman of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental railway, to the Prime Minister, of date the 23rd of April, 1908, in which he says: 'The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company make objections when they see fit and these are looked into at once with due care.' 1. Was the Chairman of the Commission, at the time of presenting this memorandum, aware of the existence of the letters of complaint and objection by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, through their assistant chief engineer, Mr. H. A. Woods, of the 7th October, 1907, October 8, 1907, November 4, 1907, February 4, February 20, 1908, March 24, 1908, and March 30, 1908?

2. At the date of said memorandum, had the matters of complaint referred to in Mr. Woods' letters, or any of them, been carefully and fully looked into or looked or inquired into at all by or on behalf of the commission? If so, when, how, by whom, to what extent, and with what result?

3. If not, what was the meaning of the chairman's statement?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The objections of Mr. Woods as stated in his letter of October 7, 1907, were investigated by Chief Engineer Lumsden, of the commission, assistant Chief Engineer Woods and Inspecting Engineer Armstrong of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and the district and other engineers of District 'B.' October 25, 1907, and resulted in disclosing a difference of opinion between Chief Engineer Lumsden and his staff as to the interpretation of the classification clauses of the specifications, which subsequently resulted in Chief Engineer Lumsden modifying and correcting his interpretation of these clauses of the specifications in January, 1908, all of which is fully set forth in the report of the special committee appointed to investigate the charges of Major Hodgins. Mr. Woods' letters October 8, to March 24, inclusive related to the same matters as were covered by his letter of October 7, and the engineers in District 'B,' advised Chief Engineer Lumsden that the classification in that district was in conformity with his interpretation of the specifications dated January, 1908. Investigation of the classification could not proceed during the winter months, consequently further investigation was deferred by Chief Engineer Lumsden until April 24, 1908, when he wrote Assistant Chief Engineer Woods of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company with respect to arbitration of matters in dispute.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC PROGRESS ESTIMATES.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. In district 'A' of the Transcontinental, on contract No. 1, mile 0 to mile 50, from Moncton, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway contractors, what amount has been claimed, and paid respectively, on progress estimates returned under the headings of solid rock, loose rock and common excavation, since the 31st day of December, 1908?

2. What total amount has been claimed and paid respectively, since said date?

3. The same information is asked as to contract No. 2, mile 50 to 58, from Moncton, J. W. McManus & Company, contractors; contracts numbers 3 and 4, mile 58 to 164, from Moncton, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, contractors; contract number 5, mile 164 to 195, from Moncton, the Willard Kitchen Company, Ltd., contractors; and contract number 6, mile 195 to 255, from Moncton, Lyons & White, contractors.

Mr. GRAHAM:

There is no record of amounts claimed by the contractors, but the amounts returned by the engineers, under the terms of the respective contracts, and paid by the commissioners, are as shown on the annexed statement.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

AMOUNTS returned by Engineers and paid on Progress Estimates under the headings of Solid Rock, Loose Rock and Common Excavation, from December 31, 1908 to January 13, 1910; also total amounts so returned and paid during same period.

DISTRICT 'A.'

Contract Number.	Name of Contractor.	Solid Rock.	Loose Rock.	Common Excavation.	Total Amount Paid.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	49,963 50	294,851 21	10,176 30	894,732 22
2	J. W. McManus & Co.	26,500 50	12,971 25	1,053 68	153,227 55
3	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	47,813 63	99,425 70	33,608 97	454,714 35
4	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	514,435 58	228,989 84	39,443 04	1,113,723 82
5	Willard Kitchen & Co.	549,937 40	71,955 14	1,879 20	1,235,677 62
6	Lyons & White	99,623 52	110,667 60	18,850 05	519,171 51

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—ENGINEER'S COMPLAINTS.

Mr. LENNOX:

Did the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway take any measures to ascertain whether the complaints of Engineers Huestis, Doucet and Poulin, against the action and proceedings of the arbitrators, Messrs. Schreiber, Kelliher and Lumsden, were well founded before passing the resolution of June 25, 1909, or before sending the commissioners' letter of protest, inclosing the resolution to these arbitrators on that day? If so, what measure and investigation did the commission take and institute?

Mr. GRAHAM:

The reports referred to were confirmatory one of the other, and were further confirmed in part by verbal statements made by Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Schreiber.

INTERCOLONIAL DERAILMENTS.

Mr. TALBOT:

1. How many derailments have taken place over the Intercolonial Railway during the year 1909?
2. At what points of the railway did each of these derailments take place, and at what dates?
3. Was a regular inquiry made in each case?
4. Has a report been made in every case? If so, is the cause or causes mentioned in such report?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL LEASE.

Mr. MONK:

1. Is the lease of the Beauharnois canal from the government to Messrs. McIntyre & Robert still in force?
2. Has the amount of the lease been paid regularly? If not, since when, and does the government intend to exact payment?
3. Are the obligations of the lessees carried out according to the lease?
4. Have the company, the lessee, spent $60,000 for repairing canal banks, bridges, &c.?
5. Has the said company spent $20,000 a year as per lease, besides special work of $60,000 mentioned above, for keeping canal in good condition for navigation?
6. Are all the bridges in good order and kept at the disposal of farmers, according to lease? If not, why not?
7. Is the government aware that some bridges are said to have been out of use for nearly two years?
8. Is it the intention of the government to remedy such a state of things alleged to exist?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes, except as to the operating of bridges over lock No. 3 and lock No. 6.
4. No, not up to the present time.
5. No stipulation in the lease as to the spending by the company of a sum of $20,000 a year. The amount actually expended for staff and repairs for the calendar years 1908 and 1909 is $34,234.54.
6. All have been kept in good working order except those mentioned in answer No. 3.
7. Yes, the bridge over lock No. 3, which has not been in operation since the summer of 1908. The bridge was past repairing and the company did not see fit to go to the expense of providing a new one.
8. Yes, it is the intention of the government to compel the company to live up to the conditions of the lease.

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES ACT.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What has been the cost of administration of the Government Annuities Act for the fiscal year 1909-10, under the following heads: (a) Salaries at Ottawa and to whom paid; (b) Lecturers and agents, salary and expenses, respectively, and to whom paid, giving the number of meetings addressed by each lecturer; (c) Interest cost, counting the effective rate of interest paid on the government loans in that year as 4½ per cent?
2. How much has been received to end of year from purchase of annuities, and in what way has the money been invested?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. (a) From April 1, 1909, to December 31, 1909:

S. T. Bastedo	$2,999 97
E. G. Blackadar	1,199 97
Margaret McKain	533 28
Helen Houston	486 07
M. E. Fleming	374 94
Caroline Blair	374 94
Helen M. Jones	349 94
J. B. Racette	277 82
P. Colonnier	90 86
E. Turcotte	165 87
Loretta Lally	166 64
J. T. Rowan	133 04
A. S. O'Gilvie	130 89
Florence Driscoll	165 83
Mae George	165 78
Alice Periseau	165 78
Ilma Merkley	239 21
Thos. J. Coughlin	20 16
J. M. Deroche	10 75
H. A. McDonald	12 10
E. Swettenham	374 94
	$8,438 78

Lecturers and Agents.	Salary.	Expenses.	No. of meetings.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Mr. Jas. Samson, Windsor, Ont	749 97	1,565 70	
Allowance for lectures	1,290 00	.. ..	68
Edwin Dickie, Toronto, Ont.	1,125 00	338 94	
Duncan McArthur, Kenmore, Ont	1,125 00	310 05	21
L. N. Santerre, Quebec	374 94	449 62	
Allowance for lectures	670 00	.....	67
Georges Belleau, Plessisville, Que	365 21	463 75	
Allowance for lectures	750 00	.....	75
Nelson V. Brown, Middle Southampton, N.B.	1,070 83	978 98	67
Rev. W. G. Lane, Yarmouth, N.S	249 96	912 81	
Allowance for lectures	480 00	.....	48
	8,250 91	5,019 85	

(c) The total amount received on account of the purchase of Canadian government annuities up to and inclusive of the 31st December, 1909, was $371,174.70, which amount includes payments on account of the purchase of both immediate and deferred annuities. From this amount and the interest which the payments have earned at 4 per cent, the sum of $7,103.15 has been paid to immediate annuitants, such payments including a return to the purchaser of a portion of his purchase money. After deducting this sum of $7,103.15, there will be carried to the credit of interest account on the whole fund up to the 31st March, 1910, the sum of $9,563.71. This amount will, however, be increased by the interest on the payments received from 1st January, 1910, to the 31st March. The amount of purchase money increases with interest accumulations, and decreases as annuities are paid. The rate of interest paid on annuities account is 4 per cent compounded. In addition, deferred annuitants will be credited with the difference between the 3 per cent which may be returned to the estates of persons dying before their annuities fall due and the 4 per cent with which their payments had been credited for the purchase of annuities, so that the annuitants who survive to draw their annuities will have at their credit not only the sum which their own payments improved at 4 per cent compound interest will amount to, but an additional amount of about one-quarter per cent from the mortality benefits referred to.

2. The total amount received on account of the purchase of annuities to date, up to and inclusive of the 19th January, is $413,-510.40. Moneys are at present deposited to the order of the Receiver General, and are not treated as a separate fund. The Act so provides.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

SALES OF LAND FOR HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. How many acres of land have been sold to date on account of Hudson Bay Railway construction?

2. What amount of money has been paid in thereon and how has this been invested?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. No land has been sold on special account of Hudson Bay railway construction.

2. 4,106,560 acres have been sold as purchased homesteads and pre-emptions up to 31st December, 1909. Payments on purchased homesteads, $278,006.62; payments on pre-emptions, $118,107.86, exclusive of entry fees.

SCRIPS TO SOUTH AFRICAN VETERANS.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. How many South African Veterans' scrips have been issued to date, and covering how many acres of land?

2. How many of these still remain in veterans' hands, and covering how many acres of lands?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 6,678, covering 2,136,960 acres.

2. Up to 31st December, 1909, (January returns being incomplete), there have been located 2,748 land certificates, covering 879 360 acres. Leaving in the hands of the veterans or their substitutes 3,930 certificates, covering 1,257,600 acres.

PURCHASE OF WAR VESSELS FROM BRITISH ADMIRALTY.

Mr. FOSTER.

1. What orders in council have been passed authorizing the purchase of war vessels from the British admiralty, at what dates, and for what vessels?

2. What vessels have been contracted for or purchased, at what dates and prices?

3. On the authority of what appropriation by parliament have the negotiations, orders and contracts been made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. One order in council was passed dated the 22nd November. 1909, authorizing the purchase of a vessel of the 'Apollo' type, for protection of fisheries on the Pacific coast.

2. Negotiations are proceeding for the purchase of such a vessel, subject to the approval of parliament.

3. The vessel purchased as stated in No. 1, was so purchased under the fisheries protection vote in which $250,000 was provided for a new fisheries protection vessel in British Columbia.

REGIMENTS OF GARRISON ARTILLERY.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. How many regiments of garrison artillery are there on the force of the militia, exclusive of the permanent force?
2. How many in the permanent force?
3. How many companies are there in each regiment?
4. What is the strength of each regiment?
5 (a) What are the respective stations of the different regiments, and (b) what fortresses are manned by them?
6. What is the fixed armament of each fortress?
7. What is the movable armament of each fortress?
8. What place was taken by the different companies of the 5th regiment C. A., as compared with companies of other regiments, at the last firing competition of fixed guns?

Mr. OLIVER (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Seven.
2. One.
3 and 4.

	No. of Companies.	Strength
Royal Can. Garrison Artillery	5	690
1st Halifax Regiment.....	4	513
2nd Montreal Regiment....	3 (batteries)	355
3rd New Brunswick Regiment....	3 "	355
4th P.E.I. Regiment..	3	355
5th B. C. Regiment	3	389
6th Nova Scotia and Levis Regiment.....	3	374
7th Nova Scotia Regiment.	4 (batteries)	396

5 (a). 1st Regiment Garrison Artillery Peace Station, 4 companies, Halifax.

5th Regiment Garrison Artillery Peace Station, 3 companies, Esquimalt.

6th Regiment Garrison Artillery Peace Station, 3 companies, Quebec and Levis.

(b). It is not in the interest of the public that an answer should be given to the latter half of this question.

6 and 7. It is not in the interest of the public that this information should be published.

8. Garrison artillery regiments do not compete against each other, but companies of each regiment compete amongst themselves.

5TH REGIMENT CANADIAN ARTILLERY.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. Has any dissatisfaction been expressed to the department or any complaint made by any officer of the 5th Regiment of Canadian Artillery or by the D.O.C. 11th Military District, in connection with the addition to the armouries at Esquimalt of the battery of 12 pr. B.L. guns, recently sent there, or in connection with the proposal that No. 1 or any other company of the 5th Regiment is to train on these guns?
2. If so, what is the nature of the complaint or cause of dissatisfaction, and by whom and when was such complaint made?
3. Will horses be required for the use of the battery? If so, how many?
4. At whose expense are the horses to be supplied, and who is to bear the expense of maintenance of them?
5. Is the present strength of the 5th Regiment Canadian Artillery considered sufficient to man the fortress at Esquimalt and also to operate the above guns?
6. Is it the intention of the government to authorize the enrolment of another company in the said regiment?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. An application has been made by the district officer commanding military district No. 11 in connection with the training of this regiment.

It is not considered desirable to make the change he asks in the scheme of training, and the district officer commanding will be so informed.

2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes; 25 horses, on such occasions as it may be necessary to horse the guns.
4. Under the usual conditions and terms of military training.
5. Yes.
6. No.

MAIL PRIVILEGES UNDER POSTAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

Referring to Rule 119 of the Postal Regulations, which reads as follows:—'Members of either the Senate or House of Commons may, during the recess of parliament, send by mail free of Canada postage, all papers printed by order of either House; and members of the legislature of any one of the provinces of the Dominion may in like manner send by mail, free of Canada postage, all papers printed by order of such legislature,' does it authorize the persons therein mentioned, to send by mail during recess, from their office or private residence, free of Canada postage, all documents therein mentioned?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX:

Yes, in so far as the documents mentioned in the regulations in question are concerned.

LIFE BOAT AT SEAL COVE, N.B.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. What is the present condition of the lifeboat at Seal Cove, New Brunswick?
2. How often has it been inspected since it was placed in service, and by whom?
3. When was it last inspected, what was the nature of the inspection, was it inspected in the water as well as out, and what was the report of the inspector?
4. When was this boat placed in service, how many drills have been held with this boat since its purchase, what are the dates

of such drills and the length of time occupied in each drill, and who composed the crew or crews of each of those drills?

5. What amount of money has been paid to the crew or crews of this boat for drills for each year to December 31, 1909.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Good.

2. Six times: Once by Captain Bloomfield Douglas; five times by S. C. Campbell, inspector of life-saving stations.

3. November 27, 1909. Inspected out of water. Boat and gear in good condition.

4.

Date of Drills.	Time.	Crew.
1899.		
May 20	5 hours	Frank Benson, coxswain.
" 29	6 "	
June 10	5 "	Irvin Benson
" 28	6 "	
July 5	7 "	Burton Cook
" 29	9 "	
Aug. 17	5 "	Harry Harvey
" 29	5 "	
Sept. 7	6 "	G. Cook
" 24	5 "	
Oct. 6	6 "	Colman Green
1900.		
Aug. 7	6 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 20	5 "	
" 31	6 "	I. Benson
Sept. 1	5 "	
" 17	7 "	B. Cook
" 19	5 "	
Oct. 10	5 "	H. Harvey
" 17	7 "	
" 18	10 "	G. Cook
Nov. 5	8 "	
" 15	5 "	C. Green
" 27	5 "	L. Benson
1901.		
May 3	5 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 20	5 "	
June 6	5 "	I. Benson
" 19	6 "	
July 6	5 "	B. Cook
" 27	5 "	
Aug. 2	6 "	H. Harvey
" 17	5 "	
Sept. 6	5 "	G. Cook
" 19	5 "	
Oct. 5	6 "	C. Green
" 26	5 "	
Nov. 2	7 "	L. Benson
" 23	6 "	
1902.		
May 2	5 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 17	6 "	
June 3	5 "	I. Benson
" 14	6 "	
July 5	4 "	B. Cook
" 25	7 "	
Aug. 2	5 "	H. Harvey
" 16	6 "	
Sept. 2	7 "	G. Cook
" 20	5 "	
Oct. 4	6 "	C. Green
" 21	4 "	
Nov. 1	5 "	L. Benson
" 21	6 "	
1903.		
May 4	5 Hours	F. Benson, coxswain
" 20	6 "	
June 4	5 "	L. Benson
" 15	7 "	
July 1	6 "	B. Cook
" 20	4 "	
Aug. 3	5 "	H. Harvey
" 15	5 "	
Sept. 2	6 "	G. Cook
" 20	4 "	
Oct. 5	6 "	C. Green
" 12	4 "	
Nov. 1	5 "	L. Benson
" 17	6 "	
1904.		
May 14	6 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 16	5 "	
June 8	5 "	I. Benson
" 15	7 "	
July 6	5 "	B. Cook
" 15	5 "	
Aug. 3	4 "	H. Harvey
" 18	7 "	
Sept. 2	5 "	G. Cook
" 20	5 "	
Oct. 5	6 "	C. Green
" 12	4 "	
Nov. 1	5 "	L. Benson
" 17	6 "	
1905.		
May 5	5 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 24	6 "	
June 6	6 "	I. Benson
" 20	6 "	
July 5	5 "	B. Cook
" 15	5 "	
Aug. 9	6 "	H. Harvey
" 18	7 "	
Sept. 4	5 "	C. Cook
" 28	5 "	
Oct. 5	6 "	C. Green
" 25	4 "	
Nov. 7	5 "	L. Benson
" 18	6 "	
1906.		
May 3	5 "	F. Benson, coxswain.
" 9	7 "	
June 5	4 "	I. Benson
" 11	5 "	
July 8	5 "	L. Benson
" 15	5 "	
Aug. 4	4 "	G. Russell
" 9	3 "	
Sept. 4	6 "	F. Ingersoll
" 8	4 "	
Oct. 2	5 "	J. Dalzell
" 17	3 "	
Nov. 5	5 "	B. Cook
" 8	6 "	

5.

1900-1,	drills and coxswain's salary..	$195
1901-2	" ..	222
1902-3	" ..	222
1903-4	" ..	271
1904-5	" ..	271
1905-6	" ..	271
1907-8,	coxswain's salary for 1906..	75
1908-9	" 1907..	75
1908-9	" 1908..	75
	Total..	$1,677

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Has any report been received by the government or the Department of Marine and Fisheries from the person or persons appointed to investigate the lobster fisheries during the past summer? If so, when will such report be available for the members of this House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

The intention was that the report of the commissioner and the evidence adduced by him would be for the use of the Special Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries. The report will be ready for the committee when it convenes.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing in the construction of drill halls or armouries, or the leasing of sites for camps of instruction, in how many and what instances municipalities, regiments, or individuals, have contributed to the cost of the same in the way of concessions, sites, or moneys, and the amount in each case since 1904.—Mr. Worthington.

Return showing: 1. All amounts which may be deducted from the allowance due officers commanding corps of the active militia to cover deficiencies in clothing, &c., deposited to the credit of the receiver general of consolidated revenue.

2. The amount of money that has been received from officers commanding corps of active militia during the five years ended 31st March, 1909, in payment for clothing issued to such corps, including deductions from allowances to cover repayment to replace deficiencies.—Mr. Worthington.

Return showing what tenders were called for in all cases by the Department of Militia for the manufacture of tents during the five years ended 31st March, 1909; what public advertisements were published calling for such tenders, and in what places and in what newspapers such advertisements were published; from whom tenders were received, and the amounts thereof.—Mr. Worthington.

Return showing what tenders were called for by the Department of Militia for harness and saddlery during five years ended 31st March, 1909; what public advertisements were published calling for such tenders, and in what places and in what newspapers such advertisements were published; from whom received, and the amounts thereof.—Mr. Worthington.

Copy of all correspondence between the government, or any member thereof, and the Imperial South African Service Association, or any of its officers, in reference to a proposed military reserve to be formed by the members of the Imperial South African Veterans' Association.—Mr. Macdonell.

Copy of all declarations, affidavits and solemn declarations made and sent to the Post Office Department, or to the honourable the Postmaster General, since the first day of September, 1907, up to the fifteenth day of January, 1910, respecting the franking privilege asked for the Arthabaska 'Gazette,' with copies of the lists of pretended subscribers to that newspaper with the said declarations, affidavits and solemn declarations; also a copy of the report of Mr. A. Bolduc, post office inspector, respecting the said Arthabaska 'Gazette.'—Mr. Lavergne.

Copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other correspondence in connection with the establishing of a post office to be named Charleston or Kelmont, on the south side of the Assiniboine river, in the parish of St. Charles, province of Manitoba?—Mr. Staples.

Copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, documents and correspondence, occurring during the first six months of 1908, in connection with suggested amendments to the Northwest Irrigation Act.—Mr. Magrath.

Copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, documents and correspondence in connection with the establishment of the experimental farm near Lethbridge, Alta.—Mr. Magrath.

Return showing: 1. The amount of Canada's copper, silver and gold coinage respectively, for each of the last ten years, and the cost and profit of each year's coinage, counting the interest and depreciation of the cost of the Canadian Mint at 6 per cent, and the cost of maintenance and staff for the years during which it has been in operation.

2. The amount of United States silver, and at what cost that has been deported each year, and the estimated amount of United States silver current in Canada from year to year. —Mr. Foster.

Return showing: 1. How much money has been paid by this government from 1896 to the present time to the firm of Sullivan & Langdon, contractors, of Kingston, or to Mr. Sullivan, contractor, Kingston.

2. What public buildings or other public works that have been let by contract to either of the above firms since 1896, the contract price in each case, and the total amount paid to the said contractors in each case.

3. The total cost of each building or public work in which either of the above mentioned firms was interested.—Mr. Edwards.

Return showing how much money has been paid by this government in each year from 1896 to 1909, both years included, to the firms of Elliott Bros., and of R. Carson, of Kingston, Ontario, for supplies furnished to, or services of any kind performed by the government.—Mr. Edwards.

Return showing all tenders called for by the Department of Railways and Canals, or the purchasing agent of the Intercolonial railway at Ottawa, at any time during the year 1909 for wire fencing; a copy of any tenders received for such fencing, with the names of the tenderers, and the prices quoted by the said parties tendering for the different kinds of fencing; the names of the successful tenderers, and the particular kind of fence bought, the gauge of wire, number of strands and distances apart of the brackets in uprights; the price per rod, and where the wire was manufactured.—Mr. Wilcox.

PARTY PATRONAGE.

On the order:

That in the opinion of this House the prevailing system of party patronage constitutes a menace to honest and efficient government, incites to great waste of resources and extravagance of expenditures, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public

morals, and should forthwith be eliminated from our federal administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I gave notice that I would move that to-day, but at the request of the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I will not move it to-day, but next Wednesday if it be reached.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), but as I would like to say a few words, perhaps I will be pardoned if I rise to a question of privilege instead, my excuse for doing so being the statement of the right hon. First Minister to me the other day that I was somewhat out of date. It is in regard to the report of the fisheries commission. The right hon. gentleman took exception to my calling it a report, and told me when I called it a report that I was out of date. But the right hon. gentleman, in several parts of his speech, called it a report; so that if I was out of date, he must not make fish of one and fowl of another.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad that I was in good company.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister thinks he was in good company. I estimate it at the same value as himself. He was absolutely out of date, and I will prove it from his own words. He said that the report had been signed by two commissioners and sent to a third for approval and signature. He was absolutely out of date when he said so as he will prove if he lays the report before the House. It is signed by the three commissioners who are existent to-day. There were three commissioners appointed in the first place, one of them resigned because he was appointed to a judgeship, and after the resignation a third commissioner was appointed in the place of the commissioner who had resigned to accept a judgeship. The three commissioners came here together, spent a week or ten days, made a report, presented that report, that report has been printed, and all I ask is that the report as printed and signed by the three commissioners be brought before the House. May I not suggest to the First Minister that I have a right to ask for that, and that I have a right to have it brought down. It must be authentic if it is signed by the three existing commissioners. When I ask for this report, I want the First Minister to understand that I am not here in a spirit of joshing at all, but that I am here in deadly earnest. This report refers to people in my county. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) last year promised me that he would have those commissioners inquire into matters that are of great interest to some of my constituents. For instance, one man has sent an affidavit to the effect that he worked for the men who had these closed leases granted by this government, and when he wanted to sell his fish to an outside buyer, the government officials forbade him to do so, although the lease holder offered him only $8 per ton while the outside buyer offered $140 per ton. Even at that the lease holder has not paid the man and now owes him $800. This unfortunate position is entirely owing to the interference of the government officials, as otherwise he would have sold to the outside buyer. Will the government protect that man and others who are in the same box? We take the position in the west that Canada is not in a hurry to get rid of her output of fish, she ought not to be in a hurry to deplete her lakes for the benefit of the United States markets. It costs us nothing to keep the fish in those lakes, and I think it is in the interests of the people of Canada, until such time as Canada requires that fish, not to have these lakes depleted. Would the Prime Minister give me the report so that I may see it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) the other day charged me with not being up to date I must say that I somewhat resented the imputation. Of course I am an eastern man and I cannot expect to be up to the standard of western men, but I try to be, I do my best, and when the hon. member charged me with not being up to date in the new department which it is my misfortune to administer just now owing to the illness of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I sent for the papers and looked them over. I found that a commission was appointed consisting of Messrs. Metcalfe, Reid and Professor Prince, the government fishery inspector. They were to investigate the four lakes in Manitoba and the Northwest, Lac du Bonnet, Lake Winnipegosis, Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. I found a report prepared and ready for publication concerning Lac du Bonnet which was investigated by the three commissioners I have named. I understand that after this report was prepared Mr. Metcalfe was appointed a judge. I have not yet found whether he resigned or not, but it was thought that his new duties were not compatible with the exercise of his functions as a judge and a new commissioner was appointed, Mr. Hogg. Mr. Hogg and the two remaining commissioners have been investigating the three other lakes. The report concerning Lac du Bonnet is printed, but the original of it has not been signed by Judge Metcalfe. It has been sent to him for signature. I have looked into the report and can see no rea-

son why it should not be brought down. The same remark applies to the interim reports on the other lakes. This morning I called on my colleague who, I am glad to say, is better and could talk business, and I suggested to him that I saw no reason why these reports should not be brought down for the satisfaction of my hon. friend and his friends. My colleague saw no reason why the reports should not be brought down and they will be presented to-morrow morning.

Mr. FOSTER. Now you are up to date.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would remind the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that on Friday last he promised to give me an answer on Monday as to the report of Professor Prince and Dr. Starr Jordan with regard to the regulations that were being prepared concerning fishing in international waters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have looked into the matter and I find that the regulations have been made, but there was an agreement that they should be published simultaneously in Washington and Ottawa. We are communicating with Washington now to have them brought down. We are pressing the matter. I sent a new despatch to-day.

UNITED STATES MINIMUM TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice in the press that President Taft has issued a proclamation or made known his view with reference to the relation of certain countries to the United States as regards the minimum tariff. Amongst those mentioned as being subject to the minimum tariff is Great Britain. Does the Prime Minister know whether that includes Canada or not? I take it that it does.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I take it so, but I would rather my hon. friend would put the question when the Finance Minister is in his seat.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No.73) to amend the Interest Act.—Mr. Miller.

On section 1,

Mr. MILLER. When we were in committee to consider this Bill some objection was made to the wording and its consideration was deferred until some amendment might be considered. I have now to move to add this provision:

Provided, however, that nothing in this section contained shall restrict the rights of any mortgagor to repay any overdue principal or interest, whose rights to pay the same have not been affected by any contract by him entered into.

I think this amendment will get over the difficulties suggested by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley).

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been able to look into this. What is the result of the section, when carried?

Mr. MILLER. It provides that overdue principal upon a mortgage may be repaid at any time by the mortgagor upon giving one month's notice of his intention to pay or by paying one month's interest by way of bonus.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, it nullifies any agreement between the borrower and the lender made at the time the mortgage is given as security, and without consulting the wish or will of the lender?

Mr. MILLER. It provides that he cannot demand more interest in case of the money having been tendered or the notice given.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Is provision made in the Bill to meet the case of a mortgagor giving a month's notice but not fulfilling his notice? I have known that case to occur frequently, and it is a hardship to the mortgagee, who, on receiving notice, makes arrangements to reinvest his money, which arrangement he is prevented from carrying out.

Mr. MILLER. It is not necessary, because it is in the hands of the mortgagee to penalize the defaulting mortgagor. He may, if he chooses, take action to enforce the covenant.

Mr. NORTHRUP. But he may not wish to penalize. He may not wish to throw costs on the mortgagor. At the same time he does not like to be disappointed in making the investment he has promised.

Mr. MILLER. He would be in the same position as though he had taken a mortgage for five years and the mortgagor had notified him, before the maturity of the mortgage, that he would repay it, yet fails to do so.

Mr. NORTHRUP. In other words, two wrongs are to make a right.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think that applies.

Mr. CARVELL. I think that if the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) will read the section carefully, he will find that it provides that the mortgagor must pay or tender as well as give the notice. Therefore, it is in the hands of the mortgagee to accept it or not.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART. It appears to me that this is of very doubtful

benefit to the borrower. It can easily be got around by the mortgagor. As the mortgage becomes due he presses for payment of a renewal. If the mortgagor is not ready to pay, he gives a renewal which costs $5 or $10, and then mortgagee and mortgagor are back in the same position as before. I agree with what has been said by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) that this is a class of legislation very frequently brought before the House and often enacted, but of very little use to the parties whom it is expected to benefit. I think that is the experience of all practitioners.

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Alexander Haggart) was not in his place the other evening when the Bill was under discussion. I think that in practice, when a mortgage matures, if it is permitted to continue in arrears, it must be by the consent of the borrower and the lender. The mortgagee will usually permit the money to remain in arrears until the time comes when he may call it in and lend it at an advanced rate of interest. He takes the mortgagor at that much of a disadvantage, and the mortgagor must then pay him the increased rate of interest or go some place else and borrow the money at a higher rate. If the effect of this legislation is to make the parties at the maturity of a mortgage, enter into a renewal agreement, it has the advantage of putting both parties on an equal footing, and each can take his chance whether the rates go up or down.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART. Look at the expense and trouble.

Mr. MILLER. Usually, in practice, there is little or no expense as most of the loan company mortagees, at least in the province of Ontario, are sufficiently willing to retain their investment, to renew the mortgage by agreement without charge. There is sometimes a charge, rarely more than $5 and usually only $2 or $3.

On section 2—application of sections 6 to 10.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the effect of this?

Mr. MILLER. If the hon. member (Mr. Foster) will look at the section, he will find that this is absolutely necessary. Section 11 of the Act says that the provisions of the five sections last preceding shall apply only to moneys so secured by mortgage executed after 1st July, 1880. The legislation I seek to carry to-day is not retroactive, and I am slipping in section 10a immediately before section 11, and still making section 11 apply to the sections to which it was intended to apply, but it would be absurd to make it apply to the new section I am putting in.

Bill, as amended, reported.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART

CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 26) respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.—Mr. Monk.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The promoter of this Bill, who is laid up ill, has requested me, on account of another Bill that is on the Order Paper and will be moved, to move this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Several hon. members want to speak on this Bill.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. If it stands, the similar Bill of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Harris) should stand also.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know how it has been arranged. What applies to one should apply to the other.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 53) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Meighen.

Mr. MEIGHEN. At the present moment, I would request that this Bill be allowed to stand. If it be in accordance with the rules, I would suggest that other orders be called and this one taken up a little later.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All right.

Mr. GRAHAM. If it stands only while one or two of these orders are dealt with, that will not help me out of my difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister in difficulty again?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I simply ask that it stand until such time as we can complete the negotiations that are pending.

Mr. GRAHAM. Better go on with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I move the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is where we differ a little. This Bill and one from my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Martin) and one from my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) are Bills which materially affect the railway companies, and these companies have requested that the Bills be sent before some committee where the companies can be heard. In the case of the other Bills, with the consent of the promoters they were sent to the Railway Committee where they will be dealt with by special sub-committees. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has two Bills before special committees now. Once these Bills go before the Railway Committee, that committee will appoint a sub-committee to deal with them. Any committee we would select here would probably consist

of members of the Railway Committee. My hon. friend perhaps does not quite understand that there are 180 members on the Railway Committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The ground of my objection is this, that the Bill is in the nature of an amendment to a public Act and is in no sense a private Bill, and therefore should not go to the Railway Committee at all, but go before the Committee of the Whole House in the usual way. I am quite aware that other Bills, perhaps of a similar nature, proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, have gone to the Railway Committee and thence to special committees, and I believe also that one introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln met the same fate.

Mr. GRAHAM. And South Toronto.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not think that the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln went from this House to the Railway Committee with the consent of the mover. If the principle prevails, that amendments to public Bills should come before the Committee of the Whole House, there is no reason for sending this Bill to the Railway Committee. I am quite aware that this Bill affects railway companies and affects them very materially, but it is a Bill of a public character and there is nothing in it to affect one company more than another. It deals simply with the principle of liability, and I do not see how a subcommittee of the Railway Committee is better fitted to deal with it than the Committee of the Whole House. The principle involved is that of liability, and the Committee of the Whole House is clearly the one to discuss a principle of that sort. If it were a question of incorporating or limiting the powers of a company, the case would be different, but that is not the character of the Bill. If this Bill goes to the Railway Committee and then to a subcommittee, it will be likely to be very successfully steered outside of this session. I am very anxious such should not be the case. If the Minister of Railways will consent to the Bill going to the Committee of the Whole, I shall be willing to oblige him and wait until it is called again, but I do not want to be a party to shunting the Bill as it is likely to be if referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no desire to shunt the Bill to one side at all. I have in my make-up a good deal of fairness, and no matter what may be my own opinions, I think that those who are to be affected by legislation should be given an opportunity to express their views before we adopt it. Strictly speaking all these Bills should go to the Committee of the Whole House, and not to the Committee of Railways or a sub-committee of that body at all; but when those deeply interested say they want an opportunity to be heard, I feel I ought to try and meet their views. My hon. friend from South Toronto has a Bill regarding commutation of tickets, and he consented readily to have it go before the Railway Committee where all parties might be heard. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has one which is largely a legal question, and he arranged with me, before the Bill came up, that it should go to a committee. We had some little difficulty as to the outcome but I said to him, as I say to my hon. friend, that the object was not to detain the measure at all, but rather to expedite it. I do not think that we are in a position to discuss these Bills fairly until we hear the other side.

Mr. MEIGHEN. With regard to the Bills referred to, I heard my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) protest vigorously against his Bill being sent to a committee. The position I take this afternoon is endorsed by my hon. friend. It was he who suggested it. As regards the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), it is on a subject of quite a different character. It affects the details of the management of the road regarding which the companies should be heard, but this Bill simply affects the principle of liability of railway companies in the event of loss, which is a matter this House ought to deal with in Committee of the Whole. I do not want the Minister of Railways to take it as an act of discourtesy on my part that I object to the reference to the Railway Committee. I object because I believe that means delay. I do not believe that the railway companies have any right to be heard on a question of general public policy. I move therefore that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM moved in amendment that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. EDWARDS moved the second reading of Bill (No. 74) to amend the Canada Shipping Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this is precisely the same Bill that I introduced in the House last session. At that time the Bill was brought down too late to receive the consideration it would other-

wise have received. It is a very simple Bill, its object being merely to place vessel owners of the province of Ontario on a parity with vessel owners of the other provinces with reference to pilotage dues at Montreal. The amendment proposed has been the subject of negotiations between the Ontario government and this government and has also been the subject of very frequent representations on the part of the Dominion Marine Association which represents practically all the vessel owners on the great lakes. Sec. 477 of the Canada Shipping Act discriminates against Ontario vessels in a manner which I do not think is warranted or justifiable. That section reads as follows, speaking of ships exempt from pilotage dues:

(a) Ships belonging to His Majesty;
(b) Ships wholly employed in His Majesty's service, while so employed, the masters of which have been appointed by His Majesty's government, either in the United Kingdom or in Canada;
(c) Ships propelled wholly or in part by steam;
(i) Employed in trading from port to port in the same province, or
(ii) Employed in trading between any one or more of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island and any other or others of them, or
(iii) Employed in voyages between any port or ports in the said provinces or any of them and the port of New York, or any port of the United States of America on the Atlantic north of New York, or
(iv.) Employed in voyages between any port in any of the said provinces and any port in Newfoundland, or
(v.) Having a draught when loaded not exceeding 16 feet, and employed exclusively in voyages between any port or ports on Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Huron, Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, or on any of the waters connecting those lakes and any port or ports on the River St. Lawrence, or between any ports on the River St. Lawrence.

Prior to June, 1908, subsection 5, the last section I have read, granted exemption to vessels with a draught, when loaded, not exceeding 16 feet and employed exclusively in voyages between any port or ports on the Great Lakes and the rivers connecting them and any port or ports on the St. Lawrence or between ports on the St. Lawrence. But this partial exemption was denied by the repeal of that subsection in 1908, while at the same time the vessel owners of Ontario were urging and earnestly asking to be placed on a parity with those of the other provinces. I ask the House to fairly consider this matter. It is one which affects very large interests. There is hardly a county in the province of Ontario which is not affected by it. certainly every county in the province of Ontario bordering on the St. Lawrence or any of the great lakes, is directly affected by this Act as it now stands. Why should a vessel sailing to Montreal from Halifax or Newfoundland or New York be exempt from compulsory payment of pilotage dues and a vessel from any port on any of the great lakes be obliged to pay those dues? It does not seem to me to be fair and I do not think that the Marine Association are asking more than their just rights when they ask that to be changed.

I wish to call attention to by-law 25 of the Montreal Pilotage District. That by-law reads as follows:

Every vessel liable to compulsory payment of pilotage dues and moved into or out of the limits of the harbour of Montreal or from one point to another within the same, shall pay such dues for the services of a branch pilot, except in the case of vessels which are merely shifting their positions at a wharf and attached thereto by their moorings.

The only vessels that come under that by-law of the Montreal Pilotage District are the vessels of Ontario because all those vessels which are exempt from pilotage dues under the sections which I have read are specifically mentioned as not coming under by-law 25 of the Montreal Pilotage District and consequently that by-law only applies to vessels from Ontario and subjects the owners of vessels of Ontario to an additional tax which vessels from the other provinces are not subjected to. This is an injustice on the face of it. Ontario vessels, I repeat, only come under section 477 and therefore Ontario vessels are the only ones which come under the provisions of by-law 25 so they are the only ones subjected to this additional tax. What benefits are received by Ontario vessel owners from this tax? None whatever. Is the liability of the owner lessened? Not in the least. Is the owner's responsibility lessened because he has to pay the tax? Not in the least. Section 474 makes this very clear. That section reads as follows:

Nothing in this part shall exempt any owner or master of any ship from liability for any loss or damage occasioned by his ship to any person or property, on the ground either of such ship being in the charge of a licensed pilot, or of such loss or damage being occasioned by the act or default of a licensed pilot, or on any other ground.

While the Ontario vessel owner is obliged to pay pilotage dues, he may or may not take the pilot on board; if he does, the taking on of that pilot does not relieve him from damages which may be caused by his boat even while he has a pilot on board. Yet he is obliged to pay these dues from which vessel owners from other provinces are exempt!

Now, when I brought this matter up last session the Minister of Marine and Fish

eries said that an order in council had been passed providing that vessels coming through the Lachine rapids should not be obliged to pay these dues on entering Montreal harbour; he admitted that this did not apply to Ontario vessels passing through the Lachine canal. But I wish to say that the exemption to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred only helped the Richelieu and Ontario boats, and one or two others, and only partly helped even them. But if, as the hon. gentleman says, the order in council was passed to meet the serious complaint of the Dominion Marine Association, I would then ask why the repeated protests of that association, representing as they do practically all the vessels on the Great Lakes, should have been continually ignored? To sum the matter up. It seems to me it is proper to ask: Is there at present a distinct discrimination against Ontario vessels? I do not think any gentleman in this House can dispute the fact that there is a distinct discrimination against Ontario vessels. Secondly, if there is such discrimination, is it just and fair; and thirdly, is not that discrimination not only unfair but un-Canadian, to grant not only to vessel owners of the maritime provinces an exemption which is denied to those of Ontario, but to grant it also to Newfoundland vessels and vessels trading from New England states as far south as New York? It seems to me not only unfair to Ontario vessels but distinctly unpatriotic. I think this is something of which Ontario vessel owners have a right to complain. Large sums of money have been expended in improving the Montreal harbour for the St. Lawrence trade. It is not my purpose to criticise those expenditures, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that a portion of that money, as I may justly claim, has been paid by the people of Ontario. I merely ask what has been asked repeatedly by the Dominion Marine Association, having very large interests in the province of Ontario, that they be placed on a parity with the other provinces in this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will strike every one who has listened to the remarks of my hon. friend that if the law has been framed so as to exempt the province of Ontario from the provisions applied to other provinces with regard to pilotage dues, there must have been some reason for it. Looking at the statute, I agree with my hon. friend that one cannot see the reason why Ontario was exempted, and was not included in the section of the law which he has quoted. The law expressly mentions ships trading between one or more of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and mentions no others. As the hon. gentleman has said, Ontario seems to have been purposely left out in mentioning the provinces, and it would strike one that there must be some reason for it. The reason, as I understand, is altogether local. I may be wrong, but it is my apprehension of the facts, that the local conditions rendered it advisable not to apply those provisions to the province of Ontario as they were applied to the other provinces mentioned. I would not, with my imperfect knowledge, presume to contradict the position taken by my hon. friend, nor to express any positive opinion. I think this is a matter deserving of more information than we have at the present time. There is on the face of it, as the hon. gentleman says, an anomaly, and surely there must be some good reason for such an anomaly appearing in the law. Under the circumstances, I think my hon. friend will see that he would sufficiently advance the cause he has at heart by agreeing to the second reading of his Bill, and then sending it to the Committee on Marine, where all parties can be heard, and let the matter be threshed out there.

Mr. EDWARDS. I accept the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman that the Bill be now read a second time and sent to the Committee on Marine. I think the more the matter is looked into the more convinced this House will be that the Bill should go through.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. GEO. GORDON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 85) to amend the Criminal Code. He said: As I explained on the introduction of this Bill, it is an exact copy of an amendment which was brought in during the last session of this House, and which was sent to the Senate on almost the last day of the session; and owing to want of explanation it was thrown out by that body. It is designed to meet the circumstance that very valuable ore, in some case nearly pure silver, has been carried away from the mines at Cobalt, and sold at what are commonly known as 'blind pigs,' where it passes in exchange for drinks. It is sold to parties who make a business of it. When these parties have accumulated a quantity worth while they take it to Toronto and other cities and sell it. The object of this Bill is primarily to put these receivers out of business. If this is done there will be an end to this business. No injustice will be done to any person by putting these receivers out of business because the mine owners do not sell mineral in small quantities. It has been found necessary both in the Transvaal and in Australia to have legislation enacted such as is sought for in this Bill. If the words in the last

line of the Bill 'prove that he came lawfully by the same' seem too drastic there might be substituted therefor the words 'account satisfactorily for or prove his right to the possession of the same.' If this change is made I submit there should be no danger of the possessor of ore getting into any trouble. It is easy for him to prove where he got the mineral. It was brought up in the Senate that danger might arise to a person, for instance a broker who held ore, but I do not think there is any danger in that regard because any broker who has ore in his possession must necessarily know where he got it from or it would be of no use to him. The ore which he has in his possession is no doubt from a person who is interested in a mine, to show what he may expect to get from that property.

I may say that recently what has taken place has proved very conclusively that unless such legislation is passed there is no knowing where the thefts which are now going on at Cobalt may end. While it would be improper to say anything here about the convictions which have recently been made owing to those thefts it might be proper for me to say, to show how valuable some of this ore is, that it was given in evidence in court in Toronto that one party had obtained in one month two tons of ore, and it was shown that this ore was worth $5 per pound; so that, in one month, that party had received $20,000 worth of silver from the Cobalt region. I therefore trust that this House, in its wisdom, will see the advisability of having this legislation enacted.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I am not disposed to take exception to the views which the hon. gentleman has just expressed as to the merit of this legislation. It seems absolutely necessary if any check is to be given to the evil which has been described that legislation of this nature should be passed. This House was of that opinion last session and in passing the legislation in question did so simply from the conviction, as I understood the action of the House, that it would be impossible without it to afford any effective redress in cases of this description. The evil seems certainly serious. It is a crime in respect to which there ought to be prosecution and conviction where there is guilt, and it is practically impossible to secure a conviction, no matter how plain a case, according to ordinary ideas, the evidence may show, simply because it is impossible to identify the particular piece of ore, or any quantity of ore, which may be found in the possession of the person accused, as ore which has come from a particular mine. The difficulty about the matter which was felt in the Senate last year was that it was reversing the well understood rules of criminal procedure as to the burden of proof, and that, instead of putting upon the prosecution the whole burden of proving an accused person guilty, this legislation would require the accused person to prove himself innocent.

No doubt that representation of the effect of this legislation is quite true, but the question is whether that is not justifiable in the particular case in hand and in view of the evil which it is desired to repress. It is not an unknown thing in the course of either a civil case or a criminal prosecution that the burden of proof should rest upon the person who is charged with either responsibility for the payment of damages or responsibility upon a criminal charge. There are many instances of it perfectly well known to practitioners in the courts, and apart altogether from instances in which the burden or presumption is at once upon or against the person charged with any particular course of action, it is an every day occurrence in trials that the burden shifts from the one side to the other side according to the special evidence which may from minute to minute or hour to hour in the course of the proceedings be given. That is all that this legislation seeks to do; it puts at the outset the burden upon the person in whose possession the ore is found to account satisfactorily for such possession. That is only another form of stating that the possession of ore, when there is a charge that it is wrongfully in the possession of the person accused, at once puts that person in the position of having a presumption raised against him. In the case of honest possession it will not be a difficult thing to rebut that presumption. Many instances have been suggested where some innocent person might be wrongfully prosecuted if this change in the law were made. It has been said for instance that a mining broker might have samples of quartz or ore in his possession and be unable to state where they came from. That has not occurred to me as any serious difficulty. The presumption which this Act might create if it became law would, in the case of the mining broker, be rebutted the instant it arose by the circumstance of the character of his business and the fact that in the ordinary course of his business he was just the man who might be expected to be in possession of a great quantity of samples of quartz which he might not be able to identify himself or whose source he could not prove to a demonstration. However, if the phraseology of the Bill is changed, as has been suggested, the mining broker who might otherwise be charged and might be in difficulty under the phraseology of this statute, would at once rebut any prima facie presumption

which the statute would appear to raise by the mere circumstance that that was his ordinary and proper line of business.

Legislation of this character, as the hon. gentleman has stated, has been found necessary in mining communities. We have the example of legislation, not only of South Africa, but also of different states of the Australian commonwealth upon this very subject, at least as severe as anything which is proposed in this legislation. But in our own Criminal Code there are plenty of instances where such a presumption is already created by the existing law and where no evil has come from it. Take any one found in possession of naval or military stores bearing the broad arrow or marked otherwise as being public property, at once the burden is put on that person of accounting for it satisfactorily. It is but common sense that it should be so, and in the sections of the Criminal Code dealing with evidence at trials many instances of the same sort of thing are to be found. The presence of cards, dice, counters, tables or other implements of gaming affords prima facie evidence that gaming is carried on in the place where they are found. It is but a statutory statement of the deduction and inference which any man exercising ordinary common sense would make in his own mind on finding such a condition of affairs. The finding in an unlicensed house of an unusually large quantity of intoxicating liquor at once affords the presumption that it is there for an unlawful purpose, that it is kept for sale instead of for private consumption. Things of that sort found in legislative enactment, as I have pointed out, simply state in words and by Act of parliament that which is the ordinary inference that any jury would draw from such circumstances if proved before them in evidence. I think, therefore, that this legislation is meritorious. I regret that it was not adopted last year by the Senate, and I support entirely the motion of my hon. friend for the second reading. When the Bill goes to committee I shall propose that it should not extend to or have application in the Yukon territory, simply for the reason that the conditions of placer mining are quite different from those of quartz mining. In the Yukon at one time, and perhaps still, it was quite the custom to use nuggets of gold, the results of placer mining, as currency. Each man carried his pouch in which he had such gold dust as he had won during the day or week and it passed current by weight and probably does so still. At any rate that is a very different thing. The possession of quartz of greater or less value having possibly a very high percentage of precious metal and in the whole amounting to considerable sums by some person who is not a regular dealer is something which seems to require to be accounted for and we have already upon our Criminal Code a provision of that character with regard to workmen and labourers. Section 988 of the Criminal Code provides that in any prosecution proceeding or trial for stealing ores or minerals, the possession, contrary to the provision of any law in that behalf, of any smelted gold or silver or any gold-bearing quartz or any unsmelted or unmanufactured gold or silver by any operator, workman or labourer actively engaged in or on any mine shall be prima facie evidence that the same has been stolen by him. That has been our law for ten years or more. I do not know that any one has ever found any difficulty from it or been wrongfully prosecuted under it. This legislation is on the same lines and I cannot but think if its effect and the reason for its introduction had been appreciated in the other House, the Bill would not have met with the fate which befell it last year.

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

On section 1,

1. The Criminal Code, chapter 146 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 424:—

424a. Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who, having in his possession or on his premises with his knowledge any rock, ore, mineral, stone, quartz or other substance containing gold or silver, or any unsmelted, or untreated, or unmanufactured, or partly smelted, partly treated or partly manufactured gold or silver, is unable to prove that he came lawfully by the same.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think it would be better to change the wording. I would suggest the striking out of the words 'is unable to prove that he came lawfully by the same' and substitute 'is unable to account satisfactorily for or prove his right to the possession of the same'. These are the words of the Act of the Transvaal applying to the case of any person found in possession of rough or uncut diamonds, and unable to prove his right to the possession of the same.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I move that the following be added as subsection 424b:

This Act shall not extend or apply to the Yukon Territory.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the amendment would be more effective if it were made simply to exclude placer gold from the operation of the Act. If confined to quartz mining, it will apply to the Yukon as well as to any other part of the Dominion

If my information be correct, there are very rich quartz veins in that territory, which, if not operated, will be operated in the near future, and the necessity of the law will be as great there as anywhere else. As to the Bill affecting the broker, I do not think that would be the case, because the object is to bring to book not only the person in whose possession the ore may be found but the person who sells it. The broker may have considerable samples in his office, but no broker that I know of sells ore.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the wording of this amendment should be modified. This is to be included as section 424b and it might be held to relate to the Criminal Code and to exclude it from application to the Yukon. It should be made to read in some such way as this:

The foregoing section shall not extend or apply to the Yukon Territory.

To provide in the Criminal Code that 'this Act shall not extend or apply to the Yukon territory' might lead to confusion.

Mr. PARDEE. Section 424 of the Criminal Code is cognate legislation with this which is now being put through the House. It is divided into sub-sections (a), (b), (c) and (d), and the last provides 'the two next preceding subsections' (b) and (c) 'shall not extend or apply to the Yukon territory'.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I say. But I understand that this provision which we are now discussing is to be embodied in the Criminal Code as section 424b. If it were left in the form proposed, it might have the effect of preventing the Criminal Code from having any application to the Yukon territory. It says: 'This Act'—not 'this section'—'shall not extend or apply to the Yukon territory'. That is, according to this amendment, the Criminal Code, shall not apply to the Yukon territory, which would be unfortunate. The words used should be 'the foregoing section',

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 39) to amend the Railway Act. —Mr. M. Martin.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Ways and Means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. OLIVER J. WILCOX (North Essex). It was not my intention to offer any argument in this debate, but as I have ceased to be the baby member of this House, and as my colleagues on this side, together with some friends whom, I am glad to say, I have on the other, have urged me to speak, I make my first attempt to take part in a debate on the budget. I listened yesterday to the argument of the hon. the Minister of Customs, and from what he said one would come to the conclusion that the Liberal party in this country had accomplished everything they had undertaken by promises to do. But there is one thing I am absolutely sure they did not succeed in doing, notwithstanding they were backed by all the force and power of the government—they did not capture the riding of North Essex in the late bye-election. I was opposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the Secretary of State and two very estimable gentlemen from the sister province of Quebec. I welcomed them and gave them almost control of my meetings. The electorate of the riding of North Essex came out and listened to these hon. gentlemen. Although the people of Essex are a very kind and hospitable people and came out in great numbers to listen to what these gentlemen had to say, the next day they went about their ordinary work and evidently they did not pay much attention to what the hon. gentlemen said, and they had a reason for that. They remembered that these gentlemen, or if not the same gentlemen, those who propounded the policy, came before the electorate of the riding of North Essex in 1881 and in 1892 and addressed the electorate of North Essex with the same eloquence; but the voters had the recollection that these gentlemen, or if not the same gentlemen, had different policies to lay before them in 1881 or 1892. Consequently it is not any wonder that the grand, intelligent electors of the riding of North Essex should go about their business after these hon. gentlemen were there and not pay much attention to what they said?

Another reason for my occupying the proud position of member of parliament for the riding of North Essex is the violation by the Liberals of that plank in their platform of which the Minister of Customs did not speak yesterday, that is the appointing of members of parliament to positions of emolument and public trust. Sir William Mulock declared in this House that any member of parliament who accepted a position of public trust from the hands of the government or any man who was looking for a position was a menace to parlia-

mentary independence, a corrupt agency in parliament, and a parasite upon the administration. It is interesting to inquire what has become of the representatives of the people who were sent to this House to represent the county for which I now have the honour to represent. In 1896 the policy of free trade was preached in every corner and every school house, upon every hustings in that border riding. The representative of the party which to-day holds the reins of power in this country said to the intelligent electorate in my presence: Put the rascals out, these customs house officers because we are going to have free trade with the United States if you return us to power. And with all the force and power in their ability they educated the people in the riding of North Essex, who were anxious to get across to the city of Detroit, into the principles of free trade until the morning after June the 3rd, when William McGregor was returned to this parliament for North Essex. So great a hold did that education take, that for a fact some people of that riding went across the Detroit river and actually refused to pay the duty to the American customs house on account of the promises that had been given . Yet the Minister of Customs, (Hon. William Paterson) rises here as he did yesterday and makes the statement to this House and to this country that they did not preach or advocate free trade in the election of 1896. I took his statement as a joke. I believe the hon. gentlemen opposite took it as a joke and I am sure the people of this country will take it as a joke for there is not a school boy of ten years I believe in the whole of Canada who does not thoroughly understand that it was a plank in the Liberal policy that we should have free trade with the United States if the Liberals were elected.

But I was speaking of what had become of those servants and representatives of the people who had been returned by the electorate of North Essex since 1896, for I am the first man, I am proud to say, upon this side of the House who has had the honour of representing my fellow countrymen in that county in the last twenty-one years. William McGregor, who preached free trade and was elected on that policy in 1896 was, two or three years afterwards, placed by this government in one of the most import- and positions of public trust in the customs house at the port of Windsor. A free trader! Then we have another hon. gentleman who was a representative of the agricultural classes. The government did not, I believe, appoint him to office. I refer now to Mr. Cowan. How we Conservatives and Liberals in the riding of North Essex, believed in the principles which he advocated in the interest of agriculturalists in respect to drainage across railways, a subject on which I hope I will have something to say later on. Sir, what has become of this representative of the people? It was not wrong for one of the great railway corporations of this country to say to Mr. Cowan. We want you in our service, we want you to sacrifice the interests of the grand old farmers you are representing in North Essex. Mr. Cowan took the bait, and he is to-day in the courts fighting against the interests of the farmers. I will not say so much against my friend Mr. Sutherland. He is occupying an important position upon the bench, and I agree that he is a man who will be able to fill the position with dignity, he is a gentleman whom I respect. But let me say this, that his appointment is not a fulfilment of the policy of the government when they were in opposition, that members of parliament should not be appointed to positions of public trust, seeing that they had been sent here to serve the people. It is in the light of these facts that the electors of North Essex and of the city of Windsor have seen fit to pick a farmer like myself out from among the shocks of corn and send him to parliament.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Customs yesterday undertook to make it appear to the members of this House that the Liberal Conservative party had no part in the prosperity that Canada enjoys to-day ; he would make it appear that the great political party which laid the foundation of the government which we enjoy to-day, has done nothing to make this country what it is. Sir, I think that the hon. gentleman made a grossly exaggerated statement. It would be a reasonable question for me to ask him what he actually found within the confines of the Dominion of Canada when he came into office in the year 1896. You might start at the great port of Montreal, and you would find a double line of steel reaching out from that port across the province of Quebec, out along the north shore of Lake Superior to Winnipeg, down across the province of Manitoba to Lethbridge, with rail communication of such a nature in the southern portion of Manitoba that I believe it was not possible for a settler in that province, in the year 1896, to place his foot upon any portion of Canadian soil which was more than 15 or 16 miles from direct rail communication. You found more. You found that great line of railway reaching across the Rocky Mountains, down across the province of British Columbia to the blue waters of the Pacific, through that magnificent stretch of country every foot of which has been opened up by a Conservative administration. That same hon. gentleman who addressed this House yesterday afternoon, was to be found during those years previous to 1896 upon every platform and upon every hustings which it was possible for him to reach, criticising

every act of the administration that brought into existence that magnificent public work which cemented all the provinces of Canada together. Sir, what else could you find? You could start at Vancouver and Victoria, and see there a magnificent line of steamships sailing from those ports to the town of Hong Kong in China. That great line of communication was opened up by a Conservative government in spite of all the Minister of Customs of to-day and his friends could do to harass and impede them and which he said yesterday had done absolutely nothing for this country in which we live and move. What else do you find? Another magnificent line of steamships going out from St. John and Halifax down to the Argentine Republic in South America. What else? You found that the independence of our country had been solved. You found the magnificent waterways which were opened up in 1896. You found the magnificent line of steamboats coming down from the west freighted with the produce of that great country to the port of Montreal, in 1896. When I think of the advantage which our friends opposite had when they came into power, the knowledge, the experience which had been acquired by the the Liberal Conservative party during the years they ruled this country, it seems to me that a man has a good deal of audacity when he rises before this House of Commons any says that this country is what it is to-day as a rusult of the policy of the present government. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a man who would refrain from attempting to take credit for what other men have done, men who lived and moved with power and force in this country when my hon. friends opposite were babes in arms, politically; men who lived and moved with power and force in this land, and whose noble deeds and acts have made the land in which we live what it is. For example, suppose we take an ordinary farmer in this country, a reasonably prosperous agriculturist. I do not blush myself because I am one of and a representative of that particular class, because I realize that I am a representative of one of the most important classes in this country. Now, suppose we take a farmer who has worked his whole life and who has become physically incapacitated to carry on his farm any longer, and he hands it over to his son. His son takes that home, he paints the cornice of the house, he puts up a post here and there, he runs a fence around it, and then he says to the passer-by: Look at my beautiful home, I have done all this in the last few years. What would his father say? Well, Sir, the position of that son is the position that the Liberal party occupy to-day, men, some of whom were not born when those grand and noble men were at work in the pioneer days of this Dominion, making it the great heritage for generations to come; and yet, according to the Minister of Customs, all that has been accomplished has all been done in the last twelve and three-quarter years.

As I listened attentively to the speech of that hon. gentleman I was inclined to the view that he was trying to believe what he was saying. But his speech was delivered altogether from a partisan standpoint. It was delivered, as it appeared to me, for the express purpose of going out to the constituencies and making something appear that did not exist. I declare here from the place I occupy in this House that I trust, whether it shall be my privilege to represent a constituency in this parliament for a long or short period, I shall never get so wrapped up within the thrall of party politics that I shall put my party above my country, and above truth. If there is a position that I do admire and one that I would be pleased to take it is the position that was declared by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the 29th March last when he introduced the motion in the House affecting the naval defence of this country together with the position which the right hon. the leader of the government took upon that question and the position which was taken by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). This is a great national question, a question of mighty public import, therefore, we shall consider the question upon its merits without having any regard to party politics. This was the position then taken. I admire the position taken by the leader of my party in that regard. It is exactly the position I intend to take myself. I was amazed at the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), last evening in speaking upon the budget, when he made the statement that they were of one accord on that side of the House on this particular question and that we on this side of the House were not united. Well, Sir, in view of the position which has been taken by the right hon. leader of the government himself I declare that we are more in accord with the policy which has been laid down by the leaders of this party than is the hon. member for Assiniboia himself. I do not believe it is within the range of human possibility that the 146 members who constitute the party on the government side of the House can be of one accord upon any one question unless they are actuated by party politics. It is not human nature to be that way. Upon that question of such mighty public import we, as true patriotic Canadians, will express our opinions according to the dictates of our own conscience regardless of party considerations.

The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) spoke at great length yesterday

afternoon regarding the tariff. In view of what I had read in my past life of the addresses which that hon. gentleman delivered himself previous to 1896, I was amazingly surprised and entertained by the statements which he made. The hon. gentleman spoke of the tariff. He had stood upon the hustings in days gone by and had declaimed about robbers great and robbers small and about the tall chimneys that were being built up by the tariff. Now, it seems to me, that by going over the tariff as it exists to-day it will be found that the average dutv upon dutiable products coming into the country is about 28·75 per cent. The average duty in 1896 was within 89-100th of one per cent the same as it is to-day. So, the tariff which was in existence during the years previous to 1896 is exactly the same in principle as the tariff which we have to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. With a different name.

Mr. WILCOX. Well, yes, with a different name. I know, every hon. gentleman on this side of the House knows and I am absolutely sure that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House know that it is beyond the contol of any government to legislate prices, that all the government can do is to so frame its fiscal policy that when a time of commercial expansion prevails throughout the whole world Canada shall enjoy its fair share of it, and the fact that the rate of tariff is, practically the same today as it was in 1896 this prima facie evidence that the fiscal policy under which this country has enjoyed so much prosperity is exactly the same as that which was in existence before hon. gentlemen opposite came into power.

There is a remark that I wish to make regarding the tariff upon Indian corn. Two or three hon. gentlemen made reference to that particular item. I am sorry to say that I am not as yet sufficiently acquainted with the House to be able to state their exact names or the constituencies which they represent. Reference was made to the fact that the government had taken the duty off Indian corn and allowed corn to come in for the benefit of the farmers of this country. I represent the riding of North Essex, there is the riding of South Essex, there is the ridings of East and West Kent, and Indian corn is chief product of these ridings. The farmers up there say corn is king. They say it is king because the production of that cereal is their chief industry. So that the action of this government in taking the duty off corn was certainly against the best interests of the people in that particular part of the country which makes almost a specialty of this crop. While the farmers of Essex and Kent produce a large amount of corn they are not able to produce the amount called for by the demands of the country. Thus while they suffer while having to compete with Indian corn from the United States there is one condition in connection with that trade which is scandalous and ridiculous. That is that we in the county of Essex are discriminated against by freight rates which give the American farmer the advantage in eastern Ontario over us in the county of Essex. I have to pay to-day 17 cents a 100 pounds to ship my corn to the grain merchants here in the eastern part of the province while it can be brought from Chicago for about the same price, and I believe the rate from Detroit is 13 cents. An hon. member informs me that the rate from Chicago is 12½ cents. We shipped a cargo the other day at 17 cents a hundred pounds. I desire to bring this to the attention of the government, I am pointing out to them that if such a condition does exist, as it does, if we are to submit to American competition without any protection—and we are producers as well as the manufacturers, we are producing the raw material, we are producing what is more important than the produce of the manufacturer, the food stuffs of the country—it is unfair that we should be discriminated against in freight rates in this manner. Incidentally may I ask why, if it is a good policy to take the duty off Indian corn and allow American corn to come in free, would it not be a magnificent policy to take the duty off corn cultivators so that we could get a cultivator to cultivate our corn? A free cultivator for free corn. The effect of the absence of duty and of this gross discrimination is that the farmer of the western states has the corn market of Canada on more favourable terms than we who make a specialty of corn growing in Essex and Kent.

Speaking of the tariff, the statement of hon. gentlemen that we wish to build a tariff wall as high as Heaven does not necessarily make that assertion true. I know his statement is not in accordance with the facts but I believe that it is unfair that I as a representative farmer in the riding of North Essex, growing hay, and horses, and cattle, must pay a higher duty if I wish to take my products into the United States than the American farmer has to pay to bring his products into Canada. The American farmer can bring his hay into Canada at $2 a ton but I have to pay $4 a ton to get mine into the American market. I believe that is not a proper condition of things. I have pointed out to the government that it can be remedied and I believe by the expression on the face of the Minister of Public works just now that he intends to

remove it. Another instance of the same unfair condition is the duty on eggs on which I have to pay 6 cents a dozen against the American farmer's 3 cents a dozen. While I am a producer I am a consumer as well in some respects, but in so far as I am a producer engaged in the most important industry in this country, I am entitled to protection as well as the manufacturer. The farmers as a representative class in this country have to pay a great deal in taxation. As the tillers of the soil producing the raw material which keeps the wheels of machinery revolving it was said of the farmers that during the financial crisis of a few years ago they, through the application of knowledge and skill and science to the tilling of the soil we are able to bring from mother earth millions of dollars of raw products more than had been produced the year before, and when those products went out upon the markets of the world they brought back into the country in which we live those shining dollars which sent this country on her way in peace and abiding peace and we trust we shall have continued prosperity. This is the class we represent in this House, and when I represent the agricultural class, then, Sir, I am working in the interests of the merchant, the doctor, the lawyer, the labourer and all classes of men, because it is the foundation industry of the country. I am sorry there are not more of my class here, but I believe that the time is not far distant when the farmers of this country will have more to say upon the affairs of this country than they have to-day. We are the people, we are the men who bear the burdens in this country largely. What have we to pay? We start at the foot of the ladder and we pay our township tax, we pay our school tax, we pay our ditch tax to drain our soil, we pay our county tax. Then the provincial government comes along and takes another grab at us. Then the Dominion government comes along and we have to pay some $130,000,000, the greater portion of it, to carry on the expenditures of this country when the hon. gentlemen opposite said they would reduce the expenditure when it was only $41,000,000.

Reference has been made by the hon. member for Peterborough and by another hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is one of the grandest institutions ever established in this country in the interest of the common people. But I do not pretend to say that the government is entitled to the credit of creating that body; I say that to parliament is due that credit. If, as a representative of the people and a member of the Liberal-Conservative party, I rise in my place here and support any good measure, I am just as much entitled to credit for that measure as if I were a member of the government. Suppose that upon the great and important question now before us, the Naval Bill, we decide upon the principle of considering this question without regard to party politics, that has been laid down by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the Prime Minister—and I venture to believe that if we carry out that principle honestly and conscientiously, you will find men on both sides of the House for and against it, should not the whole House get the credit? And let me say, I do concur in the position taken by the leaders of the two political parties in that regard. But that is aside from my present argument. There are some amendments relating to drainage across railways that should be passed in the interest of the community at large. Though, I am, as I have said, a representative of the agricultural class, I am not one of those who would impose a great burden on our railway corporations. I realize that these corporations are necessary and their interests must be protected, and I am ready to stand on the floor of this House or in committee and protect the interests of those corporations so far as justice and reason demand. But there is a provision in the statute which is not necessary for the protection of the railway companies and which works most detrimentally to the interest of the farmers. I might mention several points, but let me speak of one particularly. In Ontario we drain our soil under the provisions of the special Drainage Act of the province, or under the Ditches and Watercourses Act, or by individual effort. The people's way of draining—not the municipal councils' but the people's way—is under the Ditches and Watercourses Act. The provisions work out in this way: Suppose that there are four or five men engaged in agriculture whose land is immediately adjacent to a railway right of way. The railway has built a considerable embankment which has stopped the natural flow of the water and it is absolutely necessary, in order to bring that land into a state fit for cultivation, that there should be an outlet across this right of way. Under form 9—I think it is—of the Ditches and Watercourses Act, we will inform all parties interested, including the railway company, that it is necessary to have a drain constructed. The Act is right and fair. But go a step further. After the award is made under the Ditches and Watercourses Act by a competent engineer appointed by the municipal corporation for that purpose, if any of the private landowners is not pleased

with any provisions of the award, he has a right to appeal to the county judge whose decision is final. But if the railway company is dissatisfied to whom does it make appeal? To the county judge? No, Sir, it will appeal to the Railway Commission of the Dominion. In ordinary cases of this kind the expense of bringing the farmer to the Railway Commission is twice as much as it would cost to do the actual work. I say that the appeal of the railway company should be to the county judge the same as in the case of the farmer, for I do not admit that a corporation should have higher rights or privileges than an ordinary landowner.

Again, the construction of local telephones is a question that is of deep interest to the people in the rural districts—in western Ontario it interests the people more than any other question that I know of to-day. The Dominion Railway Act contains a provision relating to railways which seriously handicaps us from getting our lines across the right of way of a railway, a provision that is quite unnecessary, for the interest of the railway companies can easily be protected without it. I have superintended the construction of at least a hundred miles of rural telephone lines in the county of Essex. When we come to the right of way of a railway, the actual work of making the crossing will cost us about $20. But if we attempt to string our wires across the right of way, notwithstanding that we are the farmers and taxpayers of that community, the men who have made the country by building roads and by other means of development, we are met by some representatives of the railway company from Detriot, New York, Boston, or some other place, who demand to know what right we have to do the work until we have the permission of the Railway Commission. That is the law. In my opinion, it is quite unnecessary to have such a provision in the law. I would not hesitate to say that the law should be kept unchanged if it were fairly in the interests of the railway companies to have it so, but it is not necessary. Under the law, we have to procure four plans—one for ourselves, two for the Railway Commission and one to be served on the railway company at a cost of $20. We have to employ a solicitor to make application to the Board of Railway Commissioners for an order to cross our wires on the company's right of way. In most cases, it costs from $50 to $75 to get through the preliminaries when about $15 or $25 will do the actual work. The Railway Act itself ought to contain a provision empowering companies to string their wires across the right of way of a railway company, according to a standard specification set up by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Let the board make an order setting forth a standard specification and then give the municipalities the right to string wires across the tracks according to that standard, and the officers of the railways will be sure to see that the work is done according to that standard, and we shall be saved from $50 to $100 on every crossing.

I intended making a few remarks respecting taxation, but as that matter has been fully gone into I shall not detain the House further, and before resuming my seat I would like to thank hon. members for the kind attention they have given me on this my first effort to address the House.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N.B.). The hon. gentleman from North Essex (Mr. Wilcox), who has just spoken, told the House he was its baby member. Well, considering some of the statements he made, I think he deserves that cognomen. The first point he attempted to make was that free trade had been preached on every hustings by the Minister of Customs, and that in addition the slogan of the Liberal party was: Put the rascals out. If the hon. gentleman were present yesterday afternoon and heard the Minister of Customs put forward the platform of the Liberal party, he had no right to make the statement he did. It was my privilege and pleasure to have attended the Liberal convention in the year 1893; and if there was one thing which impressed me more than another, if there was one principle enunciated more clearly than another, it was that the policy of the Liberal party was a tariff for revenue purposes and a tariff bearing as lightly as possible on the necessaries of life which are consumed in the workingman's household. The hon. gentleman, in speaking of his own election contest, said that the farmers in his constituency paid no attention to the speeches of the ministerial representatives but kept on husking corn. I am quite sure they did, or the hon. gentleman would not be here. But it seems to me he has husking of the corn on the brain this afternoon, because when attempting to show that we were continuing the protective tariff of the Conservative party, he, in the next breath turned around and told us that we had taken off the duty from Indian corn for the use of the masses. To my mind the one statement contradicted the other. What we thought wrong about the protective policy of our predecessors was that it was protection for the classes. Now, the masses use Indian corn. It is used down by the sea, where it is not grown. Is it fair that on such a commodity used by the people, there should be a tax in the interests of

the farmers of any particular locality? It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is not logical. Let me remind him that he omitted to make the statement that the Conservative party had allowed corn to come in free for distilling purposes, but that the farmers had to pay the duty. It seems to me that his argument is strongly in favour of the policy of the Liberal party, who have changed our tariff policy and put it on a revenue basis rather than on a protective basis.

The hon. gentleman made some references to the giving of positions of trust by this government to those who had been members of parliament, and in that connection he mentioned the name of a gentleman who was a member of parliament many years ago, but who is now solicitor of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I fail to grasp the point which the hon. gentleman made. I fail to grasp the point the hon. gentleman made on that occasion. It seems to me that if the Grand Trunk railway considered Mr. Cowan a suitable employee, they were right to engage him and that it is no fault of the present administration. If Mr Cowan had the ability it was the right of the Grand Trunk to engage his services.

The hon. gentleman asks what the Minister of Finance found when he came into office in 1896. That was a very pertinent question. One thing that the minister found when he came into office was that for the preceding three years there was not sufficient money in the treasury to pay the ordinary running expenses of the country. He found that in the last five years of the Conservative party they had added to the public debt $21,000,000, that they had expended only $16,000,000 chargeable to capital account; the balance, $5,000,000, was borrowed on the money markets of the world to pay ordinary running expenses. That is what the minister found when he came into office in 1896. If you examine the public accounts you will find that for nearly every year under the Conservative regime more money was borrowed than was expended on capital account.

Another statement made by the hon. gentleman was that every foot of the west had been opened by the Conservative party. That statement is so extreme it hardly needs an answer, considering the development in the west during the last twelve and a quarter years. Where was the population of the west twelve and three-quarters years ago? Does he take credit for the population we have now? Yes, forsooth, it has all come because of the policy of the Conservative party up to 1896. He speaks of the magnificent lines of steamers. When did the magnificent lines of steamers come on? Have they not been aided by the present administration? How could such steamers as the Allan line now bring to Montreal come up the St. Lawrence river twelve and three-quarter years ago if there was no money available from the revenues of the country to dredge that channel? We know that the St. Lawrence channel has been dredged and deepened so that steamers of that class can reach the great commercial metropolis of this country, and yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to tell us that these magnificent lines of steamers are due to the administration of the Conservative party up to 1896. I shall later have an opportunity of analysing the expenditures for such great public works as the dredging of our waterways and show you what a very small percentage was available for that purpose during the regime of the Liberal-Conservative party, when, as I tell you, they were borrowing money for every dollar expended on capital account, and had not even enough to meet the ordinary running expenses. What stockholders would like to have their officials come before them and state that during the preceding three years they had not been able to raise sufficient revenue to pay operating expenses, and had to borrow money to pay their ordinary running expenses? Would an official care to say that if they added a new boiler that would also have to be charged to capital account? That was exactly the position during the last five years of the Conservative regime. The hon. gentleman said that some one had the audacity to say that this country is what it is today because of the work of the Liberal party. I do not know that any one ever said that, but I would judge from the hon. gentleman's speech that his declaration is that the country is what it is because of the administration of the Conservative party. It seems to me that we should not forget that Providence has not very much to do with the extension of prosperity in the country, but that at the helm there has been a very wise captain keeping the ship from touching the rocks—and the time of prosperity is the time perhaps when there is the greatest danger. Some two years ago on the horizon out in the west there was a danger flag. Asiatics were coming into the country and over-flooding this land—that was the cry. But the wise captain at the helm advised caution and patience. The interests of British Columbia would be protected and looked after, but higher and above all that, the honoured leader was loyal to the British flag and he said: Treaty rights must have their due place and their first place, and it seems to me that this is an evidence of wise and practical statesmanship.

The hon. gentleman likened the government to a young farmer who, on succeeding his father in the possession of the farm, goes out and paints the cornice of the house and says: Look at my beautiful home. The insinuation is that the Liberal party have taken possession of the beautiful home of the Conservative party, painted the cornices and are now saying to the country: Look at my beautiful home, whereas, it was the father, the Conservative party, who built the house. Mr. Speaker, when we think of the expenditure in this country during the last twelve and three-quarter years and of the public works, great and small that have been erected, of the great increase in trade, both exports and imports, we wonder whether such a statement is the statement of a man of a sound mind?

Now the hon. gentleman made another statement regarding the Minister of Customs, he said that when he addressed the House yesterday he did not believe himself what he was saying. Well, it is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that, but it does not make it a fact. I do not know on what ground he based his statement; all I can say is that I deny it. I say that the Minister of Customs was fair, he read all the resolutions adopted by the great Liberal party; the Minister of Customs was frank, he told the whole story. Yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to say across the floor of this House that the Minister of Customs did not believe the statement he was making. I think that if the minister were here he would be justified in asking the hon. gentleman to recall that statement, and I have no doubt he would agree to do so, providing the minister would be a good boy afterwards.

The hon. gentleman also made reference to the naval question, and I concur in much of what he said regarding that matter. I think we ought to treat that as a great national question, and keep it as far as possible outside of party politics. I want to say here that I think the country is to be congratulated on the unanimity of opinion expressed a year ago when this House unanimously passed a resolution on the naval question. I think I can go further, I think I can say on behalf of hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces that we all respect the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) who leads His Majesty's loyal opposition in this House, and it was pleasant to know that that hon. gentleman stands by the resolution unanimously passed in this House. Let me say that I wish he could foster among his followers the same loyalty and fidelity to the British flag. Let us be of one mind and one heart in this great national undertaking. When the Minister of Finance said in his budget speech that this was a growing time for Canada, I think he might have said that it was an epoch making time in the history of Canada. The departure we are now making in building a fleet and controlling it in times of peace, it seems to me is a great national event, and might well be considered as forming an epoch in the history of this rising nation.

The hon. gentleman also referred to an argument of the Minister of Customs yesterday when he spoke about the tariff wall being made as high as Heaven. Well, I suppose that if the tariff wall was made as high as Heaven, then we should have to resort to direct taxation; but I do not think that is the policy of either political party, and it seems to me the remarks of the hon. gentleman were hardly pertinent to the matter under consideration. Another statement he made, and I suppose he made it on the same principle, in the same sense that he says the Minister of Customs made his statement, whether he was saying it from his mind or not, he said that it was unfair to allow the Americans to bring in hay at $2 per ton, while the United States government charged $4 per ton on hay going from Canada into that country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that is an unusual doctrine, it is a doctrine that the Canadian pays the rate exacted by the American tariff, and that the American pays the rate exacted by the Canadian tariff. I have always understood the very reverse to be the fact, that the Canadian pays the rate exacted by his own government, and the American pays the rate exacted by the congress of the United States. But the hon. gentleman reverses that principle. I fail to understand the policy of imposing a customs duty if the hon. gentleman's argument is a logical one. Sir, I know whereof I speak, I say there may be one case out of a hundred where the exports pays the duty. But in all ordinary transactions in trade, the importer and the consumer pay the customs duty. Therefore I think the hon. gentleman's argument does not bear on the subject before the House, except in this sense, that he wants the duty raised to $4 as a further protection to the farmer. I think the hon. gentleman is like every other manufacturer, he wants to have an undue rate of duty placed on commodities at the expense of the general public. He says further that the farmers are entitled to protection as well as the manufacturers. One would suppose that there was no protection afforded to the farmers in this country. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the farmers have a very liberal share of protection. If he had been in the House last year he would remember that the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr.

Edwards) made a plea for an additional duty on hog products, and he was informed that there was at present a duty of two cents per pound on those products. So the farmers who raise hogs are certainly protected. As I had occasion to say once before, perhaps hog and cattle products are the only articles in regard to which the system of protection has been retained by the present administration, because rates of specific duties on these items have not been changed.

Mr. EDWARDS. You say that we have a duty of two cents on bacon coming from other countries?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. And that the farmer is protected?

Mr. LOGGIE. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. From whom is he protected by the two cents duty?

Mr. LOGGIE. He is protected by getting a better price than he would otherwise get for his bacon.

Mr. EDWARDS. But the American duty is five cents a pound on our bacon going into the United States.

Mr. LOGGIE. That has nothing to do with my argument—nothing whatever to do with it. The point I make is that if there were no duty on a barrel of pork it would be laid down in Montreal for $4 less than it is to-day and go into the consumers' hands at that much less cost to them. The farmer to-day gets practically two cents a pound more for his hog products than he would if the duty were not in existence.

An hon. MEMBER. And the artisan pays

Mr. LOGGIE. And the artisan—and the consumer—of course, pays. It seems to me that that is the logical conclusion. I cannot explain it if the hon. gentleman does not understand that.

On motion of Mr. Loggie debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock, House adjourned.

Mr. LOGGIE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 20, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company. —Mr. Gladu.

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway.—Mr. Conmee.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CONMEE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: This Bill was introduced last year, and I explained it then at some length. It is to give railway employees the right to vote although they may not be in their own particular polling subdivision at the time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What is the mileage of government telegraph lines in Canada, separated into divisions, and the cost of each division, (a) in construction, (b) maintenance, and (c) salaries of operators, and the revenue for each division for the last fiscal year?

2. What has been the total construction cost of the Yukon system of telegraph lines, what the revenue for each year of its operation, and the cost in maintenance and salaries, respectively, for each year?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1

Division.	Construction in 1908-9.	Lines in operation at date, March 31, 1909.			Revenue and Maintenance, 1908-9.			
		Land lines.	Cables.	Total.	Revenue.	Salaries.	Repairs and Sundries.	Total.
	$ cts.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia	5,967 11	638¼	30	668¼	3,324.92	10,523.85	4,720.22	15,244.07
New Brunswick	....	76¼	11	87¼	1,094.37	1,595.38	1,387.35	2,982.73
Quebec	7,779 77	1,965	198½	2,163½	11,165.80	31,965.01	26,700.11	58,665.12
Cableship *Tyrian*	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	16,760.71	29,862.50	46,623.21
Gulf lines, contingencies	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,303.78	14,303.78
Ontario (Pelee Island)	.....	25½	17¼	42¾	247.45	161.77	1,194.33	1,356.10
Northwest	18,714 79	1,009⅓	....	1,009½	5,805.21	21,382.65	10,594.56	31,977.21
British Columbia	34,671 76	957¼	10¼	967½	14,732.46	21,855.64	23,188.21	45,043.85
Yukon	2,344 37	2,542½	.....	2,542½	76,805.13	117,618.80	97,391.25	215,010.05
Telegraph service generally, printing, &c	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,639.06	3,639.06
Total	69,477 80	7,214¼	267	7,481¼	113,175.34	221,863.81	212,981.37	434,845.18

Add.—Newfoundland (Port au Basque-Cape Ray Line)—14 miles operated by Anglo-American Co. for the Government.

2

YUKON TELEGRAPH LINES.

Year.	Construction.	Maintenance.	Salaries.	Revenue.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1899	157,209 54	.....	.....	.....
1900	223,044 77	5,213 15	10,426 28	33,716 88
1901	259,837 82	9,131 83	18,263 66	108,272 13
1902	221,897 14	15,689 80	125,280 12	97,158 90
1903	25,139 39	156,808 28	124,800 00	114,083 36
1904	1,039 37	82,730 38	116,495 76	126,991 27
1905	.....	112,556 05	116,795 00	115,876 18
1906	.....	90,008 56	116,500 00	77,453 81
1907 (9 months)	.....	82,391 52	87,371 82	64,979 87
1908 (extension to Prince Rupert)	4,545 33	.....	.....	.....
Hootalinqua to Livingstone	3,407 22	78,497 08	118,500 00	80,440 96
1909	.....	97,391 25	117,618 80	76,805 13
Totals	896,120 58	730,417 90	952,051 44	895,778 49

TRENT CANAL WATER POWERS.

Mr. ARTHURS:

Is it the intention of the government to take over and control locks or other improvements built upon navigable streams in Ontario by the provincial government? If so, when?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM:

The government in February, 1906, took over from the Ontario government a number of dams at the head waters of the Trent canal and several locks and bridges on the line of navigation of the Trent canal with a view of regulating the water in the said canal and also of better controlling navigation through the said canal, which are enumerated below:

Lock and three swing bridges at Lindsay, lock and swing bridge at Young's point, lock at Balsam river, together with all minor work in connection with the maintenance and operation of the same; also dams on Gull river waters, viz.: Balsam lake, Gull

lake, Horseshoe lake, Hawk lake, Paint lake, Hall's lake, Keneese's lake, Redstone lake, Eagle and Moose lake, Haliburton lake, Percy lake.

On Burnt river waters: Kocklong lake, Drag lake, Loon lake, Big Bear lake, Otter lake, Grace lake, Farquhar lake.

On Nogis creek: Swamp lake.

Mississauga creek: Gull lake, Eagle lake.

A few other smaller dams taken over but not actually required by the department for proposed reservoirs system, but now used for flotation of logs. The Dominion government is not required to maintain these dams except for the purpose of log navigation.

With reference to the taking over of any further structures, the government has not considered the matter.

SCUGOG LAKE FLOODS.

Mr. THORNTON:

1. Does the government (federal) own or control the lands, surrounding and adjacent to Scugog lake, province of Ontario, which are flooded at times of high water caused by the government dam at Lindsay?

2. Are these lands claimed by the adjacent owners, or is it possible for them to purchase them, subject to the damage caused by flooding?

3. Or are these lands looked upon as common property, in which every citizen has equal rights?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.

2. The Department of Railways and Canals has no knowledge as to whom these lands are claimed by, or what the conditions of purchase would be.

3. Answered by No. 2.

VICTORIA IMMIGRATION BUILDING.

Mr. BARNARD:

What number of immigrants have used the Victoria immigration building since its completion, and what is the nationality of such immigrants?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. European immigrants from the United States, 197; from Australia, 9; Japanese, 27; Chinese. 147; Chinese detained in building for customs, 57; building also used for registering Chinese outward bound to the number of 1,382.

STEAMER 'WILLIAM JOLIFFE.'

Mr. BARNARD:

1. When did the steamer 'William Joliffe' enter the service of the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

2. For what length of time is she chartered?

3. What is the rate paid per day, and does the same include wages, fuel, supplies, &c.?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. First chartered on September 2, 1907.

2. Each year she has been chartered for one month, then from day to day.

3. $150 per diem, all found.

Mr. GRAHAM.

VETERANS OF 1866-7.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

Has the government arrived at a decision in regard to a grant of land to the veterans of 1866-7? If not when may the veterans expect a decision to be reached?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government has not come to any conclusion, but will at an early day.

POST OFFICE, CENTRAL PARK, NEW WESTMINSTER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What reply, if any, has been made by the Postmaster General to communications from residents of Central Park, with respect to the closing of the post office there?

2. Has the department any information to show that the business of the post office had been decreasing, or that the service was not appreciated by a sufficient number of persons to warrant its continuance?

3. When was the post office established, when was it closed, and upon whose advice did the officials of the Post Office Department move in the matter of closing?

4. How many persons, approximately, were receiving mail matter at the Central Park post office at the time of closing, and what is the average distance they have to proceed to receive mail from the nearest offices now maintained?

5. Had the department received, shortly before the closing, a largely signed petition for free delivery at Central Park? If so, what did this petition present as to the importance of that district as a residential centre?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. The Central Park post office has not been closed. Representations having been made to this department that by changing the location of the post office and establishing a post office at Collingwood East the interests of the majority of the residents would be best served, after official inquiry, which bore out the above representations, these changes were authorized. Inquiries in the matter have been answered in accordance with the facts.

2. As stated in reply to No. 1, the post office has not been closed but removed to a point where it would be a greater convenience. There was no decrease in the revenue of the office.

3. The post office was established on the 1st April, 1896, and was removed to its present location on the 1st August, 1909, after official inquiry which bore out the representations made by the residents.

4. The department has no exact information as to the number of persons served by the post office at its former site. The post office is now about three-quarters of a mile from its former location and about one and three-quarter miles from the Collingwood East post office.

5. A petition praying for free letter carrier delivery in the Central Park district was received at the department on the 2nd January, 1909, but as such services are only established in municipalities having a population of at least 12,000 and a total postal revenue of $20,000, and as these conditions did not prevail at Central Park, the department was unable to comply with the request of the memorialists. The reasons advanced by the memorial for making this requesst were 'the growth of the district of Central Park and neighbourhood and the increase of places of business.'

SENATORS L. M. JONES AND F. T. FROST.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. On what date was L. M. Jones appointed to the Senate?
2. On what date was F. T. Frost appointed to the Senate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hon. L. M. Jones appointed to the Senate on 21st January, 1901; Hon. F. T. Frost, appointed to the Senate on 12th March, 1903.

RESIGNATION OF MR. HUGH LUMSDEN.

On the order: Government notice of motion for a special committee to investigate charges of Hugh D. Lumsden against a portion of the engineering staff of the National Transcontinental railway.

Sir. WILFRID LAURIER. I intended to move this to-day, but, as the House is to adjourn at six o'clock, it is understood between myself and hon. members on the other side, that we shall take it up on Tuesday, the first order.

CANADIAN NICKEL MINES—EVIDENCE OF MR. ARTHUR WILSON.

Mr. GEO. GORDON (Nipissing). I desire to call the attention of the government to an article that appeared in the Ottawa 'Free Press' yesterday, and I do it for the purpose of asking the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) a question. The article purports to give a summary of the evidence of Mr. Arthur Wilson before the Mines and Minerals Committee of this House yesterday. It speaks of him as, 'Mr. Arthur Wilson, at present of Toronto, but officially engaged in an investigation on behalf of the British government into the nickel resources of Canada.' It proceeds:

He pointed out that there were only two countries in the world which had any appreciable stores of nickel, Canada and New Caledonia. Canada had three-fifths and the French colony the balance. Both deposits were controlled by substantially the same organization, the International Nickel Company of New York, and while nickel could be used for many purposes the price was made so high by the trust that only governments were in a position to buy the mineral.

The Canadian deposits were incalculable, but tens of millions of tons were lying in the earth because it did not suit the purposes of the trust to work them.

The nickel deposits of Canada, as we all know, are in the districts of Nipissing and Algoma. If Mr. Wilson made the statement reported here—and I have no reason to doubt it—I can only say that it is absolutely incorrect. There are millions of tons of nickel in Nipissing and Algoma with which the International Nickel Company has nothing to do, and which are to be had by others. In view of this, I would ask the Minister of Mines if he knows that Mr. Wilson is a duly accredited representative of the British government? Also has the minister taken steps to refute these statements of Mr. Wilson and prevent them from being broadcasted through the country?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Mines). I had not the privilege of hearing the statements of Mr. Wilson before the Mines Committee the other day. I am informed that Mr. Wilson is a mining engineer of prominence from England, who was in Canada investigating our mineral resources—whether for the imperial government or private parties I do not know—and was invited by the Mines Committee to appear before them. His remarks, I believe, have been reported in the Ottawa 'Free Press.' I was informed by the chairman of the Mines Committee that the report was inaccurate. I have not read the Ottawa papers so I cannot give my hon. friend a categorical answer to his inquiry as to the correctness of the report. But as to his last question whether steps have been taken to refute these statements, I can only say that it would be almost impossible for the Department of Mines—and I am sure the same is true of other departments—to refute the many inaccurate statements made in regard to public matters. It was considered advisable that this mining engineer, who, I am informed, is a man of large experience, should give evidence before the committee. Whether he has a correct conception of the mining capability of Canada or not, I am not able to say. I am sure he could not grasp, upon a mere cursory examination, the wealth of mineral of our great Nipissing country.

Mr. CONMEE. I am somewhat surprised at some of the remarks—

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, no discussion can take place at this stage.

Mr. CONMEE. I merely wish to make an explanation with the permission of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the House will permit it. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) might have been called upon to give notice of his question, for questions at this stage must refer to the business before the House or must be upon some urgent matter. I allowed the hon. gentleman to put the question, but if the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River wishes to make an explanation it must be by general consent. If the order is to be applied, I will have to apply it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go ahead.

Mr. CONMEE. I saw the hon. member for Nipissing to-day, and told him that Mr. Wilson had not made any remarks from which any one would be justified in making the report which he has quoted. I am in receipt of telegrams from Mr. Wilson, who appears to be much annoyed that he should be quoted as having stated that he represented the British government or as having made any proposition that the government should take over the lands from the present owners. There are a number of members present who heard Mr. Wilson yesterday. I am sure these hon. gentlemen were well pleased with the remarks he made and the information he was able to give. There was nothing in his language from which the things stated in the report could be inferred, and the reporters have simply made it out of whole cloth. They were not present; had they been present they would not have made such a report. Mr. Wilson was asked the question whether he represented the British government, and he said no; he said that he had formerly made reports for manufacturers of nickel steel in England. He did not at all suggest that the government should take possession of the mines of the country. And, instead of saying that the nickel was all in the hands of the international company, he said there were hundreds and thousands of locations held by others independent of that company. He gave the area as being about seventy-five miles northerly and southerly by about thirty or forty miles east and west. I took occasion last evening to give a correction of the matter from Mr. Wilson to the editor of the 'Free Press.' Hon. members will see the corrections, I assume, in the 'Free Press' this evening.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Mr. GRAHAM moved the third reading of Bill (No. 17) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire, by lease, lines of railway connecting with the government railways.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). In view of the fact that I have taken considerable interest in the subject matter of this Bill, and of the further fact that I was compelled to be absent in the city of Toronto when the measure was under consideration for its second reading and in Committee of the Whole, I am sure the House will indulge me in making a few observations which I feel called on to make in connection with the subject. The acquisition by the government of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway is not solely a maritime province matter; it is of profound importance in the solution of at least one of the transportation problems of this Dominion. I have, it is true, devoted a good deal of time to a careful study of the question but I have done so not because I come from the maritime provinces where these railways are located, but because I felt it my duty as a Canadian to interest myself in this question which is as wide as the Dominion. I assert boldly that the people of Ontario and the other provinces are just as much interested in the question as we who come from the east are. At every session of this parliament, from 1906 to the present time, I have brought the matter to the notice of the House and have endeavoured to enlist the sympathy of the government and of the members of this House for it. I think I may say that I have always presented my views from a non-partisan standpoint and advanced the scheme as a business proposition and a business proposition alone. On the 22nd of March, 1907, ('Hansard' page 5225) I addressed this House as follows:

> I have felt that while the Intercolonial has had to combat many prejudices, and while there have been many influences against it, yet in view of the good it has done to the country, in view of the trade it has promoted, the day would come when the people of Canada, irrespective of section, would join in the desire to have the Intercolonial extended; would wish it to widen out its influence and absorb its feeders, either by leasehold or by some other means.
>
> In the history of Canada, especially of western Canada, we note this striking fact that when you follow along the line of the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway, wherever there are independent branch lines, feeders to their main trunk lines, one by one they are gathered in so that after a time the main trunk lines absorb all these branch lines and they are all run as one system. I assume that that is a business course, else these great corporations, governed by keen business men, would not have followed such a course. They would not have acquired these lines but they would have left them to run as independent connections of the main trunk line. I have felt that the government of Canada might some day be impelled by the force of public opinion, by the judgment of the people throughout the country, to secure to the Intercolonial railway as against all other companies the branch lines which constitute the feeders to the Intercolonial railway. What are these branch lines but instruments to

gather up the traffic in the adjacent country side and hand it over to the trunk line system—the Intercolonial railway. In so doing these branch lines are favouring and contributing to the advancement of the sections and communities which they are supposed to accommodate; nay, more than that they are contributing materially to the growth and expansion of the traffic of the Intercolonial railway, and therefore I say that I believe the day will come when a demand will go out from the people of Canada in favour of the absorption of these lines. I would, Sir, not be content with that. I would feel that in order to clasp closer together those isolated communities and to draw them closer to the communities of the west it would be desirable that the Intercolonial railway should penetrate farther west, that it should reach the industrial centres of Canada and especially that it should reach the great industrial centre of central Canada—I refer to the city of Toronto. I look forward, Sir, also to this: There are railways starting out from the extreme west reaching forward eagerly and anxiously to an eastern seaport. Many of them are concentrating their efforts upon reaching the great city of Quebec and there reaching a great ocean port, but a port which is closed for many months of the year, and I would anticipate that at some not far distant day these railways, converging at the great city of Quebec, will be reaching still farther east, so that they may find, during the winter months, open water upon which the ships would sail that would take the traffic that our railways would gather up in the west and carry to the east. That day may come, I hope it will come—nay, more, I believe it will come and when it does it will settle all speculation as to the future of the Intercolonial railway. It will for all time settle the question of the value of the Intercolonial railway as an asset of the Dominion of Canada, and it will certainly bear out this fact, which, I have at least claimed as a fact, that the Intercolonial railway is a great nationl asset, that it is of value to the people of Canada both east and west, that it has served its purpose and its mission in the past and that it still has a purpose and a mission to perform, and I am sure that when we reach that stage there will be no sectional differences over the matter, and that we will all see eye to eye with reference to the manifest destiny of the Intercolonial railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government, in the Bill which it has seen fit to present to parliament and which we are now considering, has adopted the principle laid down by me in the remarks I have just read, and I have great pleasure in congratulating the government on that fact. It demonstrates for one thing that my forecast of coming events in 1907 was correct, and that I truly interpreted the trend of public opinion at that time. I saw it was a business proposition which no government, which had in view the welfare of our great national railway, could hesitate to carry out. For having adopted that principle the government are entitled to the consideration of the people of all sections of the Dominion, because it contributes not merely to the advancement of the Intercolonial and the communities located along its line, and the communities which are served by these branch lines, but, every community in Canada. My remarks on the present occasion shall be as brief as possible and I shall only deal with the question from a purely business point of view. The propositions which I laid down in 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909, are now crystallized into legislation, and it remains only for me to inquire whether the principle I advanced has been fully given effect to and to analyse some of the details of the present Bill. I know Sir, that there have been some very vexatious remarks made with respect to my advocacy of this measure. But I think those who know me will do me the credit of believing that in advocating the absorption of these branch lines I have been entirely disinterested personally. There are those who have been unkind enough to say that my zeal arose from the fact that I or some of my friends were in some way interested in one or more of these branch lines. Now, I trust the House will pardon me for making a personal reference, and I would not have mentioned it were it not that I am aware that such a statement was brought to the notice of the government and of the right hon. the leader of the government. When I learned of this I went to the right hon. the Prime Minister and I asked him if it were true that such representations had been made; he admitted that such representations had been made. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say in the most unqualified way that while I have been for years an advocate of the extension and expansion of the Intercolonial, my advocacy has been solely as a citizen of Canada and a representative of the people. I am in no way, directly or indirectly, near or remote, either by myself or by any of my friends or relatives, interested to the extent of one single farthing, nor have I any prospective interest to the extent of one single farthing in any of these branch lines. I feel it incumbent upon me to make that statement in view of the remarks that have been made and circulated behind my back. On the other hand it has been said, very unkindly said, that this Bill has been thrown to me as a meaningless sop; that while on its face it purports to do something it in reality means nothing, that I was in effect a bothersome fellow, that I was a figure sitting at one time on the treasury benches, that I had bored the present Minister of Railways with respect to this matter, and that they had to satisfy me in some way. Well, if these remarks were made they may at least be taken as a compliment to my persistence and zeal in the promotion of this measure which I believe to be greatly in the interests of the

people. I may have been a figure, but I certainly was not an algebraic figure of a minus quantity as were those who made use of these words so far as the province that gave them birth is concerned, and who were driven from one seat to another in that province until finally they were driven out of it altogether. I congratulate the government on accepting the principle which I have continuously advanced, but, I feel that I should analyse this Bill as it is presented to the House having regard to the amendments which have been proposed. I am afraid I shall have to say that there is in the Bill evidence of a timidity which I would not have expected from the government. There is a declaration in the preamble, which means, if it means anything, that the government believe it is expedient that the traffic of the government railways be developed to the fullest capacity of the system's operations, and:

It is deemed that such traffic, development and increase can be facilitated and advanced by the acquisition by the government of lines of railway connecting with the government railways as feeders thereto and in connection therewith.

Now, that appears to be a confession of faith on the part of the government and in my opinion it should be given effect to with all possible speed, having regard to the conditions, and should not be projected into the future as a matter for consideration at a later date. Under this legislation, bearing in mind the recitals of this preamble, should the decision with respect to the acquisition of these lines be delegated to the board of management of the government railways or to anybody else than the government itself? The third section of the Bill says that the Minister of Railways is authorized and empowered upon the recommendation of the Government Railways Management Board. He is only empowered upon the recommendation of the managing board, and subject to the authority of the Governor in Council to lease in whole or in part any line or lines of railway connecting with the government railways if such line or lines are reported by the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals to be in a safe and good condition for operation. It will be observed that the power to acquire these lines is dependant upon four things: 1. Upon the initiative of the Government Railways Board of Management. 2. Upon the report of the chief engineer as to the good and safe condition of these roads for operation. 3. Subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and 4. Subject to the approval of this parliament. There are four conditions that must be met before any of the advantages that are set forth in the preamble of this Bill can be secured either

to the railway or the people of the country. It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation, while good in the acknowledgment and adoption of the principle, is of the rocking horse variety—all motion but no advance or movement ahead—and as such I think it will be open to the criticism of the people. I am not going to say anything in respect to the managing board or as to whether they can be prevailed upon by any influences to take the initiative, or as to whether the government can put their finger upon the chairman or any member of that board and say: Go and thou goest. I say nothing as to that; but I do say, Sir, that the restriction as to the condition of the road practically makes this Bill inoperative. I will venture to make this remark in the presence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I am not disposed to unduly criticise the condition of the Intercolonial railway, that if it were necessary to absorb the Intercolonial as a branch line it would not to-day qualify because any one who has travelled over that road during the past month will see that it is not in good condition and that it would require a considerable amount of money to be expended on its roadbed before it could be put into good condition. Therefore, it seems to me that the government have shown a great deal of timidity, hesitancy, and doubt. I do not know whether it is want of courage—I should hope not—or whether they are so careful and cautious that they do not wish to take a step in this direction and do not wish to secure the advantages which they acknowledge will accrue to the railway and to the country from the adoption of legislation which will bring about the immediate absorption of these lines. If they are thus weak I think this parliament should strengthen their weak hands and confirm their feeble knees in the direction of carrying out what they seem to have acknowledged to be so desirable in the interests of the whole country and of the Intercolonial line.

I do not propose to pay much attention to the Intercolonial, but I do think it is desirable that I should recall to the memory of the members of this House and the country the legislation which brought into being the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial, which it is proposed at some time by this Bill to have absorbed as feeders and as a portion of the government railway system in Canada. The Intercolonial, as we all know, was constructed with the view of promoting an interchange of traffic and an intercommunication between the peoples of the east and the west. At the time it was first initiated the people of the maritime provinces were aliens to the people of Ontario and Quebec, they knew not each other, there was no traffic between them, they were strangers in a

measure and the people of the maritime provinces were doing their trading and having their interchange and intercourse with the people of the New England states. But the Intercolonial railway was designed as a means of transportation to obviate all this. It was constructed. It went through certain sections of these provinces, but it did not reach all the important points, and in the course of time it became necessary to connect many of the important centres of trade and communities in New Brunswick, Quebec and Nova Scotia with the trunk line. The question was: How could this be done? In the early eighties it was proposed by Sir Charles Tupper, and he had the courage of his convictions in that regard, that the people of the Dominion should aid in the construction of branch lines and feeders connecting with the Intercolonial railway. The ideas which he advanced to the country at that time were put in the form of legislation. In some instances there were constructed by the government itself certain branch lines connecting remote sections of the country with the Intercolonial railway. In other instances subsidies of so much per mile were granted to private corporations for the construction of these railways. I have on former occasions called the attention of the House and country to the immense sums of money which was contributed in the way of subsidies towards the construction of these branch lines. Of course, naturally, the proposition was one that met with general favour throughout the country, and especially in the communities that would be served by the construction of these branch lines. I think that I need only invite hon. members to call up in memory their knowledge of what transpires when a remote section of country has in prospect the securing of a railway that will connect it with the centres of trade. When the announcement went forth throughout the maritime provinces and Quebec that there was a prospect of securing railway connection with the main trunk line there was delight and joy in the hearts of the people although they did not properly understand the situation. I think I will be but uttering the sentiments of every hon. gentleman when I state that no man in these districts had any conception of what it meant to have a railway constructed and to have it operated so that it might continue as a facility in aid of the development of the trade of the community. The people of the country generally believe that because of railways the wilderness and the solitary places shall be glad and that the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. They had all these ideas and they thought that their fortunes were made as communities. But, let us look at facts and conditions. I do not wish to hide them, because if you would properly apply a remedy you must diagnose the conditions. Under this subsidy legislation on the part of the Dominion parliament, and under similar legislation on the part of the provincial legislatures; these railways were constructed by companies that were not strong financially. Men interested in the localities that were to be served came in and became shareholders. They knew not the business they were going at. but they were full of hope, they had energy and zeal, and aspirations in the interests of themselves and their children, and of the communities in which they resided. They went forward with a vew to securing those branch lines. What was the condition of things when the branch lines were completed? The moneys arising from the subsidies were exhausted; they issued bonds, and the bonds with the amounts realized therefrom were exhausted. The road was started. But we all know that a railway is never completed. Railway experts will tell you that when a road is set in motion, then practically your difficulties begin. And so it was with respect to these branch lines, constructed, set in motion, with the funds exhausted, the credit of the companies gone, because they had bonded their road. Then the railway had to be run, and in a very short time betterments were necessary, the changing conditions of railway management and operation required new and additional facilities. These were not forthcoming, because in many instances the conditions made it impossible for the railways to be profitable from a financial standpoint. Why? It is very obvious. Take a branch line connecting with the Intercolonial, or with any other railway; there are in operation at once two freight rates, there is no security as respects the continuance of those roads, and the improvement or continuance of the then present facilities for transportation. Capital was not invited, it was impossible for men to do business on a branch line railway in competition with those in a similar business along the trunk line. Therefore business was paralysed, there was not that development of the country which was hoped for. The result was, in a measure, stagnation, and certainly a depreciation in connection with these branch lines.

Let us look the matter in the face, and those are the conditions that prevail to-day. Yet it is said that the government cannot advise parliament to expend a dollar unless those roads are in such condition that they will not need one dollar of expenditure. I think it has been stated in the House already by those who are authorized to say it, that where any capital expenduture is required, such line would not be taken over unless the company had expended all that was required in placing the road in a condition which would enable the government to take it over under

the provisions of this Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, apart from the difficulty that would attend any of these branch lines of railways in meeting those conditions, I say it would be in the interest of the Intercolonial to undertake the improvement and betterment of these railways. Why? It is known to the minister, it is known to the people who live in the maritime provinces, that along the line of the Intercolonial there are thousands and tens of thousands, I was almost going to say, hundreds of thousands, of tons of steel rails that have been taken up from the track of the Intercolonial, that are laying there rusty, that are of no value to the government or to the Intercolonial. There are tens, and I might almost say, hundreds of tons of steel structures in the shape of bridges which were too old to be continued on the Intercolonial railway, and which had to be removed and replaced by heavier structures. There is rolling stock, cars of every description, that are obsolete so far as the trunk line is concerned, but which could be made available on these branch lines. There is material of every description and kind lying in and about the right of way of the Intercolonial and at its shops, which could be utilized, and utilized to advantage in improving the conditions on those lines, and there would be no capital expenditure. I think it will be conceded by the minister that in the accounts of the Intercolonial this material, these old cars, these old bridges, stand as an asset, a capital asset, in connection with the Intercolonial, and it is represented in the accounts as a part and parcel of the Intercolonial, but it is of no service and no advantage to the Intercolonial. What would be the objection to having that material removed from its havens of rest, and placed where it would be of utility, where it would be of advantage to the people, to the country and to the Intercolonial itself?

I do not feel called upon to prove the advantage of this, but I think it would be as well to ask hon. memebrs to bear in mind what has been said by those who went especially to examine these roads, and to inquire into their condition. I hold in my hand a report of the commissioners who were appointed by the New Brunswick government to examine and report upon the conditions of the branch lines of the railway in that province. I also hold here a report of the commissioners that were appointed by this federal government, to examine into and report upon the conditions which prevailed on the Intercolonial branch lines, as to their traffic possibilities, as to their physical condition, as to the potentialities, and the prospects of the respective roads. Turning first to the report of the commissioners appointed by the New Brunswick government, appointed by my hon. friend who sits at my left (Mr. Pugsley), who was then, if not Prime Minister of New Brunswick, one of the most important members of that government, and holding a position high in the government of the province. He and his colleagues appointed this commission to make these inquiries, and they have reported. I need only refer hon. members to the details of the report, and I will read the closing sentence in the general report signed by Mr. T. M. Burns and Mr. Gillmor Brown. Mr. Burns is a very prominent business man residing on the north shore of New Brunswick. Mr. Gillmor Brown is a civil engineer who has, I may say, practically an international reputation, a man who held a very high position in the state of West Virginia, and had to do with the construction of some of the large bridges that were placed over the Ohio river, a man who holds to-day, I believe, a position in the Department of Public Works, who holds it very worthily, and who, I am sure, will be a credit to the position he holds, to the government under which he serves, and to those who had to do with his appointment. Now these gentlemen made a report, and in closing their report they say:

> Apart from their value to the Intercolonial as feeders, these lines of railway have been of incalculable benefit to the localities which they serve, and to the province at large. What the country would do without them is best illlustrated by the consternation that prevails when one of them closes down for a day or two. Their successful operation is of great benefit to the people of the province, and any money which has been put into them by the government by way of subsidies has been much more than repaid in the increased value of property in the districts which they serve, and in the increased business and prosperity of the country at large, due in great measure to their existence.

Those were the words of the New Brunswick commissioners. Mr. Tiffin and Mr. Storey were appointed by the government of Canada to examine into the question of the traffic and business on these branch lines, and I find that Mr. Tiffin, in his report, referring to the number of lines of railway which they had examined, said:

> In preparing these reports we have as far as possible confined ourselves to the instructions contained in your letter, in giving our views as to the present traffic, traffic facilities, and probable traffic of the various branch lines, and we trust they will prove satisfactory.
>
> We, however, feel that while our instructions do not call for any remarks outside of the line of procedure laid down for us, that we should supplement such reports by conveying to you the unanimous feeling predominating, as gleaned from our interviews with the various merchants and people living along the branch lines, as to the great benefit which would follow absorption.
>
> The want of proper facilities for the conduct of even the existing traffic is detriment-

ally affecting the business interests of the districts interested in these branches, and preventing that development of industries, enhancement of property values, and general betterment that would undoubtedly follow on an improved service.

The present branches are hampered by lack of capital and insufficient equipment, and are not in a financial position to increase their inadequate traffic facilities, and the absorption of these lines into the Intercolonial system would beyond question result in a greatly improved condition of affairs.

These are the words of Mr. Tiffin, who as general traffic manager of the Intercolonial railway and as a member of the Board of Management of Government Railways, is certainly authorized to speak with a knowledge few others possess of the advantages or disadvantages of these branch lines. Further on he said:

It is a well established fact that in nearly every case where branch lines have been absorbed by trunk lines and extended markets have thus been opened up for business along the main line, such a policy has not only proved of great value to the branch lines themselves but has provided additional revenue for the main line, they becoming valuable feeders, increasing the traffic and the earning powers of the trunk line.

There is evidence which cannot be gainsaid and is worthy of our most serious consideration. These branch lines are doing in some measure the work expected of them. Let it be borne in mind that the object of the Intercolonial railway was to reach the markets of the maritime provinces from the manufacturing centres of Ontario and Quebec, and it was desirable, in the interests of the country that every section of the maritime provinces should be reached by the Intercolonial railway if possible. There was a further hope, which I regret has never been realized, that there would be found in Ontario and Quebec markets for the natural products of the maritime provinces, such as coal, stone, gypsum, grindstones, &c. It was hoped that the cost of transportation over the Intercolonial railway would be so low that the builders and manufacturers of Ontario would not be compelled to go to the state of Ohio for their building stone and grindstones. That hope, however, was never realized. The government buildings in this very city are built, in a large measure, of stone imported from Indiana, Ohio and other American states. The coal use in many sections in Ontario and even in Montreal comes in great measure from the states of West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Ohio. I am not complaining of this, but I am only showing the facts which demonstrate that the hopes we entertained, at the time of confederation, as regards traffic from east to west, have not been realized. So far as the traffic from west to east is concerned, that is so far as giving to the manufacturers and commercial men of Ontario and Quebec, the markets of the fishermen on the coasts of Nova Scotia and the coal miners of that province, and the lumbermen of New Brunswick, our expectations have been fully realized. Three-fourths of the traffic over the Intercolonial railway is eastbound, showing that the manufacturers and commercial firms of Ontario and Quebec have benefited by the low rates which have prevailed on the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. One-fourth of the traffic over the Intercolonial railway is from east to west, showing that the maritime provinces have not the same interest in promoting traffic over the Intercolonial railway, nor have they the same interest in the Intercolonial railway as a transportation line. Every one will admit that it is in the interests of the province of Ontario to have those maritime markets. I venture the assertion that there are none better on this continent for the manufacturers and merchants of the west than the market in the maritime provinces. The people of these provinces pay their debts, they have a good country, they have fish in plenty, lumber and coal—in fact everything that makes the home comfortable. If it has been to the advantage of the merchant princes of Toronto and Montreal to have cheap and easy access to those ports, the easier we make our transportation facilities the greater will be the advantage to the business men of the west and central Canada. By permitting the absorption of these branch lines you improve transportation and enable the manufacturer to place his wares at points on these lines with the same facility as now on the main line of the Intercolonial. I go further. We have a managing board that controls the Intercolonial which is part of the government system of railways. But we have the Prince Edward Island railway as well. I say that there should be a connecting link in some form between these two systems of government railways, to enable the consumer to get his goods at the least cost of transportation, and to give greater facilities to producers and manufacturers who supply these people to reach their markets. I believe in the continuance of the Intercolonial as a government system; I believe that the Intercolonial should retain the zone of influence which, in ante-confederation days, it was intended to have. True, many shudder when a proposal is made of expenditure on the Intercolonial. A deficit on the government railway is spoken of as a terrible thing. Men hold up their hands in holy horror at the idea. We are not concerned that the operation of the canals of Canada costs a million and a quarter or a million and a half; we say that that is in

the interest of the trade and transportation of the country. We do not whimper, nor whine, nor cry over it; there is not a word of complaint. But if, perchance, there be a deficit on the Intercolonial, then the cry is raised that you must revolutionize its condition, and the fact of a deficit is held to convict the railway of every sin in the category of administrative error. It is true, the financial statements of the Intercolonial, from confederation down, have not shown a balance on the right side. Still, there has been a profit. The profit is in the pockets of the people if it is not in the coffers of the Dominion. You contribute to the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Northern and all the other railway corporations of Canada, and the rates of these companies are far beyond those charged on the Intercolonial. The rates on the Intercolonial were established for a certain purpose—to promote trade between the different sections of the then Dominion. But, in the case of the corporations I have named, the surplus is in the pockets of the shareholders. It is said that the Intercolonial has its deficits, and for that reason you should not extend it. If we brought in these branch lines, they say, you would only make the deficit worse. Are those who hold these views aware of the fact that the system of the Canadian Pacific railway east of the St. Lawrence river, tapping as it does the rich and flourishing section known as the eastern townships, and having the traffic of the border cities on the River Ste. Croix between Maine and New Brunswick, and having a practical monopoly of the traffic of the River St. John—is it known, I say, that every year since the Canadian Pacific began operating in the maritime provinces, this system has shown an annual deficit running from $500,000 to $1,000,000? That is not under government operation, but under operation that is always lauded to the skies as the best operation of railways in America by one of the strongest corporations on this or any other continent. The company is obliged to set aside year after year out of the earnings of the railway in other portions of the country $500,000 or $600,000, and in one instance to my knowledge no less than $1,000,000 to make up the deficit on this system. And yet they would not sell it, or release it, or give away control of it under any consideration. And is it known that, in addition to the advantages which they have in traffic, for nearly a quarter of a century the government of Canada has been contributing to the treasury of the Canadian Pacific railway to aid them in the operation of lines east of the St. Lawrence river the sum of $186,000? There is a deficit worthy of the name—a deficit to the people of Canada of $186,000 on the operation of the main line through the state of Maine from Montreal to St. John, and a further deficit to the railway ranging from half a million, two or three years ago, to an amount as high as a million. I speak, not on conjecture, not from rumour; the man in the street did not give me this information; the information comes from those high in authority, those who have the management and control of the Canadian Pacific railway. Yet, forsooth, the Canadian Pacific railway is doing just what is proposed to be done under the provisions of this Bill; it has been absorbing branch lines. Those who advocate the absorption of branch lines by the Intercolonial, contend that the effect would be to improve the traffic and increase the earnings of the road, and that it would develop those sections of the country that are served and traversed by these branch lines. And this contention is well grounded in the experience of other railways. We have an object lesson in the province of New Brunswick. It is well known that the Canadian Pacific runs from the city of St. John to McAdam Junction, thence to Woodstock in the county of Carleton, and up the river St. John through the beautiful county of Victoria. In that county, at the town of Perth, it connects with a railway that had been constructed by the aid of subsidies from the federal and provincial governments. That railway was known as the Tobique Valley railway, and it was built by an isolated company. The company exhausted all its subsidies in the construction of the road, and it also had a bonded indebtedness. But when the road was built and equipped, the company had not the money to run it to full efficiency. But they kept on running it with very little satisfaction to the people and no profit to the company. The Canadian Pacific railway made a proposition to that company to assume the operation of the Tobique Valley railway, undertaking to pay the company forty per cent of the gross earnings, retaining sixty per cent, and agreeing to improve, maintain and operate the road. That contract was executed, and the railway has been in operation for a number of years with what result? The interest on the bonds, which previous to that time had been in default, has been paid regularly, and there has been a sufficient balance to give a dividend on the common stock of the shareholders of the company. Other instances of similar successful operation can be found in every province of this Dominion, but this is a case in point, and such an example is worthy of being followed by the Dominion government.

I have taken a deep interest in this matter and I am glad it has advanced to the point which it reaches even by this Bill, but I would ask the Minister of Railways to think over the necessity of having continued in this Bill the requirement that these roads shall be in a good and safe

condition for operation. I said a moment ago that it might be stated under present conditions certain sections of the Intercolonial railway are not in a good and safe condition. I am sorry to say it, and I am not saying it in any factious spirit, I am simply stating facts. Would you say that because of that condition the Intercolonial railway is to be ignored? By no means. There may be certain lines of railway which in the opinion of the board and the Minister of Railways and the Governor in Council should be acquired and absorbed, but which in the face of this provision in the Bill it would be impossible for the government to take over, and a company might not be in a position to place its road in such a condition that the government could assume it. It may be said that if they had a contract they could go to the bank and get the money, but owing to the circumlocution of the procedure by which these contracts are made, there would be no contract upon which they could bank until the lease had been approved by parliament, and the company would have no contract upon which they could bank. If they endeavoured to place their railway in proper condition, they might be held up by banks and financiers or by those who had other interests to serve. This would cause great delay, and if it is desirable to have these branch lines of railway we cannot have them any too soon. It is not necessary to take over all these lines, but it certainly would be in the interest of the country to take as many of them as possible, that is, those that have any value at all. There is no necessity for adding to the public debt in this matter, it can be done on the basis of a division of earnings, and when such a lease is executed and in operation the shareholders in the branch lines would be in a position that would not mean any loss to them and the government and the people of the country would have the advantage of increased facilities for their transportation.

I do not propose an amendment to the Bill, I accept it as far as it adopts the principle, but I think the government and the minister should take into consideration the features of this Bill which make it inoperative now. The government are hedged about and safeguarded in this matter and cannot get into any trouble in reference to it. They have their own judgment, they have first the proposition of the managing board; they are safeguarded by the report of the chief engineer; they have the minister himself who can exercise his judgment, and then it goes before council and they exercise their judgment. After all this it comes before parliament. In this process, this red tapeism, how many months and how many years have been occupied? The good that it is acknowledged would follow from the execution of this idea is retarded and the development of the country and the improvement of the Intercolonial railway are delayed. It seems to me the government should make such an amendment as would enable them to act. It is no use attempting to place on the shoulders of others the responsibility which the government must finally take if they would courageously say: we will assume this responsibility, it is in the interests of the country, we will do it, we will have reports prepared, we will satisfy ourselves, we will act—that is what the country expects any government to do.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, this Bill was discussed at some length on the second reading and again in committee. I am sure we are all indebted to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) for his excellent speech on this question, which is near to his heart. I can say on behalf of the government, and I think on behalf of the members of this House that no one for a moment suspects that he has anything but the purest motives in urging this matter on the attention of the House. He has done it for some years and has been persistent and consistent in doing it, and he is only doing now what he has done in previous years. We do not entertain the least idea that anything but the motive of doing what he thinks is best for the Intercolonial and for the solution of the transportation problem of the country is what animates him. I do not think I will discuss the Intercolonial in all its phases at present, as we will be discussing that in a very short time, when I hope to be able to show a good many favourable sides to the public owned railway of the Dominion of Canada. Any difference of opinion we might have as to the management and condition of the railway we will thresh out on that occasion. I agree with my hon. friend when he says very truly that this public owned utility belongs to the Dominion of Canada. I have endeavoured all over this country, wherever I have gone, particularly in the province of Ontario, to point out to the people that the Intercolonial railway belongs to them as much as to the people of the maritime provinces and that the people of this province have received marked benefit from it. I know that many of my acquaintances who do a large business in the maritime provinces have for years shipped goods to the eastern provinces by the Intercolonial railway. Whatever cheap freight rates there were on these goods these shippers and the consumers of the east have received the benefit. I will not now, I never did and I never will discuss the Intercolonial as belonging to any part of Canada. It belongs to us

all, and that is the reason why I tried to frame my Bill so that it would meet with the approval of all Canada. We discussed it fairly in the House and in the committee. Some objection was taken, it is true, to the principle of taking over branch lines at all, and I must differ from my hon. friend when he mildly intimates that the government lacks courage. I think the government shows considerable courage in taking hold of this question in the way in which it has done. It was said when this Bill was up for its second reading that possibly anything we could do under this Bill we could have done without the Bill. That is true in a measure, but the government and parliament, by adopting this measure, put on the statute book their approval of the principle that, conditions being right, the Intercolonial would do well to take over branch lines. We have adopted that principle. I think parliament has shown some courage in that regard and not timidity. Now, what are the conditions of the Bill? My hon. friend thought we should not leave the decision as to the standard of the road and the recommendation as to taking it over to the board of managers. It is only a question as to whom it should be left to. The Minister of Railways himself is not now and has not been, in so far as I know in years gone by, a practical railway man. He must base the judgment on which he shall make recommendations to council or this House, on the opinion of somebody, and that somebody ought to know his business. Whether we agree that the board of management is a good thing or not we accept its advice on a great many things, in fact, on all things appertaining to the government road at the present time. The members of that board know and ought to know. Their chairman is the chief engineer and deputy minister of the Department of Railways and Canals and that board, or its present chairman, would be the source from which the minister would get his opinion or his recommendation. In the one case he would take it from one man, and in the other he would take it from that man and several others, acting with him and who know the conditions. I submit that the advice of the board of management is the safest and best we can take on a question of this kind, for if the board does not know what would be in the interest of the Intercolonial and in the interest of transportation along its line then nobody does. I take it for granted that expert railway men ought to know and do know as much as those of us who are not experts as to what effect it would have on the government railway. This is not something to get rid of responsibility at all. The government must and the government is prepared to take the responsibility for all it recommends in that connection. It has no desire to take away from its responsibility, but on a great many points it naturally would have to avail itself of the advice of somebody that ought to know and that somebody in this Bill is designated as the Board of Management of the Government Railways.

The question of not taking the lines over until they are in proper condition to operate, received considerable attention. The hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) paid it considerable attention from a practical standpoint and as a result we had that amendment moved and it was carried in the committee. It must be understood that the whole country is not unanimous in favour of taking over the branch lines without some such restriction as that. Personally, I am free to say that if the Intercolonial were owned by a company it would have taken over all the branch lines that are worth anything before this. I am also safe in saying, I think, that there are some branch lines that no trunk line will take over at any price. But those that are in good condition at once come into the class which if the traffic present and future warrants, can be negotiated with for a lease to the government. That disposes of those that are in good and safe running condition now. If there be others that future or present traffic would indicate as roads which would be of assistance in the solution of the transportation problem and a benefit to the government railways, I think a scheme could be worked out under this Act, or without this Act, by which they could be taken over when they are put in proper condition. I do not share with my hon. friend his fear with regard to some of the smaller branches. If the conditions were such that the board would say that there was traffic in a certain locality which, with a decent road and a decent service, would pay, I feel satisfied that the money could be raised to put these smaller branches in proper condition to lease. However, that is a matter of opinion. But this Bill was drafted, first, to approve the principle of taking over the branch lines where it was thought proper to do so. A great step forward has been made in that. Secondly, it was provided that there should be no rashness in taking them over, but that a competent board should make a recommendation before they were taken over; and thirdly, provision was made that the bargain could not be finally consummated until parliament approved of it. Under this Act we could not take a line over until it was put in good and proper shape to run. The restrictions, I admit, are quite severe and, in so far as the people of Canada are concerned, they are absolutely safeguarded no matter what government is

in power, because the government will not and cannot under this Act recklessly lease lines that will be of no benefit to the Intercolonial railway. Some hon. gentlemen seemed to fear that branch lines might be leased which would precipitate the government into an enormous capital expenditure and thus add to our public debt to that extent. That matter was discussed pretty thoroughly. That seemed to be the opinion of several hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, but in order to meet that objection and get the House to approve without any opposition practically the principle of taking over these branch lines after proper consideration and leasing them under proper conditions this amendment was placed in the Act. I believe that the Act is a great step in advance and I think it will be of more benefit than my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) now thinks. I believe that under the Act some practical advancement will be made in the taking over of branch lines that will serve as profitable feeders to the Intercolonial railway and assist in the solution of the transportation problem in the eastern part of Canada.

Mr. MACDONALD. On the second reading of the Bill I expressed my views as to the wisdom of the government taking over these branch lines, and whatever opinion I may hold with reference to the present method of managing the Intercolonial railway I shall reserve until the minister makes his statement. I merely desire to say that I do not altogether agree with the minister when he says that the board of management are the best judges as to what should be done in regard to taking over branch lines.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not what I said.

Mr. MACDONALD. The minister said something along that line.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said as to what lines would be profitable for the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. MACDONALD. That all depends on who may constitute that board from time to time and what may be their motives in arriving at a conclusion. If the motive of the board of management be to extract every possible cent that they can get out of the people who patronize the Intercolonial railway without any regard to the general improvement of the country surrounding, then the board of management are not the best and much less they are not the only judges as to what is the best course to pursue in the taking over of branch lines. But my particular object in rising now is to call the attention of the minister to what I consider a bad piece of drafting in the Bill. By section 3 the Minister of Railways is empowered to make a lease after complying with certain preliminary conditions: 1, the recommendation of the board of management; 2, the authority of the Governor in Council; 3, the report of the engineer that the road is in good and safe condition. He must have these before he can make a lease, and when he has that lease he can proceed to operate the line.

Mr. EMMERSON. He must get the approval of parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD. He would proceed to operate subject to the ratification of the lease as the Act provides.

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement was made that they would not begin to operate under a lease until the approval of parliament was obtained.

Mr. MACDONALD. But there are certain words in section 3 which seem to bring about a ridiculous state of affairs unless they can be excused on the ground of very bad drafting. Now, the effect of the additional stipulation inserted while the Bill was in the committee is, that after the lease has been made and all the preliminary conditions complied with and the ratification of parliament obtained, it would be the duty of the minister to go back to the board of management and to the chief engineer and submit to them the question as to whether all that had been done in legal form. The language used in the Bill is that the lease shall have no force or effect until the managing board and the chief engineer have approved the terms and conditions of such lease.

Mr. EMMERSON. Even though parliament has approved of it?

Mr. MACDONALD. The language is indefinite as to that. It may mean that these gentlemen are to be a still higher court after parliament has decided. It does seem the meaning of the Bill as it now reads is that after you have all the preliminary conditions complied with and after the Governor in Council and parliament have acted, that it must go back to the board of management and the chief engineer for their endorsation. I supported the proposal that the board of management should approve of the lease, although I do not think they are infallible, but at all events that last portion of the section is entirely unnecessary and absurd.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that the criticism of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonall) is not well founded. The section provides that you must first have the report of the chief engineer that the line is in good and safe condition, then that the minister on bringing the matter before the Governor in Council is authorized to enter into a lease,

and the terms of that lease must be approved by the board of management. and that I presume means the rental which should be paid.

Mr. EMMERSON. After the lease is made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. After the lease is drawn up. Then the terms of the lease must be approved by the board of management. The board will report to the Minister of Railways as to the terms on which it is proposed to lease the railway, as to the length of time the lease would run, and as to other conditions of that kind. Upon that being done, then the Minister of Railways would, in the ordinary course, execute a lease from the railway company, and he would provide in that lease that it should not be effective until it was ratified by parliament. Then in the ordinary course the Minister of Railways would submit the lease to parliament with a short Bill, approving of its terms, and upon the Act ratifying the lease being passed, then the lease would go into effect and become operative. Now, I do not see myself any difficulty in working out that section.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman not think, as a matter of construction of the statute, that the act which is contemplated in the proviso at the end, is an act which is to take place after the lease has actually been drawn, and provides for the minister appealing to the board again, and also appealing to the chief engineer to report as to the condition of the line? Because his function, as provided in the first part of the Bill, is to report upon the condition of the road. Is not that a subsequent condition imposed by this section upon the minister after this legislation and all the preliminary reports, after the drafting of the lease?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there is an unnecessary provision as to the chief engineer approving of the terms and conditions of the lease. But I do not see any objection to that. The chief engineer is the technical officer of the Railway Department, and while it may be unnecessary, I do not see that any evil result would follow that provision. As to approval by the Board of Management, I understand it would mean that the terms would be approved of after the lease was drafted, not after it had become operative.

Mr. MACDONALD. It should have no force or effect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Until it is ratified by parliament. I would say that the draft lease must be approved of by the Board of Management. If they approve of it, then it is executed, and it is executed subject to the approval of parliament, and when parliament approves of it, then the lease becomes operative. I think my hon. friend is unduly technical. The main question to be considered is whether, as contended for by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), the government ought or ought not to exact the requirement that the chief engineer should report the railway to be in a safe condition and that it can be efficiently operated. It is an important objection, but if the House should concur in thinking that it is desirable to have the certificate of the chief engineer that the road is in a safe condition for operation, then it seems to me the details can be worked out without the slightest difficulty. While upon my feet, I want to say one word with regard to the desirability of requiring that the road should be in a safe condition. My hon. friend, I think, when he was Minister of Railways, was just as much in favour of the government taking over the branch lines of the Intercolonial and the connecting lines as he is to-day. He knows that years ago, when he and I were members of the provincial legislature of New Brunswick, we stood side by side in urging as strongly as we could that action along these lines should be taken; and when my hon. friend became Minister of Railways, I have no doubt that wherever he could legitimately exercise an influence in that direction, he did exercise it.

Mr. EMMERSON. We did take one over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One was taken over, the Canada Eastern, and it became a part of the Intercolonial system. But this is a matter of great importance, it is one in regard to which the government must move slowly, no matter what government may be in power or who may be Minister of Railways. I think it will be agreed that it is not only not desirable but impossible to move more rapidly in the direction of acquiring the branch lines of the Intercolonial than public opinion moves. There has been, even up to the present time, considerable doubt upon the part of a good many people, a minority I believe, but still a good many people in the country, and certainly some members of this House, as to the wisdom of the course which is proposed to be taken. We have thought it well to adopt the conservative course, we have thought it well to be able to say to this parliament that we do not propose to take action which will impose any addition to the capital indebtedness of the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be an awful thing to do, I suppose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that parliament would not be likely to authorize the government to incur a very large indebtedness upon

the capital expenditure by taking over branch roads. Therefore we have asked parliament to approve of what I think is a reasonable measure, and one which we believe will produce the results which are desired, in the way of permitting the Intercolonial to take over all branch lines which will be likely to prove valuable feeders. Now, my hon. friend from Westmorland, in the very admirable speech which he has just addressed to the House, while approving of the course of the government so far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, expressed the fear that there would be either none at all or very few companies who would be able to avail themselves of its provisions. I do not think that my hon. friend is justified in holding those fears. Take the case of any branch railway which the Board of Management thinks it might be desirable to acquire under a long lease and operate as part of the Intercolonial. The Board of Management would reasonably say to the company, if you put that road in condition, if you make the repairs and bring it up to the standard that we lay down, if you make the repairs according to the specifications which we submit to you, those repairs will cost you a certain sum of money, and it would be fair, in addition to the rental which you would be entitled to for your road in its present condition, to allow you a rental which would be a reasonable interest upon the expenditure you would be required to make upon the road in order to satisfy the terms of this section. Now if there is a company which has a road which is worth anything at all, which will bring any advantage to the Intercolonial or to the country which it serves, I say that upon the Board of Management agreeing to take over that road, and recommending its being taken over on a long lease, and upon the Minister of Railways undertaking that upon the road being in a proper condition it will be taken over upon a rental which would represent the interest upon a fair value of the road in its existing condition, a reasonable interest upon the amount which would be required to be expended in order to put it in a proper condition to fulfil the terms of the statute—upon that being done, when it can be taken over upon a long lease say of 99 years, no company would have the slightest difficulty in making the necessary financial arrangements in order to put the road in a condition which would warrant the Minister of Railways in executing the lease. Therefore it is that I believe this statute will be effective, I believe it will result in bringing to a successful completion the policy which my hon. friend from Westmorland and myself, and many others from the province of New Brunswick, have been advocating for years, both in the legislature and on public platforms, and that most beneficial results will follow, not only to the maritime provinces, but to the province of Quebec and to every section which is served by the Intercolonial, as a result of the enactment of this measure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Bill passes I would like to say, in regard to what has just fallen from the Minister of Public Works, that in my opinion a great deal of care should be exercised before the government enters into an arrangement with any railway company for the expenditure by that company of money upon a particular line to put it in a good and safe condition for operation. It seems to me that there would be considerable possibility of the public interest not being served by such an arrangement unless it were accompanied with very secure safeguards as regards the expenditure. I would take the liberty of advising my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to be rather careful about the conditions of any such arrangements and the safeguards surrounding them. My hon. friend the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has drawn attention to the drafting of the section, and I am bound to agree with him that perhaps in some respects it might not be regarded as very artistic drafting; but still I think you can fairly gather from the section what it is the minister must bring to parliament when he submits a proposal for the leasing of any lines. In the first place he must bring the recommendation of the government railway managing board. In the next place the report of the chief engineer of railways and canals that the line is in good and safe condition for operation. In the third place, he must bring his lease and procure a certificate from both these authorities that the terms and conditions embodied in it have their approval, having regard to the beneficial results to accrue therefrom to the government railway. If he brings those to parliament, it seems to me that he fulfils all the conditions precedent created by this section, and it will be then for parliament to consider whether it is in the public interest that the lease should be entered into. I think this may fairly be gathered from the section; and although perhaps the meaning might be expressed in more clear and explicit terms, it is not difficult to find that these are the conditions to be observed before the Minister of Railways can call on parliament to ratify any such lease.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N. B.) When the House rose yesterday, I was making a few remarks in reply to the criticisms of the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox). I have but very little to add regarding his criticisms, but I want to refer for a moment or two to what he said concerning the Railway Commission. The commission he said, was the grandest institution of the country, but then he added:

> However, I do not pretend to say that the government is entitled to the credit of creating that body. To parliament is due that credit.

This seems to me new doctrine. According to it, we are not to give credit to the great Conservative party for the great work it has done. Why not give that credit to parliament? All the Conservative government did was to introduce the measure. It seems to me that if he gives credit to the Conservative government in the one case, he ought to give credit to the Liberal government in the other. Then again, although he extolled the Railway Commission, as the grandest institution in the country, in the next breath he found fault with the work of that commission in the way of discrimination in rates. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot hold the government responsible because the rates are not made by the Railway Commission to suit his particular locality or the transportation in which he is particularly interested. He also blamed the commission for not providing that telephone lines may cross the railway tracks. But he ought to know very well that provision is made for such cases. All that requires to be done is to proceed in the regular way, and it is not a very difficult one, and permission is given with very little delay unless some good reason be shown why it should be refused. There was another argument he made, to which I would not object if the hon. gentleman had not followed the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). He said it is beyond the control of a government to fix prices by legislation. On general principles, that may be true, but as the Minister of Customs pointed out the day before, when the government were legislating regarding the Crowsnest Pass railway, they included in that legislation a provision that the Canadian Pacific railway should reduce its freight rates on all grain carried over its lines. That meant an increase of about three cents per hundred pounds to the price the farmers in the west got for their grain. In such a case therefore it is possible for parliament to govern the prices of commodities by legislation. Another statement which the hon. gentleman made, was that the customs taxation is precisely the same as it was in 1896, and he based that statement on the allegation that the customs rates were practically the same in 1896 as they were in 1909 on dutiable goods. But is that a fair proposition? Would it not be more to the hon. gentleman's credit to have placed the rate on all the imports in the year 1896 and compare that rate with the rate on all the imports through the customs in 1909?

Had he referred to the trade and commerce report he would have found the following figures: In 1896 there was collected on the imports passing through the customs of Canada $19.13 for every $100 worth of goods. In 1909 the amount collected on every $100 worth of goods was $16.58. This is a reduction of $2.55. That is to say, the rate of taxation in 1909 was 13 per cent less than it was in 1896. Apply this to the imports and you will find how much the people of Canada would have saved had they imported in 1896 the same quantity of goods as in 1909. They would have saved $7,344,000. Yet the hon. gentleman had the audacity to tell the public that there is practically no reduction in the rate of duty as compared with that of 1896. The average of the imports for the last thirteen years is $216,000,000. Applying to this saving of $2.55 on every $100 worth of imports and we find that the average saving of the people as compared with what they would have paid in 1896 had the imports been as great then as now, was $5,508,000, or, for the thirteen years, $71,604,000. I have stated the rate of reduction of taxation at 13 per cent. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), when speaking the other day made it 12 per cent. That hon. gentleman calculated from 1897, while my calculation was made from 1896. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in his speech the other day, said the Liberal party were taking practically twice a much from the people as their predecessors did. He stated the amount at $618,000,000 for the term of the present government. If he will take 12 per cent of that amount, he will find how much extra taxation would have been taken from the people of Canada had the rate remained the same as it was in 1896. That amount is $74,160,000. The rate of taxation is based on the needs of revenue, and that revenue should be sufficient for ordinary running expenses. More than that, I think that, in a country like this, revenue should be sufficient to pay for small public works without adding to the

net public debt. And let me congratulate the hon. member for North Toronto on the doctrine he expounded to this House two years ago. He told us then that the proper thing to do was to pay for small public works out of current revenue, and, when you had a large expenditure, like that for the Grand Trunk Pacific the money should be borrowed, to be repaid in so many years, thus letting future generations bear a share of the burden. To my mind, that is good doctrine. And that is the doctrine that is actually carried into practice by the present Minister of Finance. But the hon. member for North Toronto comes down with another proposition this year almost diametrically opposed to that a few years ago. He says that this is a time of overflowing treasuries and that it is a time for using some of our surplus to reduce the national debt. He comes down this year with a proposition to curtail our small public works and to apply our surplus to the reduction of the debt. It is the old story with the hon. member for North Toronto. He cried: 'Wolf, wolf', and no wolf came. He takes a new venture at it this year, and it is: 'Wolf, wolf' again. I congratulate the country on its present prosperity. But this is no time, in my opinion, to withhold expenditures for small public works. This is a growing time, a time when Canada's resources are being increasingly developed, her citizens becoming more wealthy, outside capital being invested, trade inwards and outwards increasing, home industries working full time and a brisk demand for consumption of home manufactures. And our fertile lands have yielded an increasing quantity of wheat and other cereals, the staff of life, making our farmers more wealthy by millions of dollars. In view of all this, the present does not seem the time to raise the cry: 'Wolf, wolf'.

Let us see how the debt of the country stands. I find from the blue-books that during the regime of the present government we have added to the debt of the country in round numbers $65,000,000 during twelve and three-quarter years. Of that $65,000,000 we have expended no less than $58,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific, including the Quebec bridge. While doing that we expend, not $7,000,000 on the small public works of this country, but $165,000,000, an average of over $10,000,000 per annum, and yet during the whole time we have added but $7,000,000 to the net debt of the country over and above what is invested in the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. I wish to refer to a remark of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). At page 1536 of 'Hansard' he tells the country that during the regime of the Conservative party they added to the debt of the country $118,000,000. But he drew attention to the fact that included in that $118,000,000 there is $10,000,000 which was expended for the purchase of 7,500,000 acres of land from, I think, the Canadian Pacific railway, and said that this was a live asset, adding that any fair-minded man when he counts $118,000,000 as added to the debt by the Conservative party, would put $10,000,000 as an asset on the other side of the ledger. I concede that to the hon. gentleman, I think that would be fair, and I think any fair critic in criticising the addition to the debt made by the Conservative party would take into account the fact that this asset of $10,000,000 was added.

The hon. gentleman from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) yesterday made an argument that if we deducted the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific we should also deduct the cost of the Canadian Pacific railway. There is a very pertinent reason why we should not deduct the cost of the Canadian Pacific railway, and yet should deduct the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I take the hon. member for North Toronto as my authority. The reason is very obvious, because in the one case we own the property, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we have an asset, as we have the land, but we do not own the Canadian Pacific railway, we have no interest in the Canadian Pacific railway except inasmuch as it operates to bring prosperity to our country. If you allow the $10,000,000 on the one side in the case of the $118,000,000 added to the debt by the Conservative party, you have for the same reason a right to put on the other side of the ledger the expenditure on the Grand Trunk Pacific, because it is admitted that in the near future at any rate, if not to-day, we will have in the Grand Trunk Pacific a live and valuable asset that will bring interest on its cost, and as I said it is practically the same as if we sold the Grand Trunk Pacific, put the money in the bank, and drew the interest. The hon. member for North Toronto, to whom I give credit for his power of imagination, might have gone as far as to put the $58,000,000 on the other side of the ledger against the $65,000,000 that the government have added to the debt during the last twelve and three-quarter years. If he had done so, he would have seen that only $7,000,000 have been added, represented by over $100,000,000 expended on the lesser public works of this country.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. The hon. member makes the broad statement that this government has reduced the rate of taxation thirteen per cent. I would ask him to name any of the necessities of life on which there has been a reduction. Has there been a reduction on tobacco, sugar, tea or coffee, groceries of any kind, flour, butter, cheese, cottons, boots and shoes, agricultural implements or hardware? Has there been a reduction made on any of these

articles by the government? Has there not been an increase?

Mr. LOGGIE. I do not propose going over all the list my hon. friend has mentioned, but I will give him one that occurs to me at the moment—not one perhaps that he invests in but one that the poor fishermen invests in, the man down by the sea and the man back in Ontario where there is no electric light. If he wants to buy his oil, how much less has he to pay for it? How much less is the rate of duty on refined coal oil?

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much does the government tax the people of Canada to make up for that reduction?

Mr. LOGGIE. My hon. friend tries to get out of the corner. There has been a reduction on coal oil of about 50 per cent, and a reduction in the rate on sugar equal to about $300,000, I am told. I know whereof I speak with regard to coal oil.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Will the hon. member say that coal oil can be got any cheaper to-day than it could in 1896?

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. gentleman is asking me another question now. He is asking me if the market price of coal oil is higher than it was twelve or fifteen years ago. That is an entirely different proposition. What I have tried to explain to the hon. gentleman is that the rates of duty have been cut about fifty per cent.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Name the article on which they have been cut.

Mr. LOGGIE. On the article of coal oil. My figures are found at page 14 of the Trade and Commerce report and you will find there the rates on all imports that went through the customs house in 1896 as compared in 1909.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Let my hon. friend compare the dutiable goods for both years 1896 and 1909. Never mind the free goods.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) did that. There is no necessity of repeating what that hon. gentleman did, and I think he did it very well from his standpoint, but if he had wished to be a fair critic he would have taken the average rate of duty on all imports.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. No, that is the Grit way of doing it, but it is not fair.

Mr. LOGGIE. Now, there are one or two remarks that I want to make regarding the public debt. I have tried to explain that we have reduced the rate of taxation. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we have not only reduced the rate of taxation, but we have reduced the debt rate per capita and I can verify that by the statements in the blue-books.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. You are contradicting the Finance Minister now.

Mr. LOGGIE. I beg your pardon; the Finance Minister said the very same thing. The debt per capita in 1897, according to the statement in the public accounts was $50,87; in 1909 it was reduced to $45.33, a reduction of ten per cent. But, that is not the best of it. I want the House to bear in mind what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said. He wanted to put $10,000,000 on the other side as an investment in land. Take your $58,-000,000 from the increased debt and you have your per capita debt reduced to $35.22, or thirty per cent less than it was in 1897. But the hon. member for North Toronto tells us that it proves nothing. If the hon. gentleman had a debt to pay and had his two hands to pay it with I can assure him that if there were other two hands engaged the debt would be more easily paid. I think it proves a great deal. If we owe only practically what we did twelve and three-quarter years ago and if we have seven and a half millions of people to pay it instead of five millions of people, it seems to me a very material matter as to whether it proves everything or anything. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that the pertinent thing is that you have taken $11 per head from the people instead of $5 or thereabouts as was taken by the Conservative party in the year 1896. That might be logical from my hon. friend's standpoint, but oh, if he had the other side to tell, if he had the other picture to present, it would then be a story that would be worth hearing. To my mind the pertinent thing is the rate of taxation, not the amount per head, but at what rate you collect, what the man pays. How is it that we collect more per capita in the way of taxation than the Conservative party did? That is not a very hard question to answer and my hon. friend from Leeds knows the situation quite well. When he was in business he kept the goods his customers wanted. I appeal to him, is not that exactly what he did? If his customers wanted two suits of clothes in the year he kept those two suits of clothes. If those two suits of clothes had to be brought into this country, for example, what happened? Twice as much duty was collected. Why?—because the customers of my hon. friend wanted the goods and the pertinent thing is at what rate did he pay the taxes on those goods. When I point out to my hon. friend that he pays taxes at the rate of thirteen per cent less than the rates that were collected in 1896.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. On clothing?

Mr. LOGGIE. On the average.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Name the article.

Mr. LOGGIE. I said that I was only using this as an illustration, and I mentioned clothing. But, the principle is the same. The framework of our affairs has been repaired in these days of prosperity. It was in a rather rickety condition in 1896, but since we have had some good material to put into it, material from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, since we have had the foundation repaired and the building enlarged we have, in the place of a population of 5,000,000 a population of 7,500,000. The story is a bright one, the picture is not that which has been painted by hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for North Toronto, who on this occasion has cried 'wolf,' when the facts indicate an entirely different position of affairs, but it is one of which every Canadian should feel justly proud. I have some other matters to refer to and I therefore beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 21, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—Mr. Verville.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Forget.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from the second of February next, inclusive, to the end of the session, government orders shall have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after questions to be put by members.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I moved on the 18th of November last for a return showing the number of immigration agents in the employ of the government. When may we expect that return?

Mr. OLIVER. I thought it was laid on the table some time ago, but will make inquiries.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I inquired in Mr. Polkinghorne's office this morning and it was not there yet.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. LOGGIE. When this House rose yesterday, I had finished making some remarks on the net debt of Canada. I now propose making a few comments on our expenditure, and in that connection, I wish to refer to some criticisms passed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman said—see page 1490 of 'Hansard':

> What have you to show for the $922,000,000 less the $51,000,000 that has been spent in the twelve and three-quarter years. We cannot escape from the conviction that millions of it have been worse spent than wasted.

In connection with this, the hon. gentleman gives a tabulated list of expenditures. And, he uses this language:

> In eight and three-quarter years, $57,000,000 have been expended on public works alone. I say that this expenditure is inordinate. It is indefensible and you cannot point with your finger to the compensatory advantages, to the compensatory product of stimulus or of health to warrant the expenditure of this amount of money.

I pointed out yesterday that we had received this money at a less rate of taxation than that which had prevailed under the previous government. I wish now to refer to some expenditures that, I think, we can all agree, are to the advantage of Canada. And it does seem to me it would have been much more pertinent had the hon. member for North Toronto named the expenditures that, in his opinion, it was improper for this administration to make. Let hon. members bear in mind that, during the year 1909, the amount expended in the public works of this country was no less than

$12,000,000 as compared with a little over $1,000,000 in the year 1896. Of what did these works consist? Well, there is all the dredging that is done throughout the Dominion, the dredging of St. John harbour of the St. Lawrence water-way, of the Northern Ontario sea-ports, if I may so describe them—inland ports but equal to sea-ports so far as transportation is concerned—and the public buildings, including the new wing to the parliament buildings here at Ottawa, a work carried on under our own eyes. And yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to say, 'What have we to show for this expenditure?' What he ought to have done was to point out the expenditures that, in his opinion, ought not to have been made. By the way, he did say that when expenditures are contemplated the minister is buttoned-holed by the member and that expenditures for post offices are not placed where they ought to be. Speaking of the things that are not done, he says there is no such thing as taking into account the localities which are to be served and in the line of precedent, he illustrated that by the minister coming to parliament and asking $25,000 to build a post office where there was a postal revenue of only $700 or $800. This, he said, was only an illustration of what was going on. I could not help thinking, when the hon. gentleman was speaking, that possibly we could find a precedent for that kind of expenditure. I made inquiries, and I found that in 1887, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance, and, as such, had the keys of the country's chest, a public building was erected at Dalhousie in the adjoining county to my own. The sum of $20,000 was spent on that post office, though the postal revenue of Dalhousie at the time was only $1,012. I admit that this is a little larger than the amount the hon. gentleman named, but I wonder who was consulted on that occasion. I wonder if the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. James Reid) at that time button-holed the minister and if it was because of that that this $20,000 was spent on this public building. An hon. friend beside me reminds me that of the expenditure in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Foster's) own county at Sussex. In 1881, when, I think, the hon. member for North Toronto represented King's county, a new public building was erected there at a cost of $23,000, though the revenue of the post office there was only $1,300. Then, in the county adjoining my own, the county of Gloucester, a public building was erected in the town of Bathurst in 1886, the cost being $26,000 and the postal revenues of the place at that time about $1,300. Have we a precedent, then, may I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)? Besides, I think he ought not to forget what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) stated when he asked for the appropriation which was criticised. That hon. gentleman said that we ought to have a substantial building, one built of brick, one that could be used for generations so long as the population did not increase to such an extent as to make the building inadequate for the postal service of the place. And there was the case in my own town, the town of Chatham, though to cover its whole history I must go back beyond the time when the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was not a member of this House. On November 4th, 1873, the Conservative government went out of office. But on the 16th of October immediately preceding, they bought an old stone house which was converted into a post office and customs house building, and the cost was over $10,000 additional. It is true that the opposing party came into power and that the government under their control carried out what had been arranged. But, nineteen years afterwards, with the Conservatives again in power, the government abandoned the old building, after an expenditure of $20,000, on the ground that it was not suitable for the purpose for which it had been bought and remodelled. And so they built a new post office and customs house. This gives all the greater weight to the statement of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that it is important that we should erect for these purposes buildings of a substantial nature, buildings that will meet the requirements of the public service for many years to come. So, I think the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is hardly fair when he throws across the floor the insinuation that the expenditure of public money is handled at haphazard and without precedent. I contend that we have that precedent; whether it is a good one or not, hon. gentlemen may judge for themselves.

Now, I want to say one or two words regarding other expenditure. On the lighthouses and coast service the expenditure last year was $2,700,000, as compared with $445,000 in 1896. Thus we are expending $2,000,000 more on the lighthouse and coast service of this country, and it seems to me this is a work that is very necessary to our commercial prosperity. It is of advantage to exporters and importers, and also to the shipping interests of Canada, to the carriage of merchandise inwards and outwards. This expenditure has enabled us to place Canada in the enviable position she occupies to-day of competing for the ocean trade, I was going to say, of the world; because it is a matter of general knowledge that the New York shipping interests are envious to-day of the possibilities of the shipping trade of Montreal and the St. Lawrence. The expenditure on dredging and lighting our coasts, and

placing better gas buoys in place of the old fashioned buoys in our waterways, I think is all a wise expenditure. The hon. gentleman should not have made the broad remark he did, and it would be much more becoming on his part if he had pointed out the particular expenditure that is not in the interests of this country.

Now, I want to say something about the Intercolonial, because the hon. member for North Toronto is very severe in his criticisms of the management of the Intercolonial. He read a letter purporting to have been written by the late Hon. Israel Tarte, in which he claimed that the management of the road was influenced by the member of the county through which it passes. Now I can tell the hon. gentleman that I have been a member for a number of years of a county through which that road runs, which it intersects, and as far as patronage is concerned by the sitting member, I can only say that there is not a particle of truth in the statement made in that letter purporting to have been signed by the Hon. Mr. Tarte. I think the Intercolonial is managed from a business standpoint, it is run and managed directly in the interests of the people who have made the investment. Of course, due attention is paid to its customers, and to the customs of the road. Any corporation does the same thing, any corporation would be glad to receive a recommendation from a customer, particularly if that customer gave them a large business. When they require a good man they ask the name of a suitable person from the member, and that is about all the patronage there is on the Intercolonial. I think we have got the Intercolonial at present down to a matter of business.

But the hon. gentleman asks, what have we got for the addition to capital account? He tells us that during the Conservative regime, or rather up to 1896, the amount chargeable to capital account was $55,000,000, and that since then we have added $33,000,000 to capital account because of the expenditure on the Intercolonial; and he asks the question, when is this to stop? What have we to represent that expenditure? Now, Sir, I want to point out, and I think it is important that hon. gentlemen should know, that we have some valuable living assets for this additional expenditure. For the increase of sixty per cent to capital account, we have, first, an increased milage of about 318; we have an equipment to-day that is capable of earning $8,527,069.40, as compared with an earning power in 1896 of $2,866,000. In other words, we have an equipment capable of earning, or capable of doing work, if you like to put it that way, three times as much as the equipment was able to do, or did do thirteen years ago. The 318 additional miles of railway is largely represented by the Canada Eastern between Fredericton and Loggieville, and by the Drummond County railway. It seems to me these facts convey a totally different conclusion to the one sought to be conveyed by the hon. member for North Toronto when speaking on the Intercolonial. I think we should bear in mind what the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) said yesterday about this railway, this great national asset, and the trend of public opinion in favour of maintaining it as a great national asset, to be operated by the government of Canada. I quite concur in what that hon. gentleman said as to the terms and the standard on which this road was constructed, that it was to be operated by the government of the day.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke about deficits on the Intercolonial. I find on investigation that during the thirteen years the present government have operated the railway, there was a deficit six years, and there was a surplus seven years. I find that during the preceding thirteen years there was a deficit eight years and a surplus only four years. So the condition regarding deficits is not very different under this government from what it was during the preceding thirteen years.

Another matter the hon. gentleman brought up was the amount charged to capital account during this past year. I find on referring to the blue-books that we have expended as follows:

New rolling stock	$1,353,000
Locomotives, car shops and equipment at Moncton	569,000
New machinery for shops	154,000
Double track from Moncton to Painsec	199,000
Strengthening bridges	131,000
Increasing accommodation at Halifax	499,000
New bridge at Indiantown	79,000

Will the hon. gentleman point out which of these items should not be charged to capital account. Then it has been insinuated that we are not keeping up the plant of the Intercolonial railway out of the revenues of that railway, but are charging it to capital account. It is true that certain items have been charged to capital account and rightly so, but listen to what has been charged to revenue out of the earnings of the railway during the past year. During the past year there have been paid out of revenue the following items:

Renewals of freight cars	100,000
Renewals of locomotives	135,000
Repairs to passenger cars	272,000
Renewals of passenger cars	67,000
Repairs to freight cars	602,000
Renewals of freight cars	100,000

It is only right that the country should understand that a large proportion of the cost of keeping up this railway is paid out of the ordinary revenues of that railway during the year, and only what is looked

upon as an addition to the asset is charged to capital account each year. I say, that to the best of my judgment, we have an asset worth $33,000,000 more than it was thirteen years ago.

I think that some of the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) were extreme. His remark about the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company buying millions of acres of land from the government at $1 an acre is an unfair statement. There is a phase of truth in it and the worst kind of representation is the one with a phase of truth in it. What does it lack. It lacks the conditions of the dollar an acre, which were settlement conditions. If one farmer buys a lot of land for $1,000 with no condition and another farmer buys the adjoining lot for $1,000 with the condition that $500 must be expended in the erection of a house, is it not a concrete example that the one plot of land costs but $1,000 while the other, to all intents and purposes, is costing $1,500? That land was sold at $1 an acre with settlement conditions which some hon. gentlemen said were onerous, the settlement conditions were carried out and the country is flourishing and prosperous. The railway running between Regina and Prince Albert, I understand, traverses a country that is productive of good crops, and it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman has hardly been fair in his criticism regarding the Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company, when he says that we sold land for $1 an acre. He should have added that we sold it for $1 an acre subject to settlement conditions.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac). The debate on the budget presented by the Finance Minister has this year followed much the same course as in former years. Very much the same array of figures has been presented by the Finance Minister and very much the same laudation of that hon. gentleman by his followers, the same tribute of bouquets has been laid at his feet at the conclusion of his address. But, Sir, I venture to say that never before in the history of this parliament or of any parliament in the British empire, or any other civilized country, has it taken a gentleman three days to deliver himself of the load which oppressed him, as it has taken the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. In the course of my professional career I have at times had to submit to some very long and weary hours of waiting, but, Sir, I confess that this is the longest accouchement I have ever attended—and I must say that the results are exceedingly disappointing. It has, it is true, passed through all the stages of first, second and third in each succeeding day. I thought that from the very laboured and agonizing effort of the patient we would have had at least a triplet of ideas to have added to the political nursery opposite. But, Sir, after all has been said and we have looked about for the results we find only a heterogeneous mass unworthy of notice except from the standpoint of the curio hunter, because I venture to say when you consider that mass in its entirety you find nothing like it in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. The hon. gentleman in his remarks referred to the hon. member from North Essex as deserving the cognomen of the baby member. We on this side of the House, and I venture to say many on the other side of the House, consider the baby member from North Essex as a very robust and promising youngster, and I am only sorry that when the member for North Essex was delivering his maiden speech in the House the Minister of Agriculture was not in his place, for I venture to say that if the minister had been in his place he would have been induced to revise his assertion that the farmers of this country were a slipshod and indifferent class of people. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that the member for North Essex is deserving of the name of the baby member recalls to my mind that there is a time in the life of men, if they live long enough, which is called second childhood, and I did think, during the course of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that he had prematurely reached that second stage which is supposed to be peculiar to men of riper years.

Between the severe pangs which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) seemed to be suffering during the course of his speech he was able to tell us that the Conservative party had allowed corn in free for distilling purposes. Well, I have before me the tariff of 1894 and the tariff of 1907, and I can tell the House that the statement of the hon. gentleman in that regard is absolutely incorrect, and that the duty on corn for distilling purposes under the Conservative regime was 7½ cents per bushel, and the duty is the same to-day. Further, the Conservatives permitted corn which was to be planted and sown for soiling and ensilage to come in free of duty. The Liberal party did remove the duty from corn, and that was a benefit to farmers in certain parts of the country, but it bore hardly on the people of the county represented by my hon. friend from North Essex. But, when this government took the duty off American corn they neglected a splendid opportunity of conferring a great benefit upon the farmers of Canada in not exacting from the United States a quid pro quo that they would remove the duty from Canadian barley. Then, the hon. gentleman told us that the only article in regard to which the system

of protection had been retained by the present administration was bacon, on which the duty is two cents a pound, the same as it was before. He said that bacon stood all by itself in this connection. Now, I would like to know from the hon. gentleman how he could possibly make such a statement in view of the actual facts. Has this government changed the duty on butter or on cheese? Was the duty on biscuits changed? Yes, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) might answer that the duty was raised on sweetened biscuits and that is where that great and illustrious statesman, that apostle of freedom of trade, the Minister of Customs, got in his work. The duty on biscuits was raised because the Minister of Customs is directly interested in the manufacture of biscuits. But, let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) take the Liberal tariff of 1907 and compare it with the Conservative tariff of 1894 and let him look at the two tariffs for the duties on blankets, bicycles, carriages, buggies, farm wagons, cottons, boots and shoes, and then let him see whether he will repeat his statement that bacon was the only article on which no tariff change had been made by the Liberal government. The Conservative Tariff of 1894, is the same on these and many other articles as the Grit tariff to-day. The statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Loggie) is simply astounding, and I can only say that the hon. gentleman either made the asertion with the deliberate intention of misleading this country or he spoke from the depths of the most profound ignorance.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the remarks of the hon. member convey that any hon. member of the House deliberately intended to deceive the House then his remarks would not be in order.

Mr. HENDERSON. He qualified that by giving an alternative which I think removed anything which might be offensive.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is the right of the hon. gentleman to himself explain his remarks.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker; I am a member of this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The remarks of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) are not in order.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then it must be supposed that I am not a member of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When an hon. gentleman is called to order it is his right to explain his remarks himself and not the right of any other hon. gentleman.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Surely any hon. member has a right to express his opinion on the question as to what the rule is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The wording of the rule is that when a question of order is raised the Speaker 'may' allow debate. The first step is that the member called to order has the right to explain his words. Until that step has been taken the other point cannot be decided.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is a new rule in this House that the Speaker 'may' allow a debate. I have been in the House for a great many years and the privilege has always been allowed members of the House to discuss questions of order with the Speaker and with the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would you tell me, Mr. Speaker, what remarks I have to withdraw?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may not have caught the hon. gentleman's words exactly, but he appeared to me to be using language to indicate that an hon. member of this House had used expressions deliberately intending to deceive the House. If that be so the hon. member was out of order.

Mr. EDWARDS. If I said he deliberately intended to deceive the House I certainly said what I did not intend to. The statement I thought I made was that either the hon. gentleman made his assertions with the intention of deliberately deceiving the country—I know he could not deceive this House—or that he spoke from the most profound depths of ignorance; either the one or the other. It seemed to me I was justified in that assertion because he is not a new member of this House, and with the tariffs before him plainly setting out that on dozens of articles the duty is precisely the same today as it was in 1894 under the Conservative government, how could the hon. member possibly make the assertion that the only item which had not been changed was the duty on bacon. Now, the hon. gentleman also referred to the duty on oils. I find that the duty on illuminating oils in 1894 was 25 per cent and in 1907, 20 per cent, so there is a reduction there. There has been a reduction in the duty on coal oil, but I call attention to the fact that this government has done what the Conservative government did not do; in the years 1905, 1906 and the nine months of 1907 this government has paid out no less than $907,757 in bounties to the oil people. They went to the people and said: See what we have done for you. See how we have reduced the duty on coal oil for your benefit. The coal oil man did not like this. Then the government turned

around to the coal oil men and said: Keep quiet, we are experts in this business and we will put our hands in the public chest and take out $907,000 of the people's money to pay you back. That is the position.

The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made some reference to the spending of the money of this country for public works. It seems to me that the hon. member for Northumberland is not in a position to express an independent opinion with regard to spending the money of this country on public works. My reason for saying that is that the records show that that hon. gentleman has had his feet in the political pap trough himself and has been drawing very largely for his own benefit from the public funds.

Mr. LOGGIE. I would like to take exception to that statement of the hon. gentleman. It is not a statement of fact. I have never personally had one dollar of public money from the hands of the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. EDWARDS. Not quite so soon. If I have misstated anything in reference to the hon. gentleman, I will take it back most willingly, but, if I am not mistaken, I presume the House will bear me out in my statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must again point out to the hon. gentleman that when an hon. member of this House denies a statement made with regard to himself, that denial must be accepted.

Mr. EDWARDS. Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that if I make a statement of fact and am prepared to prove that statement I must withdraw it because another man says that it is not correct?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No, that is not the ruling of the Chair. The ruling of the Chair, as well as the rule of the House, is that when a member of this House makes a statement with regard to the act of another member, and when that other member denies the accuracy of that statement, that denial must be accepted. It may be open to him by other process to proceed, but the rule of the House is that the denial must be accepted.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be properly in order for the hon. member after that to go on and give the grounds upon which he made the statement?

Mr. MACDONALD. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that is quite in order.

Mr. EDWARDS. If you will permit me I will——

Mr. EDWARDS.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am speaking to Mr. Speaker at present.

Mr. NESBITT. That does not matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order; I have to hear what the hon. gentleman desires to say.

Mr. EDWARDS. If you will permit me I will give the item in the accounts which justify my statement, and then if you say I must accept the hon. gentleman's denial, I will do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think, although it may not seem fair to the hon. gentleman, that the rule is explicit, and I have in my own practice endeavoured to enforce it, that when the words or the acts of an hon. member are called in question his denial has to be accepted. There are other means, no doubt, by which the hon. gentleman may proceed, but the rule seems explicit that the plain denial of an hon. gentleman of an act attributed to him must be accepted.

Mr. J. HAGGART. May I be allowed to say a word upon the subject? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edwards) accepts the denial of the hon. member opposite (Mr. Loggie) who says that what my hon. friend says it not so. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) is entitled to make a statement justifying the statement that he makes here. Is it not open to him to say: Here is the reason I assign for making the statement, but if the hon. gentleman denies it I withdraw it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It has not yet reached that stage. The hon. member for Frontenac has not yet accepted the denial of the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. EDWARDS. I shall certainly abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and accept the denial of the hon. gentleman, and I will go about the matter in another way. I find that the Auditor General—not the member for Frontenac, but the Auditor General—in his report for 1908, volume 3, page V—199, says that W. S. Loggie, not W. S. Loggie, Limited—that appears of course, in a good many cases in different parts of the accounts, as we all know, and, the hon. gentleman appears very largely in the accounts—but W. S. Loggie received moneys in connection with an expenditure made at Shippegan harbour, New Brunswick, in connection with public works.

Mr. LOGGIE. I wish to say that notwithstanding what is stated in the Auditor General's Report, I have not received personally a dollar of public moneys.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well. Mr. Speaker, I presume that since the hon. gentleman re-

pudiates the Auditor General's Report, we are logically entitled to take all the statements and figures which he gave to this House, and which were based on the Auditor General's Report, cum granum salis. I have no further comment to make on that, but the Auditor General's Report is there. The hon. member for Northumberland says that it is no good, that you cannot depend upon it, although hon. members on the other side of the House have frequently referred to it, and hon. members on this side have regarded it as correct. Here, the figures are plain. The report says that W. S. Loggie got some money from the Department of Public Works of this country, that he benefited to a certain extent, and I can only present that statement of the Auditor General to this House and place it alongside of the statement of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and who says that this book is wrong. I assume that the hon. gentleman had that in mind the other day when he said: It is no time, in my opinion, to withhold expenditures for small public works. I assume that possibly he had in mind either small public works in the past or small prospective public works.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to some statements which were made during this debate by the hon. member for Assiniboine (Mr. Turriff). The hon. member during the course of his remarks on the budget, went considerably into detail. He referred to a great many items which are now on the free list. Throughout his whole argument he endeavoured to make it appear that the very articles he enumerated had been made free by the Grit government. He challenged the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to point to one of these articles which that hon. member would place on the dutiable list. thus implying that they had all been made free by the Liberal party, and had all paid duty previous to that party coming into power, and that it was the intention of the Conservative party to replace these articles on the dutiable list should they come back to office. That statement, Sir, is directly at variance with the facts, as any hon gentleman can convince himself by comparing the tariff of 1894 with that of 1907. The Conservative tariff of 1894 admitted free of duty poultry, horses, cattle and all kinds of animals for the improvement of stock; animal and vegetable fertilizers; corn for ensilage, oil cakes and similar feeds, rennet, sawn lumber not dressed, laths, fence posts, garden seeds, tea, coffee, sugar up to No. 16 Dutch standard, and on refined sugar only 64-100 of a cent per lb. The tariff of 1907 charges 1·08 cts. per lb. up to 88° test and for each additional degree by polariscope test 1½c. The Conservative tariff of 1894 also reduced the duties on agricultural implements, mowers and binders, seed drills, ploughs, harrows and horse rakes from 25 to 20 per cent. One binder twine it reduced the duty from 25 per cent to 12½ per cent, and on rove for making twine it reduced the rate to 10 per cent. The duty on barb wire was reduced by the Conservatives to ¾ of a cent per lb. The Grits took the duty off twine but paid in bounties from 1904 to 1907 over $70,000.

It was most unfair for the hon. member for Assiniboine (Mr. Turriff) to have misrepresented the facts as he did. It was most unfair for him to have made it appear that the articles I have enumerated were paying a duty when the Conservatives were in office and had been placed on the free list by the Liberals. That is not in accord with the facts, and I am very much surprised that a gentleman, such as the hon. member for Assiniboine (Mr. Turriff) should have put himself on record as having made any such misleading statement.

Time and again hon. members opposite have been exclaiming to the house tops about all they have done for the benefit of the farmers. But take the items on the list to-day and those in the tariff of 1894, and see which party is entitled to the gratitude of the agricultural class. What party was it that established our system of experimental and branch experimental farms? That system was originated in 1886 by the Conservative party. Five experimental farms were then established. The Liberals came into power in 1896, and it took them ten years to find out that we ought to have more of these experimental farms. Then in 1906, they established one at Lethbridge and in 1907 one at Lacombe.

A good deal has been said about the reductions in the tariff by the Liberal party since they came into power. Let me give this House a few figures in that connection, and I take all my figures from one of the books authorized by this government. I find that in the year 1906, the average ad valorem rate of duty collected on dutiable imports from the United States amounted to 24·779, and on our total imports to 13·144. I find that the average ad valorem rate of duty collected on dutiable imports to this country from Great Britain in 1906 was 24·601 and on our total imports from that country 18·709. On the same authority I find that the average ad valorem rate on dutiable goods imported from all countries in 1906 was 26·835, and on our total imports from all countries 16·393. Further I find that the average ad valorem rate collected on dutiable imports into Canada from the United States for the forty years from 1867 to 1907, amounted to 23 803, and to 12·843 on our total imports from the United States dutiable and non-dutiable. On goods from Great Britain the average rate for the

40 years on dutiable imports, was 23·195 and on the total imports 17·772; and the average rate on dutiable goods from all countries was 26·349 and on the total imports 17·. Comparing these figures you will find that the average ad valorem rate of duty charged to-day by this government on dutiable goods and on the total goods coming from Great Britain and the United States and all countries, is higher than the average rate during the 40 years on goods, dutiable and non-dutiable from Great Britain, from the United States and from all countries. That seems to me to bear out the statement made by this side of the House that there has been comparatively little change in the tariff, that the tariff of to-day is a protective tariff in principle and in fact, as it was when the Conservatives were in power, that in fact the tariff of this government is the policy of the Conservative party carried out with comparatively few changes.

Some may say that the average ad valorem rate of duty for the 40 years is lower than the average rate charged by this government because of the revenue tariff said to have prevailed during the Mackenzie regime. But as an offset to that, I would refer to the figures of the previous years from 1867 down to the time when the Mackenzie government came into power, and you will find that the average ad valorem rate was lower then than when the Mackenzie goverinment was in power. That was the condition which prevailed up to 1878 when that great statesman, the late Sir John Macdonald, inaugurated the National Policy, believing that our people would be best served by adopting a policy which would protect all classes from undue competition by other countries. That policy was inaugurated in 1878, and that is the policy which, with slight changes, I am glad to say, is being carried out and to which the great prosperity of the country is entirely due. Another matter which is often referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite is preferential trade with Great Britain. I have only one or two figures to give on that subject. In 1896, of the total imports of Canada, 31 per cent came from Great Britain and in 1908 less than 27 per cent. On the other hand, in 1896, Canada received 50 per cent of her total imports from the United States, and in 1908 the proportion had risen to 56 per cent. Of imports free of duty, we took from Great Britain 22 per cent in 1896 and only 17 per cent in 1908, while the proportion from the United States during the same time rose from 64 per cent to 70 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is nothing in the argument of the adverse balance of trade. But they used to declare that Canada's natural market was the United States. For years they went up and down this country preaching the doctrine that Canada should look to the United States, and even went so far, in 1891, that they would have bartered Canada and Canada's honour for Yankee dollars; they would have given this country away to the United States, or would have adopted the policy that must have had that result. Yet the figures prove that this country, with its population of seven million, is a better market for the people of the United States than is the United States with its population of ninety millions for us. In 1908 the United States provided us with a market for $96,900,000 of our goods, but in the same year our smaller population afforded for the people of the United States a market for $214,000,000 worth of their goods. There was thus an adverse balance of trade for Canada of $118,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that cuts no figure. But will any man in this House say that he would not prefer to have those figures reversed? Will any man say that it would not be better for Canada if we were selling the United States $214,000,000 worth while they were selling us $96,000,000? In 1908, we bought from the United States $1,254,704 worth of horses. And what market did they afford for our horses? They took $900,000 worth. Why was this? As I stated last session and repeat to-day, it is largely because our tariff discriminates against the Canadian farmer, that is, under the tariff arrangements, it is easier for the American farmer to bring stuff into Canada than for the Canadian farmer to get his stuff into the United States. In this same year, 1908, we bought from the United States 1,123,336 dozen of eggs, allowing these eggs to come in here on paying a duty of three cents a dozen. When the Conservatives were in power, the duty was five cents a dozen, the same as the Americans charged us. We lowered our wall, we opened our gates, and the result was that they sent over more than a million dozens of eggs. Then, we went across the ocean to hunt up a market for our surplus eggs, for the United States would receive from us only 32,991 dozen. We find a similar condition in regard to bacon. We imported 7,304,187 pounds of bacon from the United States in 1908, charging a duty of two cents per pound. But the Americans put a duty of five cents per pound on our bacon, and so we sent into the United States only 30,294 pounds. If there is nothing in this, it seems very strange that the figures should all point one way. In this great wheat producing country, we bought from the United States in 1908, 5,803,452 bushels of wheat, which we allowed to come in at a duty of 12 cents per bushel. And we sold to the United States 114,926 on which they

charged us the duty of 25 cents a bushel. I maintain that that is a decidedly unfair policy to the farmers of this country. I entirely agree with the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Wilcox) who touched on this matter in his very able speech the other day, and I believe the farming community of the constituency he so ably represents will back him up in what he says.

We have in this House a very worthy and able gentleman, who, however, so far as trade matters are concerned, is a rara avis. I refer to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) who is a theoretical free trader. That hon. member, so far as his utterances on trade matters are concerned, occupies a position in this House of splendid isolation. I can imagine that when he left his native land to come to Canada—and I am sure that it was a good thing for Canada when he came, and I hope that hundreds more just like him will leave their native shore to take up their home here; this country will be the better for their coming—he must have been impressed with what had been repeatedly set forth by the grit party of Canada, that they would abolish protection—that they would not leave a vestige of it—that they would cut it out root and branch—that they would cut off the head of protection and trample on its body. I can imagine the hon. member for Red Deer, when he looked over the papers and saw utterances of that kind, would naturally ally himself with the Liberal party when he came to this country, assuming that, with the Liberal party in power at Ottawa, protection must have been abolished and free trade established. He started to build his house and found that the bricks he used were protected by a duty. The dressed lumber that went into that house had also a protective duty upon it. The hon. gentleman found that the glass put in his windows had a protective duty, nor was there any grit ready to tell him that the Conservative party when in power had largely reduced the duty on window glass. The putty the hon. gentleman used in fastening in the glass, and even the putty-knife he used in the work were protected under the tariff. Going into his house, the hon. gentleman sat on a protected chair, at a protected table, with dishes upon the table protected by duties kept up by this free trade Grit government. The food that he eats in many instances, with the exception of tea and coffee, which were made free by the Conservatives, is also protected by a duty. He steps outside to reflect upon these things. He fills his protected pipe with protected tobacco and lights it with a protected match—all under the rule of the free trade Grit government of Canada. Finally he looks around, and he spies a piece of binder twine, and in his joy he would decorate that piece of free binder twine with love knots of baby ribbon if it were not for the fact that the ribbon had to pay a duty. But he finds this piece of free binder twine, and he gets hold of a piece of fence wire, and he goes to work to make a fence but he has to use a protected hammer. But he finds these two things, and he lauds the Liberal party, which he calls the free trade party of Canada. He has found a piece of free binder twine and he has found a piece of wire; and he told us a few days ago that he could not find where the Conservatives had done anything in the direction of free trade, or to help the farmer. He has lost sight entirely of all these things I have enumerated, and which were put upon the free list by the Conservative party before the Grits came into power; and he now has the audacity to refuse credit therefor to the Conservative party.

Now there were one or two other things which are free under the present tariff. If the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), after building his house, wished, as I am sure he would, being a gentleman of artistic taste, to decorate the walls of his house with pictures, he would find under the tariff of this free trade grit government pictures which cost less than $20 he would have to pay a duty on. But if he has lots of money, and can pay $1,000 for a painting, or a pastel, then he will find that it comes into the country free of duty. Yet there are some persons who claim that this government is tending towards free trade. A few sessions ago my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) proposed a resolution in this House, when the House was in committee, and what was the nature of that resolution? To reduce the duty on agricultural implements from 17½ to 10 per cent. The hon. member for Red Deer says that he appreciates every move in the direction of a reduction of duty. I can understand that, holding the free trade opinions he does he is quite consistent in appreciating every reduction, no matter how small, as agreeing with his views. But I call his attention to the fact that when the hon. member for Souris brought that motion before this House, it was supported by the Conservatives, while every gentleman on the opposite side who claim that they are supporting a government which does all it can for the farmers, opposed it; and my hon. friend from Assinboine (Mr. Turriff) and my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) who, I think, were in the House at that time, also opposed it.

Now I want to call attention to a few militia matters, and I am sorry that the Minister of Militia, who was in the House a short time ago, is not now in his seat; I want to call attention to the manner in

which some of the money of this country has been squandered by the present administration. Take the case of the cottages for the Royal Military College at Kingston. They were contracted for at $77,739, 16 flat-roofed cottages, for men receiving about $400 a year. They have cost up to November 22, 1909, $90,995, being a cost over contract price of $13,256 or 17 per cent. That is not an isolated instance by any means. How did this come about? A favourite of the government is given a contract to put up a building. The first thing he has to do under his conrtact is to excavate, to make a cellar for the building. He goes to work, and after a while he comes back and says, I have found a little rock there instead of earth, and I want more money. Now the rock under those buildings was a shaly kind of rock that did not require any great effort to get it out. But he went to the Minister of Public Works, and that hon. gentleman hands over $1,777 to this contractor for what the contractor says is rock. The same thing is done in regard to other items in connection with that building. Now, when I asked the Minister of Public Works in reference to this building, what work was let by tender and what work was let without tender, I was informed that there were three items amounting to $6,227 which he said had been let by tender, when it was subsequently shown that the only man who put in a figure on them was the man who was given the original contract. If that is not a misrepresentation of the true state of things, then I cannot understand what misrepresentation means. Then this government went to work and built some stables for the college. For these a contract was let for $6,990, and the cost was $8,573, an excess of $1,583 or 22 per cent. Those stables were built in 1905, and there has not been a horse inside of them from that day to this. Yet we are told to regard this government as one practising economy, and looking carefully after the expenditure of public money, as a government combining all the qualities of sagacity and statesmanship. Then we have the Royal Military College riding establishment. That was to provide a residence for the men who were to look after those horses that have never been in the stable built five years ago. The contract price for that building was $9,490. They advertised for tenders in 1908, the building is not quite complete yet. Now it is a singular thing that after they let a contract for the building which the contractor says is going to cost $9,490, they turn around and tell us that the estimated cost of that building is $15.000. The fact in regard to these buildings is that they did not attempt to complete them at the contract price. The contractor gets all he can grab out of them. I was in the cottages that were built for the soldiers at Kingston, and notwithstanding the fact that the contractor had drawn some $90,000 for putting up these sixteen cottages, there was not a hook nor a shelf in one of these cottages. When the soldiers moved in they had to hang their hats and coats on the floor until they went to work and put up shelves and hooks. I find in the Auditor General's Report for 1909 at page V—81 that in connection with the residence being put up as a riding establishment—and mark you it is a residence for people, not a horse stable, an item of $43 for a concrete manure pit. Of course they have a way of getting out of that through the kind intervention of the hon. member for Northumberland, (Mr. Loggie), who says that you must not believe what appears in the Auditor General's Report. The report also says that in this residence there are tin-lined oat-bins. Are they going to feed the soldiers living in that dwelling on oats. I dare say some of them are Scotchmen and would not object to oatmeal, but feeding them on oats is going too far. There are other items, such as twenty saddle racks to be put up in this residence. Why were these items attached to the riding establishment? Of course they belong to the Royal Military College stables but they did not want the expenditure in connection with that building to run up any higher, especially as the building was constructed five years ago, and so they charged these things to another work entirely.

Then we have the new rifle ranges near Kingston. If you travel east out of Kingston, along what is called the Front road, you pass through property belonging to this government. On the right, on the south side of this road, the rifle ranges formerly were situated near where Sir Richard Cartwright has his residence on the property belonging to this government. For about a mile and a half back of the butts there is government property. But Sir Richard Cartwright wanted a portion of that land for himself. The government leased 75 acres to Lady Cartwright in 1905 for $55.25 and another 100 acres for $42.96. That is a total of 175 acres leased for $102.22, or an average of 58 cents an acre. The Minister of Militia says that land is mostly rocky and stony. The assessment roll of the township of Pittsburg, in which that land is situated, says that there are 95 acres cleared. You would think that Sir Richard Cartwright was getting that land cheap enough at 58 cents an acre, but I am credibly informed that that hon. gentleman has been cutting and selling wood and timber off this land which belongs to this government and which has been practically given to him for a summer residence. Sir Richard Cartwright objected to having the rifle ranges on the same side of the road

as he lived, and consequently they were moved across the road and new ranges built at an expense of $12,000. Here again, notice the wonderful statesmanship and sagacity of this government. Just back of the rifle butts, which were built at the foot of a hill, so that when the targets were lowered to be repainted, they fell into the water, they built an embankment to stop any stray bullets which might go beyond the butts. They built this embankment of earth and built it within 100 yards of the foot of a hill which rises 12 or 15 feet higher than the top of the embankment. And yet we are told that this government is composed of statesmen and men looking after the interests of the people. In order to have the rifle ranges on their present site it was necessary to acquire property, so they bought 34·37 acres from one man, giving him $100 an acre, $3,437. Their agent then went to a couple of maiden ladies who lived alongside and frightened these ladies into selling 55·37 acres of similar land for $1,952, or $35 an acre. That is the statement of these ladies, that the agent went to them and told them if they did not accept the $35 an acre for the land, the government would take their land anyway. That is not an isolated instance. They went right along the line and ruined half a dozen farmers in that township by chopping off 40 or 50 acres from the farms, practically ruining those farms. Take a farm of 75 acres and chop off 35 acres and who wants to buy that reduced farm? It would be impossible to make a living off it. This the government have done, sending agents to these people and offering them $40 an acre, saying: If you do not take that you will not get anything. That is what this government has done and why? Because one of the cabinet ministers wanted a summer residence on property owned by the government on the opposite side of the road. The right hon. leader of the House has in the past expressed some anxiety lest we drift in the direction of militarism. Let us see how far this government has drifted in this direction. From 1868 to 1872 the militia expenditure of this country was $5,759,487. From 1873 to 1877 it was $4,913,879. From 1878 to 1895 it was $20,889,657, which includes the extraordinary expenses connected with the Northwest rebellion in 1885. For the last fourteen years of Conservative rule the average expenditure was $1,337,604.

If you deduct the extraordinary expenditure caused by the Northwest rebellion, the average expenditure for militia and defence during the last fourteen years of Conservative rule was less than $1,000,000 per year. And yet, the leaders of the Liberal party were then howling from one end of the country to the other about the enormous expenditure on Militia and Defence. Let us make a comparison. The total militia expenditure from 1896 to the present, under Liberal rule, has been $48,444,801, or an average of $3,460,344 per annum, and of this the enormous sum of $23,177,120 has been expended by this economical, wise and sagacious government during the past four years, or an average of $5,794,280 per annum. And, we are asked to vote for next year $6,876,700, which no doubt will be swollen to $7,000,000 when we get the supplementary estimates. Compare this huge expenditure under Liberal rule with the expenditure of $947,202 per annum during the last fourteen years of Conservative rule, and which was denounced by the Liberal party then as extravagant, and as drifting to militarism. Why, during the Northwest rebellion the total expenditure on militia by the Conservative government was less than one-half the expenditure the Liberals are making in this time of blessed peace. How is it that so much money is being wasted by the present government in military matters? It is because the policy of the government is directed to keeping up a lot of high officials who are simply living on the country and are absolutely useless and some of whom draw cabinet ministers salaries. I quote from figures published in the Kingston 'Standard', a newspaper which is usually correct in its statements, and those figures, just for Kingston mind you, show, that in the Ordnance Store Corps there are three officers drawing $5,566 per annum and that the rest of the force, non-coms. and men get $7,308 per annum. What an economical and wise government? In the Canadian Army Pay Corps there are four officers drawing $4,103. Take the district staff and there you have six or seven officers drawing $14,887. Take the Canadian Army Service Corps and you have four officers getting $3,719 per annum and the non-commissioned officers and men all told only get $7,295. Take the Permanent Medical Corps and one officer there gets $2,995 per annum, or more than all the non-coms. and men put together, and would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, he is not satisfied with that; he engages in his regular practice, draws his $2,995, takes the uniform off one of the soldiers, puts him in civilian clothes, and uses him as his man of all work around his house and premises, and the country pays for it. What a wise, sagacious and economical government. Take the Royal Canadian Horse Artillery and you find that the officers draw $28,148 per annum, while the non-coms. and men draw $85,525. Out of a total expenditure of $162,000 for militia and defence at Kingstone, over $60,000 went to these officers; and that is only a small piece of it; you have got the same sort of thing, only worse, in Ottawa. Talk about increasing the efficiency of your militia, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not at the

bottom, it is not among the men who form the rank and file that you want to commence, but you must begin at the top and weed out the men whose only claim on this country is the amount of attention they can attract by the quantity of gold braid and lace they can put on their clothes. But that is not all. We have in Kingston a military college which is regarded as one of the best schools of the kind in the world, and which deserves a well earned reputation because of the men it has turned out. And why is it, Mr. Speaker, that graduates of the Royal Military College must be put to one side and men brought over from England to occupy the positions they should occupy. Is that fair and just to the young men of this country? I say it is not. I am just as much a Britisher as any man in this House, but I am a Canadian and I say that if an Englishman comes over to Canada to take an additional course in our military college alongside of Canadian youth, and if there are offices which require men to fill them, I say that the Canadians should get the preference every time. Such is not the policy of this government just now, and I say it is only another instance that they are moving in the direction of militarism. The idea of this country spending $7,000,000 a year on Militia and Defence! What is it for? I ask in all earnestness for what do we spend this money. Last year when the Minister of Militia asked the House to vote $6,000,000 he said it was because of:

> The necessity of maintaining an armed force for repelling invasion in case any attempt of that kind should unhappily be made.

Repelling invasion from whom I would like to know. Is it from the United States he expects invasion? If so, why did this government deliberately with its eyes wide open permit the United States to put their war vessels on our Great Lakes and absolutely place all central Canada at the mercy of that country. Why, in 1812 the American general spent one whole summer making boats to transfer his soldiers across to the Canadian side. But to-day there are hundreds of American steamers, which, protected by armed cruisers which this government in its assinine policy has permitted on our Great Lakes, can convey thousands and tens of thousands of American soldiers across to this side. Talk about a naval policy; if we are going to defend this country the place for us to start is to put a Canadian fleet equal to the American fleet on the Great Lakes. If, in the event of war—which I do not expect and which nobody expects—in the event of war between this country and the United States, it is an undeniable fact that because of the carelessness and negligence of this sagacious government, all central Canada has been placed absolutely at the mercy of the United States.

I want to refer to one or two statements that were made during the address of the hon. member for Assiniboine. The hon. member referred to a want of unity on this side of the House. He also referred to the naval question. He referred to the speech made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), then to the statement made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and then to the statement made by my hon. friend for Digby (Mr. Jameson). It has been the policy of the Liberal leaders and their subsidized Grit press from one end of Canada to the other to do their best to belittle the leader of the opposition in the eyes of the people of this country. I want to tell them that we on this side of the House are proud of our leader. We are proud of him, not only because of his splendid abilites, but because of his uniform courtesy and unwavering loyalty to Canada and the British empire. Not only are the members on this side of the House proud of the leader of the opposition, but every hon. member on the opposite side of the House is proud of him as well. They have a right to be proud of him, and the people of Canada are proud of him. But, forsooth, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier expressed an opinion which somewhat differed from that of the leader of the opposition. I venture to say that there is not a man on either side of this House but what would say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, when he expresses an opinion, is expressing an opinion which is conscientious, and I want to ask why he should not differ from me or from any man in this House if he is honestly expressing what he believes to be in the best interests of the country? Our leader is not a leader who is given to taking any member by the throat and throttling him into submission. That is not the kind of leader we have, thank God. Talk about unity in the ranks. I am sick and tired of having that kind of talk hurled across the floor of the House. Unity in the ranks. Why, last session, the hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) put the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) through a political Turkish bath in this House that he will not soon forget. Then what did we find? After it was done, after the hon. Minister of Public Works had gone through all the processes of a Turkish bath, the massage and everything else, and after he had come out steaming hot, a vote was called. That vote meant the speedy retirement of the hon. gentleman from the position which he adorned. What was the result of the vote? The majority was cut down about one-half, because, notwithstanding the unity across the way, a great many hon. gentlemen opposite could

not swallow it and they skipped out. But their loyalty to the party came in, and they were told to come forward and sign their names to a document declaring that they believed in the integrity, the uprightness and everything else that was good and holy of the Minister of Public Works, and like little whipped school children they walked up and signed their names. Talk about party loyalty! What is the measure of party loyalty as accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite? The measure of their party loyalty is represented by sawdust wharfs, Aylesworth ditches, Saskatchewan land deals, Merwin deals and McAvity steals. How was their loyalty measured in 1891? It was measured by a policy which expressed willingness on the part of the Liberal party to barter this country and this country's honour for Yankee dollars. Still they dare to stand up and throw the taunt of a want of unity and a lack of loyalty to the party on this side of the House. Where has the Conservative party been found on every occasion when loyalty and adhesion to the empire were called for? What was the position of the Liberal party when war broke out in South Africa? It was not until the Conservative party and public sentiment drove them, actually drove them, that they consented to allow our soldiers to go in defence of the empire. This country made money out of that deal. Great Britain sent over $10,000,000 to this government to expend for stuff that was used during the war. Our total cost was less than $2,000,000, and we made over $8,000,000 clear money out of the South African war. looking at it from a purely financial standpoint, and it is proposed now to spend the money that we made in connection with the war, the money that was won with the blood of Canadian heroes on the veldt of South Africa, upon a tin-pot fleet. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite throw taunts across the floor of this House as to our loyalty and as to the loyalty of the Conservative party. How many positions has the right hon. gentleman who leads the party across the way assumed in connection with this naval proposition? He came before this House last session and agreed to a resolution. He claimed in Toronto the credit for moving that resolution initiating the matter. In some places in the country, I suppose, where they do not regard it as well, blame is put on the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But, at all events, the resolution was put through this House unanimously. Then we find another change. He comes to us and says that not a ship shall go to the assistance of the mother country without the consent and sanction of this parliament, and he calls upon the Grit organs from one end of Canada to the other to pipe that tune, and upon the hon. member for Assiniboine (Mr. Turriff) to dance to it. He dances to it and they all dance to it. Then he goes to the Conservative city of Toronto, the loyal city of Toronto, and he tells the people there: We will send our fleet to the assistance of the motherland if she is severely pressed. He orders the organs to pipe to that tune, he orders the hon. member for Assiniboine to dance to that tune, and the organs pipe the tune and the hon. member for Assiniboine dances to it. Now he comes down with a proposition for a tin-pot navy and, of course, they will dance to that tune. That is the measure of their party loyalty. Loyalty of that kind is a synonymous term with the word servility.

Mr. Speaker, I have probably taken up more of the time of the House than I should have done. But, at least I have not taken up three days like the hon. member for Northumberland. I thank this House for the attention it has given to me during my remarks in connection with the budget.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (Northumberland, Ont.) My hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) refers several times in his speech to the hon. member for Northumberland. There are two or three members for Northumberland and I would like him to be more definite and say which one he means.

Mr. EDWARDS. The point raised is certainly one worthy of consideration. I, of course, made no reference to my hon. friend from North Northumberland, Ont. (Mr. Owen) but to the hon. gentleman from Northumberland, New Brunswick, (Mr. Loggie), who preceded me in this debate, and I wish that to be explicitly understood.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford.) If I had any desire to be rude or sin against the amenities of debate, I could easily reply in like manner to the unkind remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edwards) regarding the speech of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie). I have no intention, however, of following the hon. gentleman in that line, nor shall I follow him through the course of his long and wearisome remarks, except to make a brief reference to that portion of his speech towards the end in which he became so excited. The hon. gentleman pointed out that in our military system we paid the officers higher than the men. Well, I think that if he would search through all the countries where there is a military system in existence he will find that the officers are usually paid higher than the men. But he should also bear in mind that the militia of Canada is a very small body and that its principal object is to train officers in case there might be

trouble, so that naturally there is a greater proportionate number of officers than there would be in a regular military system. As regards the cottages at Kingston, which have always bothered the hon. gentleman, at least since I have been a member of this House, that expenditure was thoroughly explained in the Committee of the Whole when the estimates were being passed. The explanation was then accepted by the House and I do not see that there was anything in that expenditure for the hon. gentleman to become so excited about.

As regards the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) I have only to say that I throw back his challenge to the hon. gentleman, and I tell him it is absolutely untrue that we on this side were driven to support that hon. minister at any time. The only reason why the vote was less when the Minister of Public Works was challenged in this House was because our hon. friends snapped the verdict, and no one knows that better than the hon. gentleman. I do not know a man on this side of the House who was not perfectly willing and anxious to vote on that occasion in support of the hon. minister; and so far as I am concerned, I must say that I have never, either in public or private life, seen anything more disgraceful than the attack made on that minister, for which there was not an iota of proof or basis.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NESBITT. And hon. gentlemen opposite are well aware of it. As regards the rest of the speech by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) it was simply the same old story told in the same old way, and it would be wasting the time of the House to discuss it.

I wish to congratulate the Minister of Finance and the government on the very excellent budget statement brought down to the House. It is quite true, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and other gentlemen opposite claim, that the farmers of the west are responsible to a certain extent for the financial statement and also that to the farmers of other portions of the country credit for the good results is due. And I might add that the manufacturers and their operatives, the merchants, the clerks, and in fact all the workers in this Dominion, have contributed to the great prosperity we enjoy. But that does not take away one particle of the credit due the government and the Minister of Finance. When a large manufacturing industry proves successful, no one doubts that the success is due in a large measure to the operatives employed in that industry, but none the less, no one would dream of taking from the management, on that account, the credit for its good showing. It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their speeches on the budget, ought to try to be reasonably reasonable. I have never seen anything gained by misstatements of facts.

I am pleased to know that the Minister of Finance has transferred from capital account to income the expenditure on our arms and public lands and that he has told us he agrees to a large extent with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his contention that the bounties should have been charged to income. Personally I think they should, but I think the explanation of the Minister of Finance is quite reasonable, when he says that he simply followed the usual system of bookkeeping and charged the bounties to capital account just as we have been accustomed to charge subsidies to railways to that same account. I notice with a great deal of pleasure the statement of the Minister of Finance that the principal bounties will expire in December, 1910, but while I agree with my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the bounties themselves are a vicious form of taxation, I am not prepared to admit that they were unnecessary at the time. I am told that they were proposed in the first place by our friends opposite, but in any event. I have not the slightest doubt that when the government decided to pay these bounties they did so after giving the matter the most careful consideration, and I have not the slightest doubt that they were justified by the circumstances. If you look back over the results which have followed, I do not think you can honestly say that these bounties were not justified. There can be no doubt that, in the opinion of the majority of people in this country, it was absolutely necessary to establish steel industries of our own which could compete with those of the rest of the world; and, if those industries are today on a good footing, it is no doubt due to that system of bounties. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that in this case the bounties have not been a benefit. In my opinion, they have been a great benefit to this country and abundantly justified by the results. But I am at the same time convinced that there is no longer need for renewing that system. I believe that the steel industry has been sufficiently established to be able now to take care of itself. But before leaving this subject, I would point out that, as the Minister of Customs has shown us, at the time the bounties were given there was a reduction made in the tariff which allowed outside steel to come in cheaper than it otherwise would.

I listened with great attention to the criticisms of the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as I always do; for

I am not one of those so party-bound as not to admire ability on the opposition side, and I must confess that I look upon the hon. member for North Toronto as a great critical speaker, a man of great capabilities. Therefore, I was much surprised that he allowed himself—I suppose from political partisanship—to be led into some extravagant statements, if not mis-statements, such as allow even a new member like myself and one not well posted in political matters to make corrections. Before going on with these corrections, I may say that I noted with pleasure that the Minister of Finance proposed, if he could, to pay the naval expenditure out of income. While I am just as willing as any member of this House to see the naval expenditure undertaken, I think the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the government have been very wise in the proposition they have brought down. It was a very delicate proposition and required very delicate handling. It is all very well for our friends of the opposition, who have no responsibility, to say what they would do and what they would not do. But if they were absolutely responsible, as is the Prime Minister for everything he says, you would find a very different tone in their utterances. The Finance Minister having stated that he will if he can, pay the naval expenditure out of income, I think it is the duty of every one of us, no matter on which side of the House he may sit, to assist him in every way possible to carry out that intention. The Finance Minister is the one who must give final sanction to all proposals of expenditure before they are made to the House. But the hon. minister—I am very glad to say—is only human after all. And when members on this side or on the other side, press upon the minister expressions that, possibly, could be avoided, it is only human for the Finance Minister, in some instances, to give way. I heard an hon. member on the other side say in a recent speech that it was good politics for members of the opposition to attack the Minister of Finance for his operations during the year, even though expedients had been pressed upon him by those who attacked him, and that it was only baby talk for us to plead the contrary. I hope there are not many members on the other side who hold that if the Finance Minister grants a request of theirs for something to be done, they have a right to throw it up to him at the end of the year as an unnecessary expenditure for which he is responsible. The hon. gentleman who spoke in this way, I am sure, was carried away by the excitement of the debate—for I know him to be a very decent fellow at heart—when he said he thought it creditable in politics to do a trick of that kind.

Now I wish to point out one or two things that, I think, were wrong in the criticisms offered by the hon. member for North Toronto in the early part of this debate. After criticising the budget from the budget standpoint—very lightly, I must confess—he went on to say in his own inimitable fashion, 'This is a business government, now let us see what this business government does.' And he immediately brought up the old story of the Newmarket canal. For some reason, hon. members on the other side of the House always laugh at members on this side when they attack the Newmarket canal expenditure, suggesting that we are ashamed of it. Was there any intimation in our vote, when that question was challenged in the House last session, that we were ashamed or afraid of this expenditure on the Newmarket canal? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is either a very bold man or a very egotistical one who will say that any public work in this country will not be necessary. When you consider the progress the country is making, who can tell that any given expenditure of public money is uselessly made? The Newmarket canal is within very easy range of a great growing city, the city of Toronto. I am sure that I have as much reason to prophesy that we should be very well pleased with the expenditure on the Newmarket canal inside of a few years, as hon. gentlemen opposite have to prophesy the contrary. The next item the hon. member (Mr. Foster) attacked was the St. Andrew's rapids. He dwelt on this in very glowing terms, he seemed to fairly smack his lips over this question. I wondered at the time what this St. Andrew's rapids question was. I did not know much about it, so I tried to find out. I have a letter here on the subject, which says:—

> The entire structure is generally referred to as 'St. Andrew's Movable Dam.' It consists essentially of a concrete submerged dam; a steel superstructure of six main spans and a shore span. The top deck of the steel structure is a concrete floor and is to be used as a highway bridge. From the lower portions of the bridge are suspended steel girders or curtain frames on which are suspended in place and so arranged that they can be rolled by means of electrical machinery, curtains, or sets of wooden laths hinged together. These curtains and their appurtenances are for the purpose of regulating the level of the water above the dam for the purpose of navigation.
>
> Between the western end of the dam and bridge and the lockport shore is a lock for the purpose of locking vessels past the dam. The location of these works is at St. Andrew's rapids, about twenty miles north of Winnipeg. Up to the present time navigation has been impracticable, except for small boats, mainly pleasure craft, and then only at certain seasons of the year.
>
> There is no bridge between this point and the outskirts of the city of Winnipeg, about

twenty miles south, and the highway on top of the dam will, no doubt, be a great convenience for that section of the country.

I think that is all I need to read as to the advisability of building that dam. There is no bridge for twenty miles between this dam and the city of Winnipeg. Does any man tell me that, in that growing country, this bridge which is a highway, and a way for both foot passengers and vehicular traffic, is not necessary in the interests of that country? Now, the dam itself is of a kind new in America. I understand that there is one similar in principle in France, but the waste gates or shutters there are raised by hand power, whereas in the case of the St. Andrew's dam the shutters are raised by electricity. Therefore, it is the only one of its exact kind, probably, in the world. Now the hon. member for North Toronto said that this St. Andrew's dam was 35 or 40 feet above the land—so he is reported in the 'Hansard,' but I understood him to say 75 feet. I have the photographs of the dam here, also the blue prints or drawings, and the actual measurement from the top of the dam to the land of the prairie sections is 23 feet. Therefore, the approaches will only have to be built to the height of 23 feet, not 75, or 35, or 40. The hon. gentleman is welcome to see these photographs and blue prints, to find out whether I am stating facts. The St. Andrew's dam was quoted to us as a striking example of the prodigal administration of this government, but I think I have shown very clearly that, on the contrary, it is a proof, if proof were needed, that this government is conducting our public affairs in a business manner and in an economical fashion.

Several hon. members on the opposition side of the House, including the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Edwards), have quoted figures to show that the duties collected under this government were just as high as the duties collected under the Conservative government. Now, why they should desire to show that, is more than I can understand. I suppose that most hon. members on the opposition side are in favour of a higher tariff, they believe in a protective duty, therefore why they should desire to show that the duty under the Conservative government was no higher than it is now, is more than I have been able to understand. Several hon. members have contended that the duties under the old government are not higher than they are now. Now there is no use discussing so large a question as the tariff by picking out some isolated instances; the only way to discuss it is by taking the tariff as a whole. If, therefore, you take the tariff as a whole, you will find that we are at present collecting a little more than three per cent less duty than the old government were collecting in 1896.

Some hon. gentlemen have argued that it averages about one per cent less. The only way we can arrive at the fact is to take into consideration the free imports, and contrary to what was said by the hon. gentleman from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), they are very much greater under this government than they were under the former government. But I will not dwell on the question of free imports, as it has been lengthily discussed already.

I will now briefly discuss the question of loans. The hon. member for North Toronto reiterated this year that the cost of obtaining loans under the present administration had been greater than the cost of obtaining loans during the 13 years under the previous administration. Well, Sir, I took the trouble to look up the facts. The hon. member for North Toronto contended that on account of the additional cost of obtaining loans by the present Finance Minister, the credit of Canada had been impaired. Now, I take issue with him on that statement. The actual commission for obtaining loans at present is the same now as it was before, but the method of obtaining loans is different. A Canadian Minister of Finance, whether he be Conservative or Liberal, has nothing whatever to do with the form of obtaining loans, he has to adapt himself to the method prevailing at the time. At present he has to float all loans through underwriters. I am not quarrelling with that custom, because I believe it is a good one. Formerly a loan was taken on the market, and as it was absorbed it was paid over. Now the loan is floated through underwriters, they are responsible, they have to do the advertising, they have to float the loan, in other words, they have to see that the loan is absorbed, and for doing this they charge a certain commission. Our recent loans have been floated at 98½. Now, let me say that the cost during the last 15 years, excepting the few short time loans that have been effected by the present administration, is in favour of the present Minister of Finance, not against him. I may say that I think the Minister of Finance was wise in floating the short time loans. You must remember that shortly after the present government took charge of affairs the Boer war occurred, when the whole resources of Great Britain were strained, so far as her borrowing power was concerned. Immediately following that was the Russia-Japanese war, and we all know how that raised the price of money. So I think the Minister of Finance showed his wisdom very clearly, in floating short time loans in place of long time loans, until money became cheaper in the money markets of the world. Now, the only fair comparison to make between the two periods is to ascertain whether we

are getting loans now at the same ratio as other countries are getting them, which are practically in the same position we are. I will take a country that is growing very fast, a country whose credit is excellent, and that is the independent country of Argentina. It is stated that Argentina shipped to England last year 40 per cent of her foodstuffs. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I see it stated in some of the financial papers that Argentina shipped to Great Britain last year 41 per cent, to be accurate, of her foodstuffs. Now, the figures I am quoting are taken from the London Stock Exchange annual report. In December last her 3½ per cent, with a 1 per cent sinking fund, were selling at 76½, and our 3½ per cent were selling at 101.

Austrian 4 per cent bonds were 1·06. Their 3 per cents were 86 and our 3 per cents were 1·01. Russian 3 per cents were 68, Chili's 4½ per cents were 96. Germany's 3 per cents were 83. New South Wales 3½ per cents were 89. New South Wales you know is part of the Australian confederation. It was stated in this House by an hon. member that the Australian Commonwealth had sold their bonds to better advantage than we did. I looked in all the monetary papers I could get, I looked in the report of the London Stock Exchange but could find no quotation of the Australian Commonwealth. I did find New South Wales and some of the other provinces but none of them compared with us so far as the price of bonds was compared.

Let us look now at the prices at which Canadian loans have been issued. Some of them were:

Year.	Amount.	Per cent.	Price.
1884... ..	$ 5,000,000	3½	$0 91
1885... ..	4,000,000	4	1 01
1888... ..	11,000,000	3	92·95
1897... ..	2,000,000	2½	0 91

The issue of 1897, the first year that the present Finance Minister was in office, was at the lowest rate of interest. Week before last we borrowed $4,000,000 at 3½ per cent and it was sold at 99. The Indian government in the same week issued 3½ per cent bonds at 96½. That is the most recent sale and speaks volumes for this country.

An hon. member in speaking of the tariff accused this government of allowing food stuffs to come in and thus discriminating against the farmer. He quoted some figures of imports among them being:

Articles.	Year.	Value of imports.
Provisions..	1905	$1,000,000
"	1908	4,000,000
Lard..	1904	67,000
"	1908	1,000,000
Eggs..	1905	74,000
"	1908	222,000

Articles.	Year.	Value of Imports.
Butter..	1906	64,000
"	1908	192,000
Green fruit... ..	1905	2,000,000
"	1908	5,000,000

The hon. member endeavoured to prove by these figures that we were differentiating against the farmer, or in other words that we were not protecting the farmer. If you take the trade and commerce or the customs report, you will find such things as canned fruit and vegetables in which there has been a large increase and yet the hon. member said that we are not protecting the farmer. We never pretended that our tariff was a protective tariff, we do not pretend that our tariff is a protective tariff. We say—and nothing in the world, if I were to talk for a week, would make it more emphatic than these figures—that our tariff is a revenue tariff. Whether we are creditable with the fact or not, but it is a fact apparently by these figures that these things have been coming in in larger quantities in the last few years, or in other words since the coming into power of the present premier and this government. If you examine the trade returns you will find that the bulk of the agricultural products that are now coming into Canada at the time this government came into power were supposed to be luxuries. Now, owing to the fact that the people of this country have progressed, they are no longer supposed to be luxuries. Take the item of green fruit. A few years ago strawberries and ripe tomatoes and things of that kind were only brought into the cities and by a very few people. Now nearly all our towns are able to purchase these things, before the Canadian articles come into the home market. You know that owing to the climatic conditions in the United States these early fruits and vegetables come from Virginia and all along the warmer border states and beginning in a short time from this date enormous quantities of these fresh articles will come into the cities and towns of this country. The people who years ago could not afford to buy these things now use them commonly. As to the farmers of this country I venture to say that I speak for ninety per cent, yes, ninety-nine per cent of the farmers when I say that they are not so narrow that they begrudge to other people the privilege of buying these things when they cannot supply them.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me said something about eggs and butter. Do you know that some butter has been imported into this country in the last year or two? Why? Because the price of butter rose last year and it is now sold at an enormous price in most of our cities. It sold at from 32 cents to 35 cents and last year it rose in Montreal to 40 cents a pound. Is it

any wonder then that we imported butter? Butter can be brought in only when the price is very high. Do you mean to say we should protect the farmer more than that? Do you mean to say it is not necessary for the people of the country, the ordinary consumer, to have butter and that we should increase the duty and increase the price of butter and eggs? Why the price of eggs is abnormal, almost prohibitive now without putting on a duty. I do not believe there is a farmer in this country who would ask to be further protected. Take for instance strawberries, which will be coming in in large quantities from the other side shortly and selling at prices which are prohibitive for me but still within the reach of many people. I do not believe the strawberry raisers of this country are asking us to put on a higher duty so as to prohibit the people who can afford to do so, from bringing in strawberries or early potatoes or butter or eggs, in case the prices are abnormal. There is no fear of any of these things coming into Canada unless the prices here are abnormal.

The hon. gentleman who made these remarks at that time dwelt at some length on potatoes. To a small extent, potatoes may be imported from the United States into the Canadian towns along the border, but I venture to say that Canadians ship more agricultural products to Detroit and Buffalo and other large towns than the American farmers send into Canada. My hon. friend told us that he would put up the Canadian tariff as high as the American tariff, but with that I do not agree, for I believe the tariff is quite high enough in nearly all instances.

Mr. BLAIN. What about pork?

Mr. NESBITT. I am a farmer and I will tell the hon. gentleman that the tariff on pork is quite high enough to suit me, and I suppose I am about as greedy as any ordinary farmer. We can raise pork to-day against the American farmer—

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman differs from the hon. gentleman who represents the other part of this county, who moved to increase the duty on pork.

Mr. NESBITT. I cannot help what my hon. friend from the other part of the riding may do, but giving my opinion as a farmer and not from any party or political point of view, I say that the present duty on pork enables us to compete with the pork producers of the United States, and I do not believe that there is any general demand amongst the farmers of Canada for an increase in the duty. I may state that with the exception of the town I live in, my constituency is agricultural, and before coming to this session I held three meetings in my county and at every one of them I asked if there was a man present who wanted a higher duty on pork, and I got not a single affirmative answer. In my own experience I sold pork last week, and I sold some in November and October, and I got a very high price, a price which I am afraid was more than the ordinary consumer in Canada can afford to pay. So far as the Canadian farmer is concerned, there is no necessity in my opinion to put a higher duty on pork. Of course, the heavy pork used by lumbermen in the woods is imported, but I do not think the farmers should ask the government to penalize that by increasing the duty when there is in my opinion no necessity for it.

Mr. BLAIN. Last session a large deputation, including representatives from my own county, interviewed the government, asking for an increased duty on pork.

Mr. NESBITT. I have no wish to quarrel with these gentlemen, but I certainly am free to give my own opinion on the matter. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Miller) tells me that the Canadian agricultural paper is opposed to increasing the duty. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say a word about this story we casually hear from gentlemen opposite, that we do not give a preference to England. I speak entirely apart from any party motive, and I say that the reason why we do not appear to give a preference to England is that most of the free goods come from the United States, where they are produced, but if you look at the goods which pay duty you will easily discern that we do give a preference to England. Then again, I believe that the English manufacturers could very materially increase their trade with Canada if they took proper means to do so. It is the commercial people of England who are largely at fault if they do not do a more extensive trade with Canada, because I believe that the ordinary manufacturer in this country would prefer to do business with England, if he could do it on an equal basis. But, the United States travellers are in our offices every day; they study our wants and they supply our demands, while the English traveller comes seldom and if he has not the goods we want he leaves us at that and does not try to meet our requirements. If the English manufacturers would study the trade conditions in Canada, I venture to say that in a year from now the balance of trade in manufactured goods would be turned from the United States to England. And, as to this adverse balance of trade against us, I cannot agree that it is to our disadvantage. When we go into business as individuals, we have first to erect our buildings and get in our machinery and be prepared to supply goods before we get a return. I believe that Canada is identically in the position of an individual in that respect. It is just starting up in business, and it is progressing so fast that the only

wonder to me is that the balance of trade against us is not double what it is. When we are prepared to do business, as we will be in the course of a few years, the indications are that our exports will be great, and in the meantime the balance of trade against us, is simply an indication of the enormous energy and progress which this country is making. I for one am not disappointed that the balance of trade is against us, and I believe it will continue so for the next five or ten years, or so long as we are progressing as rapidly as we are.

Now, I believe Sir, that this government is not only doing the best it can for the present—and without fear of contradiction I hold it is doing remarkably well—but, it is looking to the future. The government has had engineers surveying the Welland canal, it has had engineers reporting on the Georgian Bay canal, it has had engineers reporting on the Hudson Bay railway, and all with a view to the future. And, let me say here, that the present Minister of Finance to whom I give all possible credit is one of the most capable men I have ever met in my life. They know very well that as long as the Transcontinental railway is going on it is impossible for us to do more at the present time. But, they are looking ahead just the same as the manager of a large corporation looks ahead and that is all that we expect them to do. Whenever we are in a position to do so, this government, led by the right hon. the Prime Minister, of whom we are so proud, will undertake these other great works. That is all we can do. Now, I desire to say a word with reference to what the hon. member for Frontenac said as to their being proud of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I find no fault with that. There is no man in this House, even on his own side, who respects the leader of the opposition more than I do. But, I do not see why the hon. gentleman should get into such a flurry because somebody may have taunted hon. gentlemen opposite with not being proud of the leader of the opposition. As to the taunt thrown back on us by the hon. gentleman, there has been no time since I have been in this House when we followed the Prime Minister no matter what we were asked to do. We have had no reason that I know of since this government came into power to dispute any course that the Prime Minister has asked us to follow. I hope and believe that we never will have as long as the Prime Minister is spared, and I hope that he and also my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, for whom I have the greatest possible respect, will be long spared to guide the affairs of this country of ours.

At six oclock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 58) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company—Mr. McGiverin.

On section 5,

Nothing in this Act shall affect or impair the rights of the government of Canada under or by virtue of the provisions of the section submitted by section 5 of chapter 128 of the statutes of 1906 for section 43 of chapter 103 of the statutes of 1894.

Mr. HENDERSON. I see the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in his place, as he always is, and I would like to ask him a question. What would be the effect if the government should decide to take over this whole work before the expiration of the time allowed by this Bill? Will the fact that we are extending the time for such a long period be a hindrance to the government in that case? May not the company say: We have rights to do with this matter for so many years, and we do not think the government should interfere with those rights. I believe that if ever this work is to be constructed it will be by the government and not by a private company.

Mr. GRAHAM. The answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will be found in this section. In 1906, to safeguard the government, a clause was inserted that the government, at any time, could take over this project by paying the money that had been expended by this company. That provision is re-enacted by this Bill. So, whatever powers the company may have, the government is protected by this section allowing the government, on behalf of the country, to take over the work at any time.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Goodeve.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Mayrand.

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Burrell.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Edmonton Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Doherty.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding: 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.'

Mr. GLEN. CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I had hoped that I would not have to rise and address the House to-night, because I have been, with other western members, attending hockey matches the last few days, and my voice is not as good as I would like it to be. I tried to borrow the voice of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), but although he and I are always on friendly terms, he will not assist me to that extent. There are two or three matters upon which I would like to touch briefly. The first one relates to something that was said by the right hon. the First Minister, I think on the 16th of December, in answer to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. member asked him if he had made up his mind what seat he would sit for, and he replied in these words:

> The moment the question is put in this way, I have no hesitation in answering it.

I am sorry the First Minister is not in his seat at this moment. Inasmuch as I had brought to his attention some days previously the question of his holding two seats, I feel that his answer I have just quoted was somewhat of a reflection on my courtesy. I do not want the right hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman in this House, to think that I would be discourteous to him as a gentleman, in any way; but I always hold myself ready to fight gentlemen who are opposed to me in all matters political. If it was discourteous in me to put my question on that subject to the First Minister in the words that I used, I will have to reconsider my practice, and guard myself against falling into the error of taking a precedent from the First Minister and using his words, as I did on that occasion. He told us, after speaking at some length upon the question, that he had not been asked to resign, either by one party or the other, in Quebec East or in the city of Ottawa. I used his words some days afterwards, and asked him if he had been asked to resign, and he evidently thought that I was discourteous. He surely knew that in the city of Ottawa there were several gentlemen of his political persuasion who were very anxious that he should resign, because they were fighting among themselves for his position when he vacated it. Their action reminded me of the text:

> They parted my garments among them, and for my vesture did they cast lots.

That is what his friends have been doing in Ottawa, and when the vesture descended on the shoulders of one of those gentlemen in Ottawa a few days ago, the hon. the First Minister had to go out and take it back from him.

I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend from Red Deer on the tariff. You will remember, Sir, that last session when I spoke of my hon. friend in this House, I used toward him some of our western language, and spoke of him as a political maverick. When I was listening to him the other day discoursing on the policy of this government in regard to bonuses, I was really glad, because I felt that the time had come to get a rope and catch him and put a brand on him. I felt sure that the hon. gentleman would be on this side of the House in future. But before he finished his speech I realized that had any of us on this side of the House been so ill-advised as to take him into our arms, and into our fold, and put a brand on him, we would before long have been arrested for stealing. When he wound up his speech I felt perfectly sure that if the Conservative brand was found on him, whoever put it on him would have been up for cattle stealing, or maverick stealing rather, and for the reason that my hon. friend would have been found, where he always is found, sucking the Grit cow.

He was somewhat unfair when he spoke of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in such a way as to lead the people in the country to believe that he formed part of a manufacturing firm. The hon. gentleman would have been a great deal fairer had he taken as an object lesson some of the gentlemen on his side of the House, who are the strongest protectionists in the country. Take, for instance, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris). There is in the agricultural implement business in Canada a great octopus which has the farmers of the west in its grasp, and the hon. member for Brantford is connected more or less closely with that octopus in his business. The building up of that business has been due to this protection which my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) decried, and therefore the hon. gentleman would have been fairer had he cited in his argument the name of that gentleman. Or he might have taken my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Harty) one of the best and

dearest old protectionists in this House, and one of the great props of the present government. Or he might even have gone into the very inner circle and given us the name of the minister who spoke so loudly the other day—the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). Why did not my hon. friend take him as an example, for he is one of the best protected manufacturers in Canada. When the Minister of Customs was speaking the other day so loudly of the reductions in the tariff, I thought he must have made a mental reservation in favour of the biscuit business and considered that business as an exception to which the tariff for revenue principle ought not by any means to apply. He might also have spoken of my hon. friend the member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), who is not a manufacturer, who comes from my own country and is one of the closest friends I have in this House personally, but from whom I differ absolutely in politics. The hon. gentleman might have spoken of him as a protectionist, because he belongs to one of the closest protective associations which flourishes in Canada—a protective association that will allow no one, no matter how well qualified, to practice the profession it protects, unless he has taken a three year's course in a college; and yet up to last year there was not a college in the west where a Canadian could perfect himself to practise that profession. I was going to refer for a moment to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark)—to that part of his speech where he spoke of some little incidents that came within his experience when he first went farming; but my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has so well spoken of that experience, that I shall not now touch on it. I listened with considerable pleasure to my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin); but I regretted that a gentleman of his ability should have undertaken the task of whitewashing the immigration policy of this government. But before touching on that point, let me say that I have seen in the newspapers lately the statement that we were going to lose him from this House, that he was going to be given a position of much greater importance locally—the Attorney Generalship of Saskatchewan. I want to congratulate the province of Saskatchewan as well as my hon. friend. Should that report prove true, I am sure that both sides of the House will regret his absence; but in the same newspaper article I saw a reference to the Premier of Saskatchewan to the effect that he was to come here and be a member of the cabinet. Well, should I happen to be in the House when Walter Scott re-enters it, I shall make that a red letter day in this parliament, because I will make the charges to his face which I have made behind his back and which are true. I do not say this because Walter Scott is a Liberal or because I have any personal spite against him. In fact, I do not know him, but I say it advisedly. I have seen the proofs and I believe he is absolutely a Judas, a traitor to the people. But what I wish particularly to refer to is the statement of my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) made with regard to the Galicians. Let me compare the treatment meted out to these people by the two governments. The Liberals, it is true, brought them out. They brought hundreds of them into my special district, the district of Dauphin. They dumped those people into that country without giving them any proper aid to enable them to select fit lands. They put them into a country where there were stones and sand, stumps and soakage from the mountains; and when they did not have the stones and stumps, they had the brush and the bush, and the Liberal government expected those people to be able to take care of themselves. They did nothing further in their interests. But on the other hand, when the Conservative government of Manitoba found that those people had come into our midst, that government recognized the fact that they had to be taken care of and that the best policy was to make as good citizens out of them as we could and as fast as we could. Our Conservative government in Manitoba went to work and gave grants of public money to the Galicians for the purpose of draining their settlement. They not only gave them the money, but gave them the work, so that these Galicians had the money expended among themselves granted by the government for the purpose of making good roads. Our Conservative government went further. They sent educated men among those people to teach them the English language and other things necessary.

They sent agents among those people to educate them so that they would learn that the school influence was the best influence to show them how to become good citizens. After a year or two of labour in that way the various settlements of Galicians realized that the government were trying to do something for their benefit and finally in almost every school district we have a school among the Ruthenians. We did more than that. We established training schools for the young, smart, bright men of the Galicians, one in Brandon and one in Winnipeg, for the special purpose of training young men to go out and teach schools among their own people and educate them in citizenhood as we want it in Canada. All those efforts have proved fruitful. We have all through Manitoba, in almost every district where there is any considerable settlement of Galicians, Galician councillors elected by their fellow settlers, both Galician and English and taking

a great part in the local government in various districts in Manitoba where they are. They are improving very fast. The Minister of the Interior said a few years ago and reiterated the other night, that they were not desirable settlers. Some years ago in speaking of them he traced their genealogy in the older countries for some hundreds of years and showed why they had been detrimental to Austria where most of them come from. He said that the Germans there were glad to ship them out here, and I suppose because the Germans are glad to ship any class of people out this government, with its brilliant immigration policy, ought to be glad to receive them. He said:

Where those Galicians have settled, some of the other settlers have moved away.

Asked by some hon. member: Why? he said:

Because they are not desirable neighbours.

He went on to say that there those people settled in any locality they depreciated the value of the land for that very reason, and that they were not in any way qualified to raise the morals of the people where they settled. He reiterated that the other day and I want here to take exception to it as I have always done. Those people are neighbours of mine, they live within a mile of me, some of them, they came there eight or ten years ago, and have been good settlers. They are liked by the people in my country and are making good by being appointed to positions of trust by the settlers where they live. The trouble with the immigration policy of the present minister and his predecessor is that proper pains have not been taken to get the right kind of Galicians, and when they did get them, no matter what kind they might be, they did not take care of them in the proper way after bringing them to this country, they left it to the local governments entirely to take care of the people after dumping them by hundreds in what was to them a foreign country. But while I uphold the bringing out of good Galicians into this country I cannot at all agree with the policy of bringing out these Doukhobors. Surely my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Cash) or my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) cannot believe in that policy because they must realize that an immigration policy to be at its best must bring out settlers who from the moment they arrive here make for the betterment of the country, not people like those Doukhobors who are aliens in thought, ways and deed to the native Canadians. These people came out here absolutely and intensely ignorant. For instance they started from their homes on several pilgrimages towards the east and what were they looking for, on those pilgrimages? They were looking for the Saviour, and as I saw it stated in the papers in the west the personality they were surely not, in your opinion, the right who brought them out to this country, after whom they were called 'Sifton's pets'. They were surely not, in your opinion, the right kind of immigrants to bring out. They were absolutely ignorant or absolutely immoral. They were a menace to the people living in that country. Had the minister been living on the route of their pilgrimage, had any hon. gentleman in this House been living on that route with his wife, his sister, his cousins or his aunts, or any female relatives, would he think they had a great immigration policy that brought out these poor people to this country who were so absolutely, innocently indecent or indecently innocent as to parade the country with what God put on them when they were born. These are the facts of the case. No man can say it is not true, no man dare say that this is a good state of affairs, that these were a good kind of immigrants, and I see by the papers that this immigration policy of the government is bringing some 4,000 or 6,000 or 8,000 more of these people out.

If they do so I would advise the ministry to put one Doukhobor in each township throughout the length and breadth of Canada and not allow them to locate in villages which in our past experience has resulted in so much trouble and expense to the country. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) referred to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and I know there are a good many members on the other side of the House who are tired of that subject. I do not wonder at that because I was tired of it half an hour after I heard it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clark) stated that the Conservatives had not properly laid the matter before the House, and he proceeded to tell us all about it, but he omitted from his tale two or three very important considerations. The first and most important point is that it was not 250,000 acres of what is generally called Dominion lands that were given to the company by the government at $1 per acre; it was 250,000 acres of land that had been set aside for homesteading. Then, it was not 250,000 acres of land in one block but it was 250,000 acres scattered all over the country and which was to be patented according as the entries and sales were made. I will show you how it worked out, and I will quote the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' an authority which I do not often cite, but which will not be rejected by any Liberal in the House. The policy of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company was to blanket the homesteads in the district and they ad-

vertised all through the United States inviting people to come to Saskatchewan and get a free grant of 160 acres alongside which the company would sell another quarter section. When a man spent his money examining the lands in the district and went to the land office to make an entry he would be told that James Smith had already applied for the land, and he would go out disappointed, but he would meet the Saskatchewan Valley Land agent outside and this fellow would tell him that he could fix the matter up for him, and if he bought a quarter-section at $5, or $8, or $10 an acre he would give him another quarter-section adjoining. In this way the company used what belonged to the people of Canada to enrich themselves. The best way to judge of the whole transaction is, not to take the views of party heelers and officers of the company, but to take the opinion of the people who actually knew what was done and to consider the financial success of the company. Everybody knows that the company made out of our Canadian lands given them in that way over $2,000,000 and I hold that was a steal from the people because whatever that company could do in the matter of disposing of these lands the government itself could do it if it went about it the right way. In this way we had the scandalous and nefarious Saskatchewan Land Company deal or steal, or whatever the government would like to call it. Another scandalous feature of the immigration policy of the government was the sending to the old country of political heelers as immigration agents. One of the most rabid Liberals in my district, rabid as the worst Liberals are from lack of knowledge, in order to repay him for his election services, was sent to the old country at $100 a month and his expenses, although he never earned $100 a month in his life in a legitimate way, and the result of his labours in the old country was to bring back just two farm hands. Hundreds of dollars were spent to get these two immigrants and no one will deny that that is a ridiculous policy. Now, my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) spoke very feelingly about the Grand Trunk Pacific, and as to its being a colonization road, and of the hundreds of miles that separated it from existing lines of railroads. Well, there are now 795 miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific built from Winnipeg to Edmonton and for 485 miles it is closer than ten miles to the existing railway tracks. I heard the Minister of Railways state in the Railway Committee last year that it was the general railway policy of the country to have no road closer than eight or ten miles to an existing railroad unless for some geographical reasons, and there is certainly no geographical reason why the Grand Trunk Pacific should be so close to existing railways. There is no excuse because when the building of the road was before this House the minister assured the people that the road was being built for colonization purposes. He said something with reference to prices, but colonization purposes was the cry that was taken before the people of the west. Vote for us and we will build this road to open up the new country and we will be able to control rates, which is a matter of the very greatest importance was the cry of the Liberals.

Let me make a comparison as between the two parties with reference to rates and railway buliding. In Manitoba, some years ago, the Conservative government, under Mr. Roblin, created a railway policy. When that policy was published first every Liberal in Manitoba, without exception, I think, said it was ill-advised, unwise, unthought out, ruinous and outrageous. There was no adjective in the English language that they could possibly use that they did not use against that policy. His policy was to give a guarantee of bonds to the extent of $10,000 a mile for which he got, first, a mortgage on the road, rolling stock, stations, terminals, cars and all the property of the railway company; second, a pledge that wherever settlers went in Manitoba the road would be built as far as it was possible to carry out that undertaking and, third, control of the rates in so far that before the roads built under that policy were running two years the rates were reduced over the whole line of the Canadian Northern railway to Fort William four cents per 100 pounds. That is the bargain he made. The Liberals decried it, but the Liberals found that they had to get some railway policy in order to get the railway companies to build. They adopted a policy, but instead of giving $10,000 a mile they gave $13,000 and they have no control over the rates farther than the Railway Act gives them control. Saskatchewan and Alberta adopted this policy with the result that they increased the price of railway building in Manitoba. In Manitoba now a railway company can hold up the government when they want roads built, because they are in a position to say we can get better terms in Saskatchewan and Alberta where they have increased the price $3,000 a mile. Therefore, the Liberals have raised the cost of railway building to the people. In the west the same policy has been enunciated by Mr. McBride. He has given the Canadian Northern railway a guarantee of $35,000 a mile to build in the mountains. Surely there is no Liberal in this House or out of it who will dare to get up and say that is too much, because they have to tell us that the Grand Trunk Pacific in the same kind of country is costing at least $75,000 a mile, a sum for which this country will have to be responsible.

I desire to refer to another matter, and I do so because I think it is necessary in the interest of good administration and of the proper conduct of the business of this House. When questions relating to expenditures, &c., are up before a committee of this House there should be some method of preventing a minister from getting up and absolutely misleading by his words the members on this side of the House. I have been led to refer to this by the conduct of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) on several occasions. If there is any hon. gentleman in this House who thinks I am wrong, I would be very glad to prove my statements. I just bring it to the attention of the House, and I hope it will go to the proper quarters so that we will not get misleading statements in the future from a gentleman who ought to remember that he is an honourable gentleman and that he is addressing hon. gentlemen on matters that relate to the public business and which are in their care.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not just know the meaning that the hon. gentleman desires to convey by his remarks, but if his intention is to cast any doubt on the honour of any hon. gentleman in the House it would not be in order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You surely do not wish me to withdraw the word 'honourable'; is that what you are objecting to?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, as I understood him, was referring to statements made by a minister which were misleading. I do not think that he said 'deliberately misleading,' but were misleading, and he proceeded to use the word 'honourable,' I thought, in a manner that intimated rather dishonourable. If I am wrong, the hon. gentleman knows his meaning, but I thought it my duty to point out that doubt cast upon the honour of a member of this House would be out of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I said practically what you thought I said, but there is one point that you overlook. I said I was willing to prove the veracity of my statement, if any hon. gentleman thought I was wrong. It is a matter of fact, it is not a matter of desire on my part to say anything wrong about any hon. gentleman. I am only stating a matter of fact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the statement is the hon. gentleman's understanding of a certain condition, there would be no objection, but I always feel it my duty, where any apparent doubt is cast upon the honour of any member of this House, to call in question, as strictly as the rule will allow me, any such statement. The impression was somewhat given to me by the hon. gentleman's remark that some doubt was cast upon the honour of a member of this House. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as I understand him now to intimate that it was not intended to do that.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand, he was calling in question the veracity of a statement of fact, and if he were in possession of information that justified him taking that ground, it does seem to me that he should be at liberty to present the evidence which justifies the allegation. If he is in a position to do it, I think it would be quite right to allow him to do it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to state to the House that ever since I have been in this House I have always—and I believe every hon. member must say the same thing—realized that the Deputy Speaker was making every effort to give us all fair play regardless of which side of the House we were on, and I am quite willing to bow at all times to his judgment in matters that appertain to the rules. There is one matter further to which I wish to refer, and I shall be very brief. We have vast expenditures being made on various public works. Well, there is one public work to which I wish to draw the attention of the government, and which I think would be of greater importance than any other they could undertake. I refer to the building of a canal system from Edmonton down the Saskatchewan river to its junction with Cedar lake at a place called Van Horne, then cut across eight miles to Lake Winnipegosis, thence down the Winnipegosis to Meadow Portage, a cut of one and a half miles, ten feet at the highest into Lake Manitoba, and from Lake Manitoba a cut across into the Assinboine river. A canal of that kind with less than fifty miles of actual work and with less than ten wing dams on those various rivers would enable the people of Edmonton to ship their coal and grain right into Winnipeg, the hub of Canada. A work of that kind would be surely far and away ahead of such a work as the Newmarket ditch, which is a ditch built where, I understand, there is no water, and where, if there was water, there are no boats; and where, if there were boats, there would be no freight; and where, if they could get freight, there is no place to take it. But if the government would build the canal I am asking them to undertake, that would be of real benefit to the people of the west and of all Canada and do something in the way of giving us an output for our traffic which would be exceedingly profitable. There is only one other remark I would make and that is with regard to the members from the west. I happen to be a Conservative and there are many who happen to be Liberals, but the interests of our people are the same, and I think the time has come when the men of the west, Liberals and

Tories, ought to get together and unite on any question of policy that will be of benefit to our people; and if they should do this, there are enough of them here to make any government sit up and listen and take notice.

Mr. ROBERT SMITH (Stormont). I do not consider it necessary that I should at this stage of the debate take much time in replying to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Campbell). I notice that he has thought it necessary to make one more reference to the fact that the right hon. the Prime Minister held for a certain time two seats in this House. That is a subject which seems to have caused a great deal of anxiety to hon. gentlemen opposite and given them the opportunity of ringing the changes on the outrage thus committed on the electorate. But, let me just point out that it was due to the course of action of parties, who were acting on behalf of the Conservative party, that the city of Ottawa was deprived of representation in this House the whole of last session. Hon. gentlemen opposite were within their rights in protesting that seat. The law allows that to be done, but the law was taken advantage of, not for the purpose of exposing corruption or unseating an hon. member, but for the sole purpose of working out some trifling party advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not concerned at all about depriving the city of Ottawa of representation during a whole session, but solely with the view of acquiring some party advantage by keeping a protest, which was not intended to be acted upon, dangling over the head of the leader of the government. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) made a very strong reference to the premier of the province of Saskatchewan, and I regret very much that he did not carry out his declared intention of waiting until the premier of that province had a seat in this House. The hon. gentleman referred to him as a traitor and a Judas, and I think it would have been more fitting to the credit and dignity of the hon. gentleman had he waited until Mr. Scott were actually present and could reply to any charge in person.

The hon. gentleman found a good deal of fault with my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in connection with his stand on the question of the tariff. Well, I was anxious to learn what were the views of the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) on that same question. We have had a good deal of discussion on it from hon. gentlemen opposite, but not one of them has announced any policy whatever. It would have been interesting had the hon. member undertaken to tell us whether he was in favour of reducing the present tariff or whether he was in accord with the majority on his side in advocating a general raise in the duties. But we have had no declaration of policy on his part, and in that respect he has followed closely in the footsteps of other hon. gentlemen opposite.

We have heard a great deal about the general extravagance of the government, but no attempt has been made to enter into any analysis of the increased expenditures of which these hon. gentlemen complain. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) started off with what no doubt was intended to be the main criticism of the government's management of our finances. In that criticism he made a general comparison of the expenses in 1896 with those of 1909. He chose a year in which there was very little capital expended by the Conservative administration and he bulked capital and ordinary expenditures together. He ignored the fact that since this government has taken office the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific has been entered upon, entailing the largest capital expenditure ever made in connection with any government railway. Adding the ordinary and capital expenditure of the two periods he made a comparison, and pointed out that in 1896, under the Conservative regime, some $42,000,000 were expended, whereas in 1909 the expenditure amounted to $133,000,000. But comparisons made in that way without any analysis are very misleading. What is necessary is to investigate these figures in detail. If we confine ourselves, in the first place, to the ordinary expenditure in these two periods, then there was an expenditure in 1896 of $39,000,000 and in 1909 of about $84,000,000, but a very large part of the increase is entirely represented by cross entries. For instance, there is the running of the Intercolonial railway. The annual expense of running that road is part of the ordinary expenditure of the country according to our system of bookkeeping. You will find that the government expenditure on that road caused by adding new branches increased enormously and forms part of the increased expenditure of which those hon. gentlemen complain. On the other hand, these expenditures are represented by an almost corresponding increase in the receipts of the road. Thus, these figures represent merely cross entries. To make a fair comparison of expenditure we must deduct almost $5,000,000 from that item alone. The expenditure of the Post Office Department is another item standing on exactly the same footing. Then, there are the increased subsidies to the provinces—almost $5,000,000 of increased expenditures is represented by that item. If we take all the amounts from the public accounts which are mere cross entries of that kind, we

find that they make a total of about $19,000,000, and this sum must be substracted from the $84,000,000 in order to make a just comparison between the annual ordinary expenditures of the country in 1896 and in 1909. Even after that deduction is made there still remains a very considerable amount of increased expenditure to be accounted for. If hon. gentlemen opposite desired to draw any useful lessons, they would analyse that expenditure and point out to this side of the House the portions of it and the total amount that are unjust and unnecessary. Some items of expenditure have been increased enormously, and have been increased for the benefit of the country. Let me give one example. In the item of lighthouses and river lighting, during the last years of the Conservative regime, the total expenditure was less than half a million dollars, to-day it amounts to about two and a quarter millions. I contend that that is an increase that is entirely justified in the interests of the public. Our system of navigation has entirely changed since 1896. Deep waterways have been established from Port Arthur to the ocean, harbour improvements have been made and lighthouses have been established, all these things helping greatly to cheapen transportation. It is by going into items of that kind in detail that a true idea can be formed of the justification that exists for the increase in the ordinary public expenditure.

Another very extraordinary comparison hon. gentlemen opposite make is as to the capital expenditure in 1909 and in 1896. As I said, they select a year in which the capital expenditure was something between three and four millions of dollars and compare it with a year in which the greatest expenditure is made in the construction of the great National Transcontinental railway. But these hon. gentlemen try to justify the comparison by saying that during their regime they also constructed a great transcontinental railway. I take issue with them on that point. When they were in power and procured the construction of the Canadian Pacific, they did not procure the construction of a railway that belongs to Canada. The expenditure was handed over to a private corporation, and every dollar of money that was paid out of the public treasury, and every asset of the public that was turned over for the construction of that road, became the property of that private corporation. The road now being constructed and for which this government is now making capital expenditure is a road which, when completed, will belong to the people of Canada, a road for which a rental is to be paid beginning a short time after its construction. So, there is no comparison between the expenditure on a transcontinental road made by the Conservative government and the expenditure on the National Transcontinental made by this government. Then it is contended, in comparing the debt incurred by the two governments, that it was made in the same relation, because the Transcontinental road was a part of the expenditure that went to increase the debt during the Conservative regime and the expenditure on the Transcontinental has caused the increase incurred by this government. Again, I say the case is entirely different. The expenditure made by the Conservative government in connection with the Canadian Pacific railway is not all represented in the public accounts. A large portion of the expenditure made by Canada for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway was not in cash, but in the form of lands and of road already constructed. This constructed road which was handed over to the Canadian Pacific railway company represented an expenditure of $30,000,000, which had been made prior to the accession of the Conservative government to power. These constructed lines are not represented by the increase of the debt made under the Conservative government, nor are the 25,000,000 acres of land—an asset of Canada—which passed from being the property of the people to being the property of a private corporation. If this government had undertaken to build a transcontinental road under a similar bargain, they might have alienated the public lands and secured the construction of the Transcontinental road without the expenditure of a single dollar in cash out of the public treasury of Canada and without adding a single dollar to the debt of this country.

Now, I wish to say a few words in reference to the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers). That hon. gentleman entered into a somewhat poetic representation of the actions of his party in connection with the government of this country, and took a somewhat poetic license with the facts. He contended that the Liberal party had opposed all the great measures put through by the Conservative party, and which, he claimed, had resulted in the present greatness of the country. He contended, in the first place, that the Liberal party of Canada had opposed confederation, and that Sir John Macdonald and his government and party were the only ones responsible for that great Act and consequently for the greatness of Canada to-day. I think the hon. gentleman's memory is entirely at fault. As a matter of fact, Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative government, up to a very short time before the principle of confederation was adopted, had opposed that principle against the Liberal party of this country, and it was only at the last moment that the Conservatives, joining with the Liberals, formed the coalition government to put through the measure. The hon. mem-

ber said that the Liberals had opposed the Canadian Pacific railway. I deny that; his memory is again at fault. Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, during the time he led the administration of this country, endeavoured to construct the whole of the Canadian Pacific railway by a bargain with a company on the basis of a land grant. He failed to obtain favourable terms of that kind, and his government proceeded to construct that road as a government work, and, at the time Mr. Mackenzie left office, there had been an expenditure in actual construction of that road of no less a sum than $30,000,000. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite are continually proclaiming throughout this country that Alexander Mackenzie and his party had opposed, tooth and nail, the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. The facts are that the Liberals in opposition opposed the particular terms of the bargain which was made by the Conservative government for the construction of that railway. They opposed for instance, the monopoly clauses, they opposed the clauses that allowed alternate sections of land to be laid aside and accumulate in value through the efforts of the settlers on the other sections. They opposed the exemption from taxation, and made other exceptions to the terms, but it cannot be said that the Liberal party were opposed to the principle of constructing the Canadian Pacific railway, or that they ever intended to put any obstruction towards the accomplishment of that great work.

Now the hon. gentleman also thought it would be desirable that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) should hold some revival meetings for his side of the House; and shortly afterwards he gave us a very glowing account of the virtues and patriotism of the Japanese people. When he was waxing so eloquent concerning the virtues of these people, I thought perhaps it would be a good thing for him to hold a few revival meetings with the hon. members from British Columbia upon his side of the House. One would suppose that if these people possessed all the good qualities so eloquently described by the hon. gentleman his political friends would not have such a tremendous dread of rubbing up against the Japanese.

He also undertook to tell us that an immense amount of corruption had taken place since this government came into power, and he regretted very much that there seemed to be no virtue left outside of the Conservative party. I wondered if the hon. gentleman could not remember a few things that were not exactly virtuous on his own side of the House, in the midst of his own party. When he was going so deeply into Canadian history, he might have gone back for instance to the original bargain for the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, which led to the great Pacific scandal and the hurling of his party from power. If he had come down to later times, he would remember that it was this very corruption that was mainly responsible for the hurling of his party from power in 1896. Yet the hon. gentleman seemed to imagine that there was no virtue and no honesty outside of the Conservative party.

Now the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Boyce) had considerable to say in connection with the action of the Department of Militia and Defence in charging up to the town of Sault Ste. Marie the expenses of sending troops up there to quell disturbances, or to maintain order. He had a strong opinion that the minister ought not to have rendered any bill for that service. Now, Sir, the Militia Act clearly defines what shall be done in such a case, the law is established by this parliament, and one would imagine that hon. gentlemen opposite would consider it to be the duty of any minister to fulfil the law, whatever it is, that he finds on the statute-book. Yet the hon. member for East Algoma makes it a subject of complaint that the Minister of Militia did not violate the law on this occasion, and that the town from which he hails did not have the advantage of that expenditure at the expense of the public treasury of Canada, without any authority of law. That hon. gentleman, and some others who have spoken, have taken a good deal of exception to what they call the fuss and feathers of the Militia Department. They have contrasted the total expenditure of the Militia Department in the latter years of Conservative rule with the total expenditure of to-day. Well, this is the first time I have heard that argument within this House. Upon the hustings this is a favourite theme with Conservative orators. I watched with some interest the submission of the militia estimates during the last session of this parliament, and I was astounded to find that, notwithstanding all the criticism of a general character that had been indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite on various occasions, they allowed the estimates of the Militia Department to pass through this House practically without a dissenting voice. Now I claim that if these gentlemen, sitting on the other side of the House as guardians of the treasury, as they pretend, and knowing as they pretend to know, that there is absolute extravagance and waste in connection with these militia expenditures, it is surely a part of their duty as critics of the government to raise these objections when the estimates are being passed. If there are unnecessary officers in connection with the department, why is it that these hon. gentlemen, or some one of them, did not rise in their places and protest against the salaries or allowances for these unnecessary

officers? An hon. member in speaking upon this subject to-day, made a contrast between the amount that was expended upon the officers and the amount that is expended upon the men. I had not an opportunity of examining very closely what the expenditures were to which he referred. But I am sure it is well known to every member of this House that the militia we have in Canada to-day is a skeleton militia, but including all the officers necessary for the total quota of men that are supposed to be in these regiments. You take an ordinary regiment upon the establishment we have in this country to-day, and they amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of 400 men; whereas if that regiment were filled up as it would be in case of war it would mean a thousand men. So it is not a fair comparison to speak of what goes to the officers of that skeleton regiment when the regiment has not its full complement of men. It must necessarily have a full complement of officers, and there is only a small proportion of the men enlisted. I think that is a sufficient answer to the criticism of the hon. gentleman in that respect. But there is this to be said, that we are eternally hearing these criticisms about the unnecessary expense of the staff at Ottawa, and the unnecessary officers in connection with various district staffs, and I for one would like to hear, when these estimates are being passed, some fair discussion so as to ascertain as to whether there is anything at all in the criticism they make. What I do say is that if hon. gentlemen really consider there is unnecessary expenses in this direction, they will not accomplish a reform by merely dealing in generalities as they have been doing.

Now I was somewhat amused with the argument that was made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in connection with the woollen duties. If I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that the preferential tariff introduced by this government was responsible for having wiped out a very large proportion of the woollen factories in this country, that these woollen factories were still suffering and that there was danger, unless some change were made in the policy of the government, of the remainder being wiped out. The same tariff was also responsible, as I understood him, for the fact that sheep raising had almost been abandoned, or was very much depreciated. A little further on in his speech the hon. gentleman proceeds to tell us that this same preferential tariff was responsible for about doubling the price of woollen goods in Canada. It occurred to me as a strange thing that the woollen factories, under the Conservative regime, could make money when woollen goods were at one-half the price they are to-day, and yet when the price of their product is double under this preferential tariff they should be going to rack and ruin. That is the statement of the hon. mmeber. He quoted the figures. He stated that he was quoting woollen goods of precisely the same quality, and the prices, in general terms, were about double what they were in 1896.

Referring to the hon. gentleman's statement about sheep raising, it seems that while under the Conservative regime this business of sheep raising flourished in 1896 when wool sold at 18½ cents a pound, it is being absolutely destroyed to-day when wool ranges from 24½ to 26 cents a pound. The same remark would apply to the hon. gentleman's reference to cattle raising. That was another industry which was being wiped out by the fault of this government. It would be interesting to compare for the hon. gentleman's benefit the price of beef in 1896 and to-day. I noticed in one of the local papers, that beef was bringing 8½ to 9 cents a pound on the Ottawa market. Probably from 4 cents to 6 cents would be the ruling rate under the beneficial tariff that the hon. gentleman admires so much. Another hon. gentleman from East Peterborough spoke of the laws of Great Britain in reference to the encouragement of the woollen industry and sheep raising. He told us the laws to which he referred were those which laid the foundation of successful woollen manufacturing and successful sheep raising in Great Britain, and he regretted that we had not adopted in this country the system that had been adopted in Britain for the encouragement of this industry. If the hon. gentleman's argument is worth anything we ought now in this country to prohibit the importation of woollen goods by the death penalty as they did in England, because that, according to him, was what laid the foundation of prosperity there. After a time these penalties might be relaxed somewhat. What struck me most was that the hon. gentleman informed us that he found it very difficult to find people serious upon this question of woollen production. All I can say is that if the hon. gentleman had his way there would probably be some long faces in this country to say nothing of the long necks. This is a subject that has been discussed so thoroughly not only during this session but for many sessions past that I feel there can be very little ground that has not already been pretty well threshed. I can only say that I think if hon. gentlemen opposite have really any policy in connection with this tariff they should give us some idea of what it is. So far as I know there has been no intimation from hon. gentlemen opposite as a party in connection with this tariff beyond the rather vague reference to adequate protec-

tion that was made for the purpose of the campaign some time ago. Since that we have had nothing from the hon. gentlemen. They rise in their places one advocating a lower tariff, claiming credit for having reduced the tariff and another claiming that by reason of tariff reduction, the industries of this country have been destroyed. If the hon. gentlemen are to obtain any credit in the country for having fixed ideas upon the subject it occurs to me it is time we had those ideas in the shape of some resolution upon the subject from them.

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

Mr. FISHER. There are no resolutions to be proposed to the committee in view of the fact that there are no changes in the tariff; but it is the custom to keep the Bill in committee during the session. I will therefore move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON. What effect will that have upon the subsequent proceedings? If it is called again next Monday the debate may go on.

Mr. FISHER. It might, but the keeping of the Bill in the committee is pro forma entirely. The Finance Minister always wishes to keep the Bill of Ways and Means open during the session. That has always been the practice.

Mr. BLAIN. When may we expect the return ordered on December 6, showing the number of officials in Ottawa having living apartments supplied by the Crown?

Mr. FISHER. I understand it will be laid on the table early next week.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 24, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CHIEF JUSTICE OF MANITOBA.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART. I would like to repeat verbally the question which I put on the Order Paper and which was answered a week ago with reference to the appointment of a successor to Chief Justice Dubuc. The answer given by the Department of Justice was to the effect that they did not know that there was serious inconvenience and loss to the profession, to suitors and to the public in Manitoba. I would ask now, at the expiry of a week, if we can be told when the successor is likely to be appointed and whether that successor will be a Frenchman or an Englishman.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. Really I am not able to give any other answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Alexander Haggart) than was given the other day in reply to a question that was put on the Order Paper by him. I may say that I do not think it probably that the chief justice of the province will be a French speaking man, but the whole subject is under consideration.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SAFETY OF TRAVEL.

Mr. C. JAMESON (Digby). Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to bring up a matter of urgent and immediate importance and to ask a question of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). The question is as to the safety of travel on the Intercolonial railway. During the very able and instructive speech delivered by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) on Thursday last, he stated that——

Mr. SPEAKER. Is the hon. member (Mr. Jameson) going to discuss the matter, and, for that purpose, to move the adjournment of the House?

Mr. JAMESON. No, I bring the matter up before the orders of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot discuss the subject then.

Mr. JAMESON. I am not going to discuss it but merely to ask a question. The hon. member for Westmorland said 'certain sections of the Intercolonial are not in good and safe condition.' The Minister of Railways and Canals, in replying to the hon. member, did not touch on that point and did not contradict the hon. member's statement. Now, having in mind the awful accident which occurred on the Canadian Pacific railway on Friday last by which some thirty-one persons are reported to have been killed and a much larger number seriously injured, and which, it is said, was due to a defect in the physical condition of the road, I would like to ask the minister, to what extent and at what points on the Intercolonial the condition described as unsafe by the hon. member for Westmoreland exists; whether the minister was previously aware of it; why it was permitted to develop; what steps, if any, have been taken or will be taken to over-

come it; and, when the road will be in safe condition for travel?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM. That question, I think, might better have been asked the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). There is liable to be a great difference of opinion between him and myself as to the real accuracy of the statement. I may say that, owing to representations made to me, I had the Superintendent of Maintenance of Way go over the road from Sydney to Montreal, and he reported to me, within the last few days, that every foot of it, so far as he could find out, was in good condition.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) when I may expect the report showing the instructions given to Chief Justice Howell with regard to the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. Probably tomorrow.

MONTMAGNY FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 51) respecting the Montmagny Fire Insurance Company, to change its name to 'Manufacturers Fire Insurance Company.'

On section 2,

Mr. MILLER. The Bill as we have it states that the name should be 'The Manufacturers Fire Insurance Company.' In committee it was agreed, and consented to by the promoters of the Bill, that in the House the title should be changed, and that the name should be the Factories Fire Insurance Company. If necessary, I will move that the name be changed to the Factories Fire Insurance Company.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the rule is that, while the Bill itself may be amended in committee, the title has to be amended in the House.

Bill reported.

NORTHERN MORTGAGE COMPANY OF CANADA

On the motion that Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada—Mr. A. Haggart—be read the third time.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill would allow the third reading to stand until next meeting. An hon. gentleman in the House has called my attention to some provisions in it. I am not taking any exception but I would like to have the opportunity of consulting with my officers. I have no reason to suppose that the Bill is not correct, but I would like it to stand for the third reading until the next day.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the Minister of Finance is present now and was not present in the committee when this Bill was passed, I would like to hear his opinion about the name which is proposed in this Bill—the Factories Insurance Company. It seems to me that it is of too general a character.

An hon. MEMBER. This not the same Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. It was because I was necessarily absent at that meeting and I am not familiar with the Bill that I am asking the third reading to be delayed, not that I have any objection to the Bill at all —I have no reason to suppose that the Bill is not right—but a question was put to me by an hon. gentleman concerning it, and I would like it to stand for that reason.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands until the next meeting.

MONTMAGNY FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. LAVERGNE moved:

That Bill (No. 51) respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company and to change its name to the Manufacturer's Fire Insurance Company be now passed, and that the title be entered on the Order Paper as the Factories Insurance Company.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is the Bill to which I had reference a moment ago where the change in name takes place. I mentioned the fact that the Minister of Finance was not in his place. I take no exception to that, I know that he has many things to attend to, but I am aware that in former years the minister has been very particular about names contained in various Bills in order that no one company will get any possible advantage over another in the matter of its name. We all regret perhaps that the Dominion bank ever secured that name because we believe it gives it a decided advantage over every banking institution in the country. It seems to me that The Factories Insurance Company is too general and it might give the impression all over the country that this is the only company that has to deal with factories. I think it is of too general a character and that the Bill should be amended in some way. I would like to hear the opinion of the Minister of Finance upon it.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not had the matter before me. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) is correct in saying that in the committee we have endeavoured to guard

against a confusion or similiarity of names which would lead to one company being mistaken for another. That, after all, is the main purpose. I will not pretend to say that the word 'factories,' is a word that can be patented by any body, but I do not think it would lead to any confusion. I do not think it would be alleged that this is the name of another company or that it is similar to the name of another company. My hon. friend's point is that it might convey the impression that this is the only company that has the right to deal with factories.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, that it is too general.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that upon that principle you might shut down upon a great many names. I have not had the opportunity of thinking it over and at present I do not feel like opposing the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems pretty close to the Manufacturers' Insurance Company, and there might be some objection to it on that ground.

Mr. FIELDING. Do the Manufacturers' Insurance Company object?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not aware that they do.

Mr. FIELDING. Was there any representation on that point?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, I am not aware that there was, but that is not the main point. I think the name is too general. We have always objected to a name of a too general character which would seem to give a particular company an advantage over all other companies doing a like business. It might create a wrong impression in the country. Agents might make use of it. It might be represented that they have a right to deal with factories over that of any other company.

Mr. FOSTER. The company came to this House under the name of the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company and asked for powers. That is a remarkable localized name. It implies that it belongs to a county, that its capital is chiefly in that county and its management is a small one. You take that up immediately and elevate it to the Factories Insurance Company. You take away all idea of locality and make what is really a local company as wide as the name implies. That gives too much of an advantage. A man would look upon that company as a large company. It is not limited to anything; it is not a county or a provincial company. It is given the broad designation of the factories company. It has two objections, to my mind, the first one being that it gives too much of an advantage to a localized, small company and, of course, if it gives an advantage it is to the disadvantage of all insurers. The other is that it takes a general appellation which shuts out every other company. Suppose another company with three times the capital and three times the influence comes forward and wants to call itself the Factories Company. If all the capital in the Dominion of Canada is behind it it cannot do it. It has to give precedence to a small local company. These are, I think, two strong objections to that kind of a name. I think it ought to be localized in some kind of a way. Taking that general name you prevent any other aggregation of capital from ever asking or taking that general name and in allowing that to be used as a cognomen you limit it to this company or else you violate the rule against one company taking the name of another.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think any injustice can be done by permitting this company to take the name. It is surely a case of first come first served, and the fact that this is a small company should not deprive it of the right to use the name. As to this being a general appellation, surely if a company should call itself the Farms Building Insurance Company it would simply indicate that they were making a specialty of that class of business, and it would not be reasonable to say that no other company should insure farm buildings. I have only seen the Bill a moment ago, and I have not considered the question, but I do not think there can be any objection to the name.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have some regard to the constitution of the company, its capitalization, its powers and the like of that. Suppose an insignificant company were to ask us to give it a name applicable to the whole country and thereby debarred for ever after any other large company taking the same name, I think the fact that the former company was small and insignificant should have weight with us, in connection with a general name. I do not know whether this is a powerful company or not, but judging by the fact that it takes the name of a county I should think it was limited in its scope.

Mr. TALBOT. I would ask the Speaker to name some other member as seconding the motion for a change of name. That company does a great deal of business in my county and I might be called to account for creating confusion if the name be changed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 106) respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company —Mr. Gladu.

Bill (No. 108) to incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway—Mr. Conmee.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. What portions indicated by location and mileage, of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway were surveyed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, taken over by the government, and paid for by the country?

2. What portion of this survey, identified by location and mileage, was rearranged and relocated by Major Hodgins, or any other government engineer?

3. Was a portion of the section let to J. D. McArthur, re-surveyed, or the survey revised by Major Hodgins, or any government engineer, and the location of parts of the line changed after the contract was let to McArthur?

4. Was the road improved by this change of location? If so, how, and was the cost of the work thereby cut down, and to what extent?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. Surveys extending from Winnipeg to about 700 miles east of that were made by the Grand Trunk Pacific and taken over and paid for by the government.

2. It was all resurveyed and relocated by National Transcontinental railway engineers.

3. Yes. Parts of the line as relocated by Major Hodgins and let to J. D. McArthur, were changed after the contract was let, namely: Miles to 93 'F'—mileage west from Lake Superior Junction, through mileage from Moncton 1,606 to 1,650. Also miles 103 to 122 'F'—mileage west from Lake Superior Junction, through mileage 1,660 to 1,679. Numerous slight changes were also made.

4. Yes. The figures for the two portions mentioned are as follows:

Mile 49 to 93, estimated cost, as let	$ 4,122,358 00
Cost to date, with additions of remainder of ballasting, ties, tanks, etc.	4,249,695 00
Cost over original estimate.	$ 127,337 00
A saving in length was made on this portion amounting to 4969·2 feet capitalized value	49,692 00
And a saving in curvature of 748°18 feet capitalized value	59,854 40
Total saving, capitalized value	$ 109,546 40

Mr. TALBOT.

Mile 103-122, estimated cost	$ 1,460,079 00
Cost to date, including remainder of ballasting, ties, tanks, etc., to complete.	2,025,544 00
Cost over original estimate.	$ 565,465 00
Saving in length was made on this portion of 2,000 feet, capitalized value	$ 20,000 00
The curvature was increased 228°18 capitalized value	18,240 00
Net saving, capitalized value	$ 1,760 00

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Who was Major Hodgins' assistant district engineer in August and September, 1907?

2. Was he transferred to another part of the line in the autumn of 1907? If so, when, to what point, and why?

3. What was his salary at the time of transfer?

4. Is he still in the service of the commission? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

5. Who took this engineer's place on the section under the McArthur contract, and did this substituted engineer sign the September estimate? If so, did he certify without going over the work?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. J. A. Heamen.

2 and 4. No. He resigned in November, 1907.

3. $275 per month when he resigned.

5. A. M. Macgillivray succeeded Heamen but did not sign September estimate.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. What is the length of the long tunnel on the National Transcontinental railway east of Winnipeg river?

2. What proportion of the work has been done on this tunnel, or has it been completed? If so, when was the last work done upon it? If not, when will it probably be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 613 feet.

2. Reported completed December, 1908.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has the portion of the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction been completed in every respect? If not, what remains to be done?

2. Is it open for general passenger and freight traffic, and to what extent has it actually been used?

3. Has this part of the line been ballasted?

4. Has it been taken off the hands of the contractors, have their accounts been adjusted and have they been paid in full? If not, what sums have been held back, and why?

5. Has this portion of the road been taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and has the cost of construction upon which the rental is to be based been determined between the government and the company? If so, at what sum?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1 and 4. No. The percentage reports to December 31, 1909, show 94·66 per cent completed.

2 and 5. The line has not yet been taken over by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but the engineers report trains can run over this section at a speed of from 20 to 25 miles per hour; a passenger train and a train of wheat have passed over the line, and the contractor under date November 23, 1909, has offered to operate two trains a week, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was so advised by the commissioners.

3. The percentage report for district 'F,' December 31, 1909, shows 59 per cent of ballasting complete.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Upon the section of the Transcontinental railway in district 'F,' let to J. D. McArthur, what were the government engineer's estimated quantities of (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, and (c) common excavation, upon which tender was accepted and contract let?

2. At the time the contract was let, what was the estimated expenditure, based on contract prices, for (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, and (c) common excavation?

3. How many cubic yards each of (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, (c) common excavation, and of what value, separately, have been returned and claimed by the contractor or his sub-contractors for work alleged to be done, and what is the estimated quantity and value under each of these headings of work yet to be done, according to latest estimate?

4. What sums have actually been paid under each of these headings?

5. At the time this contratc was let, what was the total estimated expenditure based upon contract prices?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. (a) S.R.— 3,696,336 cubic yards.
   (b) L.R.— 733,454 cubic yards.
   (c) C.X.—11,233,247 cubic yards.
2. (a) S.R.—$6,283,771 20.
   (b) L.R.— 440,072 20.
   (c) C.X.— 3,369,974 10.
3.

(a) S.R.—6,415,869	cu. yds.—	$10,906,977	30
(b) L.R.—2,056,297	"	1,233,778	20
(c) C.X.—2,215,876	"	664,762	80

Excavation completed except entrance to Winnipeg.

4. The sums actually paid are the abovementioned values less 10 per cent hold-back making net payments as follows:

S.R.—$9,816,279 57
L.R.— 1,110,400 38.
C.X.— 598,286 52.

5. $13,010,398.92 based on estimate quantities as taken from profile of preliminary location and not including rails, ties, steel bridges, &c. Subsequent revised estimates including above $17,534,000.

COST OF DOMINION ELECTION.

Mr. OWEN:

1. What was the total cost of the last Dominion election?

2. What does it cost to maintain the Senate for one year?

Hon. CHAS. MURPHY:

1. $401,957.74.
2. $319,653.02.

REPAIRS TO CAR 37, I.C.R.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Is car No. 37 the official car used by Mr. E. Tiffin, general traffic manager of the Intercolonial railway and a member of the Managing Board of Government Railway Board?

2. Has this car been recently repaired or is it now undergoing repairs in the shops of a private car firm or corporation in Halifax, N.S.? If so, was the work done, or is it now being done, by contract after tender or by days' work?

3. Is it true that new and commodious repair shops were constructed at Moncton, and modern machinery installed therein, with a view not only of doing all necessary repair work in connection with the Intercolonial railway, but as well to do all such construction work of cars and locomotives as would be payable out of the current revenues of the railway?

4. Why have the repairs on the car referred to not been made or undertaken in the government railway shops either at Moncton or elsewhere?

5. Have any cars or locomotives been constructed or their construction undertaken in the new shops at Moncton?

6. Have any new cars or locomotives payable out of current revenue account been purchased from or placed under contract with, private car or locomotive corporations or firms during the present fiscal year; and if any such purchases were made or contracts entered into was it done after tenders being asked?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. The expense of doing the work in the Moncton shops was carefully estimated and contracts were let at a less price to the Silliker Car Company.

3. Yes, but the shops in question have been overwhelmed with ordinary repairs due to the fact that during the interim of the transfer from the old to the new shops a considerable quantity of work had accumulated. The staff is now gaining rapidly upon it, and in a short time will be down to normal conditions. In the meantime, it was thought best to have car '37' repaired and put in safe shape to run.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. The full capacity of the shops is taken up at present with repair work, but as the organization improves new work will be started.

6. Yes.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. How many persons who have passed the necessary examination to obtain appointments

in the Civil Service since the present Civil Service Act came into force have as yet been appointed to the government service?

2. Has the government in its employ at the present time any persons who have failed to pass the requisite examination?

3. Is it the policy of the government to keep temporary employees at work in the departments when there are numbers who have passed the necessary examination who are desirous of securing employment?

4. Under whose recommendation do temporary employees secure appointments to the service?

5. Are the moneys voted as salaries to temporary employees paid out of funds for the inside or outside service in all cases?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Number of persons who have passed the regular examinations for the inside service since the coming into force of the present Civil Service Act.

Interim examinations, March, 1909:

Second division competitive examination:
- Passed.. 5
- Permanently appointed.. 3
- Temporarily appointed.. 2
- Unappointed.. 0

Competitive examination for stenographers and typewriters:
- Passed.. 19
- Permanently appointed.. 15
- Temporarily appointed.. 3
- *Unappointed.. 1

*Refused appointment.

First semi-annual examinations, May. 1909.

Second Division competitive examination:
- Passed.. 8
- Permanently appointed.. 7
- Temporarily appointed.... 0
- *Unappointed.. 1

*Refused appointment.

Third Division competitive examination:
- Passed.. 37
- Permanently appointed.... 25
- Temporarily appointed... 7
- *Unappointed.. 5

*Four refused appointment.

Lower Grade qualifying examination:
- Passed.. 25
- Permanently appointed.... 11
- Temporarily appointed.... 2
- Unappointed.. 12

Second semi-annual examinations, November, 1909.

Second Division competitive examination:
- Passed.. 9
- Permanently appointed.... 1
- Temporarily appointed.... 0
- Unappointed.. 8

Third Division competitive examination:
- Passed.. 41
- Permanently appointed.... 10
- Temporarily appointed.... 23
- Unappointed.. 8

Mr. HUGHES.

Competitive examination for stenographers and typewriters:
- Passed.. 4
- Permanently appointed.... 0
- Temporarily appointed.... 0
- Unappointed.. 4

Lower Grade qualifying examination:
- Passed.. 10
- Permanently appointed.... 0
- Temporarily appointed.... 2
- Unappointed.. 8

2. In so far as this question relates to the inside service, No. With respect to the outside service, an answer can be given only on a return to an Order of the House.

3. No.

4. All temporary employees must have certificates of qualification from the Civil Service Commission.

5. With respect to the inside service, the salaries of temporary employees are paid out of the appropriation for 'clerical assistance,' and if there is no such appropriation out of that, for contingencies. With respect to the outside service, the salaries of temporary employees are paid out of the appropriation for the service in which the temporary employees are employed.

CHARGES IN ARMY SERVICE CORPS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the government aware that information has been laid according to the requirements of the Criminal Code by two citizens of the city of Ottawa, charging the officer commanding the Ottawa company of the army service corps, with a number of indictable offences in connection with the military camp at Quebec during the Tercentenary celebration, and that such charges are now awaiting trial by the Criminal Courts?

2. Do the King's regulations, or the customs of the British service, require that when the character of an officer has been seriously impugned, he is, as a matter of routine, suspended from duty pending the investigation of charges preferred against him?

3. Has the officer concerned been suspended from duty as commanding officer of a militia corps? If not, why not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. No, the case is subjudice.

LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER AT CAROUSEL.

Mr. GIRARD:

1. Has a person named T. Arcand, lighthouse keeper at Carousel, Seven islands, been removed in 1909? If so, what are the reasons for his removal?

2. Who are the persons outside of the Marine Department, who have directly or indirectly asked for his removal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes. Unsatisfactory service.

2. No person outside of the department asked for the removal of this keeper.

OTTAWA ARMY SERVICE CORPS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the government aware whether one man, two horses and one double carriage were taken from Ottawa to Quebec for the Tercentenary celebration by the officer commanding the Ottawa company of the army service corps, and hire therefor claimed for by him on the official pay-sheets as company draught horses and light wagon, but which did no company work whatsoever, having been hired, transported and held entirely for the personal use of members of the militia council?

2. If so, by whose authority were such arrangements effected, and by whom were such horses and carriage made use of at Quebec?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

I am advised that the answer to this question is, No, but if the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand as a notice of motion, I will bring down any papers in connection with it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion for a return.

REPORT OF PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH AT TORONTO.

Mr. LAKE:

Referring to the Toronto 'Globe' of Thursday, 6th January, 1910, wherein is reported portions of a speech delivered at Toronto the previous day by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as follows:—'We are under the Suzerainty of the King of England; we bow the knee to him; but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament.'

1. Is this a correct report of the Prime Minister's words?

2. Is this the view the government holds of our relationship to the Throne?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The report of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech, which was published in the Toronto 'Globe' of January 6, notwithstanding some slight inaccuracies, is substantially correct, but the citation in the question of the hon. gentleman is not a correct reproduction of that report. It is garbled and omits an important part of the sentence. I am quite sure that the misquotation was unintentional on the part of the hon. gentleman, and he would have averted it if he had consulted the 'Globe' itself, instead of Tory newspapers. The passage cited by my hon. friend, as he can read it in the 'Globe,' is in these words: 'We are under the suzerainty of the King of England. We are his loyal subjects. We bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament.' My hon. friend will notice that in his quotation, the words, 'We are his loyal subjects,' are not to be found. To be more particular, the whole passage is thus reported in the 'Globe': 'The great poet Whittier, in the time of the civil war, wrote: "We bow the heart, if not the knee, to the Queen of England, God bless her."' We say: 'We bow the heart and the knee to the King of England, God bless him.' We are under the suzerainty of the King of England. We are his loyal subjects. We bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament.'

2. This is the view of our relations to the Throne, which is held by all true, loyal British subjects.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the right hon. gentleman going to speak for them all?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If they are not, they ought to be.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not what the right hon. gentleman said; he made an assertion of facts.

SCOTSBURN-LOGANVILLE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Who has the contract for carrying mails, between Scotsburn station, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, and West Branch River John, Loganville, and other points on the same route?

2. When was the contract awarded, and what is the contract price of the work?

3. Who is the postmaster at West Branch River John above mentioned?

4. When was such postmaster appointed, and what allowance does he receive for the work?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1 and 2. Pending an inquiry into the advisability of a rearrangement of services in the district referred to, the department has been paying Mr. Daniel McIntosh $2 per day since the 1st January instant, to operate the service.

3. Daniel Campbell.

4. February 1, 1901—$128 per annum.

SPECIAL POST OFFICE EXAMINATION, MARCH, 1908.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

Referring to special promotion examination of the Post Office Department, March 12, 1908, what in effect was accepted or would have been accepted by the Board of Civil Service Examiners as correct answer to question 4, viz.: 'What correspondence may pass through the Canadian mails free of Canadian postage?'

Mr. LEMIEUX:

All correspondence to and from the Governor General and his secretary.

All duly franked official correspondence from the public departments at Ottawa.

All correspondence to the public departments at Ottawa.

All correspondence to or from the Speakers of either House or the Librarian of Parliament.

Parliamentary library books passing between library and members of either House of parliament.

Parliamentary papers sent during recess by members of either House of parliament or by members of provincial legislatures.

Petitions and addresses to provincial legislatures, or any branch; also votes, proceedings and other papers printed by order of any legislature or branch thereof.

Remittances from postmasters to banks, and acknowledgments from banks to postmasters.

Letters on H.M.S. addressed to imperial departments of state in United Kingdom.

Documents from provincial legislatures relating to agricultural, industrial and sanitary matters, and returns made to provincial governments on prepared forms respecting same matters.

Returns of births, marriages and deaths made by clergymen and others.

Contagious diseases reports and meteorological reports.

Provincial government blank forms for returns.

Customs notices to addressees of dutiable parcels, manifests, way bills passing between collectors of customs and postmasters authorized to collect duty.

Books in raised characters for the blind.

SALES OF LAND IN SURREY, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

Has the government disposed of the following lands in the municipality of Surrey, B.C., viz.: S. E. quarter-section, Bk. 34, Tp. 2; N. half S. S. E. quarter Bk. 34, Tp. 2; and section 31, Bk. 5, N. R. 1 W., Tp. 38, Westminster district? If so, to whom, on what dates, and on what terms?

Mr. OLIVER:

The N. ½ of the S. E. ¼ of section 34, Tp. 2, W.C.M., was sold at the rate of $5 per acre, on the 31st of July, 1891, to Denis Murphy, Esq.; by him assigned to the British Columbia Timber and Electric Company, and released to the Crown by that company on the 26th of March, 1905.

The S. ½ of the S. E. ¼ of section 34 has not been disposed of.

The description 'N. ½ S. S. E. ¼, Bk. 34, Tp. 2,' is insufficient for the location of the land.

The land described as 'section 31, Bk. 5, N.R. 1 W., Tp. 38,' or, according to the Dominion survey, the S. W. ¼ of section 3, Tp. 38, W.C.M., has not been disposed of.

LEASE OF LAND IN WESTMINSTER DISTRICT.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. With respect to 40 acres southerly 10 chains, section 30, Bk. 5, N.R. 1 W., Tp. 38, Westminster district, is this land under lease for timber or other purposes? If so, to whom, upon what terms, and for what period?

2. Has any application been made for pre-emption of homesteading? If so, by whom, and upon what dates?

3. Has any report been made to the department upon application pending? If so, by whom, and to what effect?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. This land is held under timber license by the British Columbia Mills, Timber and Trading Company. It is held under the terms contained in the timber regulations. Yearly licenses are issued subject to renewal as long as timber of the kind specified in the license remains on the berth in sufficient quantities to make it commercially valuable.

2. No application to pre-empt or homestead this land has been made to head office. If an application has been made to the local agent of Dominion lands the department has not yet been advised.

3. No report has been made to the department.

POSTAL PENALTIES.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

Are penalties for violation of the postal law or regulations imposed otherwise than as the result of prosecutions? If so, what is the procedure followed?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Yes. Under the statute, which provides that the Postmaster General, or any of the officers or persons acting under his orders, may accept any penalty incurred under the terms of the Postal Act or any part thereof, without action, suit, or information brought or commenced for the recovery thereof. See section 9, subsection W.—Cap. 66, R.S.C.

ESQUIMALT FORTIFICATIONS.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. Was it with the concurrence of the Imperial War Office and in furtherance of their policy at the time the fortifications at Esquimalt were taken over, that the upper battery at Rod Hill should be dismantled and the six disappearing guns constituting the armament of the battery, should be removed to the drill hall at Victoria, to be used for training purposes of the 5th Regiment?

2. If so, what was the date of such concurrence, or of the expression of such policy, by whom was such concurrence given or expression made, and was it made or given verbally or in writing?

3. The same questions are asked with reference to the removal of the gun from Duntze Hill to the drill hall?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. The removals of the 6-inch B.L. gun from Rod Hill and of the gun from Duntze Hill to the drill hall were undertaken with

the approval of the Militia Council at the urgent representation of the military authorities at Esquimalt that such removal was desirable to facilitate the training of the 5th regiment.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

GOVERNMENT RESIDENT ENGINEERS.

Mr. BARNARD:

How many resident engineers of the Public Works Department are there in each of the different provinces and what is the salary of each engineer?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

Geo. P. Brophy, Ottawa, Ont..	$3,000
R. de B. Corriveau, Ottawa, Ont..	2,350
J. G. Sing, Toronto, Ont..	2,700
H. J. Lamb, London, Ont..	2,600
W. P. Merrick, Fort William, Ont..	2,200
E. B. Temple, Port Arthur, Ont..	2,400
W. C. Brough, Port Burwell, Ont..	2,000
E. G. Millidge, Antigonish, N.S.	2,400
C. E. W. Dodwell, Halifax, N.S..	2,700
Thos. J. Lockie, Halifax, N.S..	2,200
Jas. B. Hegan, Charlottetown, P.E.I.. ..	2,400
E. T. P. Shewen, St. John, N.B.	2,400
J. K. Scammell, St. John, N.B..	1,800
Geoffrey Stead, Chatham, N.B..	2,400
J. L. Michaud, Montreal, Que..	2,400
Thos. Breen, Quebec, Que..	2,400
A. R. Décary, Quebec, Que..	2,500
J. A. Tremblay, Montmagny, Que.... ..	1,900
P. E. Amiot, Father Point, Que..	2,000
J. T. Bertrand, Isle Verte, Que	2,400
F. X. Lefebvre, Three Rivers, Que.. ..	2,300
F. X. T. Berlinguet, Three Rivers, Que.	2,350
J. C. Taché, Chicoutimi, Que..	2,250
A. R. Dufresne, Winnipeg, Man..	2,700
Z. Malhiot, Calgary, Alta..	2,400
Geo. A. Keefer, New Westminster, B.C.	2,700

POSTAL SERVICE, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What was the date of the discontinuance of postal service at the post office known as Central Park?

2. What was the date of the commencement of postal service at the post office known as East Collingwood?

3. What notice was given to those who had been accustomed to receive mail at Central Park that the office would be removed?

4. Was any request made to the Postal Department, or any official of the department, by any person or persons outside of service, for the discontinuance of the postal service at Central Park?

5. If so, by whom? If not, why did the department take action?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. As stated, in answer to a previous inquiry, postal service has not been discontinued at the Central Park post office. The post office, as stated, was removed to its present location on the 1st August, 1909.

2. 1st September, 1909.

3. It is not usual in the case of a change in the location of a post office to give any special notice. The fact becomes generally known without delay.

4 and 5. A largely signed petition was received from patrons of the Central Park post office complaining of the management and asking that the office be removed from the control of the postmaster at that time. The case was referred to the inspector for investigation, who recommended as the result of inquiries, that a change be made in the postmastership.

SEALING ON PACIFIC.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Is there a proposal under consideration by the government for the discontinuance of sealing on the Pacific by Canadian citizens?

2. If so, what is the nature of the proposal, and to what stage have the negotiations advanced?

3. Has any advice been given to the individual seal hunters, or any negotiations in that regard? If so, to whom has this advice been delivered on their behalf?

4. Is there to be any compensation paid, will the individual seal hunters share in the distribution, or will it be confined to the owners of sealing vessels?

5. Has any advice been given to the owners of sealing vessels, of any negotiations in this regard, or has the government any reason to suppose that the owners are aware of negotiations that may be in progress?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A proposal for a total cessation of sealing during a number of years has been and is now under consideration. It would not be advisable in the public interest to bring down any information on this subject at the present time.

CARE OF IMMIGRANTS IN MEDICINE HAT.

Mr. MAGRATH:

1. What facilities have the Department of the Interior in the city of Medicine Hat for the proper housing and care of arriving immigrants?

2. Has the department made any requests on the Department of Public Works for the [illegible] of a building for such purposes? If so, when?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No facilities for the housing of immigrants, but there is an office, with an agent in charge, to receive and direct them. Facilities for housing, to serve for that district, are provided at Irvine, twenty-two miles east of Medicine Hat.

2. No.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, AGASSIZ, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What was the contribution of the Dominion government towards the cost of construction of the ditch into which the experimental farm at Agassiz, B. C., drains?

2. What is the total acreage of government owned land draining into the ditch, and what is the total acreage of privately owned land so draining?

3. What was the total cost of the ditch?

4. Have representations been made to the government that it has said to have become necessary to remove an accumulation of sediment in order to make the ditch effective, and that this sediment is said to come in considerable proportion from the experimental farm?

5. If this condition be found to exist, will the government bear an equitable proportion of the cost of the work required?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. An order in council dated July 19, 1900, authorized the payment of $754.93, as an amount equivalent to that under which the same circumstances, a subject would be required to pay calculated on the same basis as the ditch commissioner of Agassiz established for the surrounding properties. This sum was paid in full compensation and discharge of all payments, contributions or assessments to be paid by the Crown to entitle the Crown to the use of the work.

2. The area of government land is 295 acres, and the area of privately owned land is 1,144 acres.

3. It is said to have cost about $5,000.

4. No representations have been made as to the deposit of sediment from the experimental farm, though the claim has been made that the ditch is unable to carry away the drainage from the experimental farm and from the other farms as well. This the superintendent of the farm considers to be due to the fact that the ditch has never been cleaned out, and has become obstructed by cattle breaking down the banks and by frost action.

5. As far back as September, 1908, the department declared its willingness to bear its share in the expense of cleaning out the ditch and is still willing to do so.

LAKE NIPISSING FLOODED LANDS.

Mr. GEO. GORDON:

What are the names of the parties who have received moneys for flooded lands around Lake Nipissing since December 31, 1908, and the sum paid to each?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

H. Knink	$ 15 00
H. Quesnel	75 00
J. and H. Tremblay	225 00
O. Lafrance	15 00
J. Noble	52 50
S. R. Connell	75 00
C. Lefebvre	7 50
Jos. Walker	50 00
A. Lefebvre	22 50
J. Steep	70 00
L. M. Deslongchamps	15 00
F. Lajeunesse	4 00
J. Lajeunesse	4 00
M. Landry	15 00
J. Latendresse	$ 22 50
D. St. George	120 00
C. Courchaine	80 00
Total	$ 868 00

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY:

1. Has the government, or any one on its behalf, sent an officer or person to St. Peter's Indian reserve, Manitoba, for the purpose of making any investigation into the surrender and sale of said reserve, or the sale of lands recently granted to Indians of said reserve?

2. If so, what is the name and occupation of such person, what were his instructions and what was the result of his investigation?

3. Has any report, written or verbal, been made by such person, and will the minister lay the said report on the table?

4. Has any representation, report or communication been sent to the government suggesting or urging the surrender or sale of said reserve during the last five years? If so, from whom?

5. What are the rules of the said band as to notice of meeting, presiding officer, &c., upon the surrender of a reserve, and does the consent require a vote of a majority of the male members of the band over 21 years of age, or only a majority of those present at the meeting?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. A. S. Williams, law clerk of the Department of Indian Affairs, and Mr. S. Swinford, Inspector for the South Lake Winnipeg inspectorate. Their instructions will be laid on the table of the House on motion.

3. No.

4. Yes, by S. J. Jackson, late M.P. for the district.

5. The rule or custom of the St. Peter's band regarding meetings is that sufficient notice be given to permit the members of the band being made aware if the intention to hold a meeting and of its purport. Consent for surrender requires a vote of the majority of the male members 21 years of age present at the meeting. Meetings are presided over by an officer duly authorized by the Superintendent General.

CEMENT MERGER.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

1. Has the government received any complaints concerning the cement merger and the reported illegal combination resulting therefrom to inflate the prices of cement to consumers?

2. Is the government aware that this merger is said to be unlawfully increasing the prices to consumers?

3. If the government is not aware of the illegal operations of the cement combine, does it intend to institute inquiries in respect thereto?

4. Has the government under consideration the advisability of instituting prosecution against those responsible for this alleged combine?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING:

1. One communication has been received in which it is alleged that the effect of the cement merger has been to enhance the price of cement and restrict competition.

2. The government has received no information to this effect.

3 and 4. No representations as to any illegal operations of the cement merger have been made to the government.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC CLASSIFICATIONS.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Have any written objections to classification upon the Transcontinental railway been made since July 28, 1908?

2. Have any objections been made in reference to overbreak or other over-expenditure since October 2, 1908?

3. Will the minister bring down a copy of these objections?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as notice of motion for return.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing: (a) the names of the contractors for construction of the National Transcontinental railway and the number, mileage and location of the contract; (b) the estimated expenditure under each contract at the time the contract was let, based upon the engineer's estimate of quantities, at rates of the accepted tender (c) the estimated increase or decrease in expenditure in each case occasioned by change in location, specification, construction, material, grade or other change subsequent to the letting of the contract; (d) the amount returned and claimed on progress estimates under each contract to date; the amount actually paid under each contract, and the estimated amount yet required to complete the work in each case; (e) the engineer's estimated quantity of solid rock, loose rock and common excavation in the section of line covered by each contract, the estimated cost under these headings, based upon the rates of the accepted tender, the actual expenditure under these headings to date, as shown by progress estimates, the amounts actually paid to date under these headings, and the estimated quantities of work yet to be done, and the estimated sums yet to be paid under these headings in respect to each contract.

Also, as to all contracts other than the twenty-one covered by the return brought down on the 26th of April, 1909, No. 46h; a copy of (a) engineer's itemized estimate of quantities as to each contract of each class of work and material, as set out in the schedules and itemized, and total estimated expenditure based upon rates of accepted tender, and (b) a copy of all tenders received; (c) itemized quantities of work and material under the various headings actually done or furnished to date, and itemized, and total expenditure therefor; itemized statement of estimated quantities of work yet to be done and material, &c., yet to be furnished and itemized, and total estimated cost of the same based on contract prices.—Mr. Lennox.

For a copy of all instructions given during his term of office by the Honourable Speaker Blanchet to the then Sergeant-at-Arms or to other officials in connection with the appointment of sessional messengers.—Mr. Monk.

For a return showing what interest or control the Canadian Northern Railway Company has in any of the following railway companies: the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company, the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company, the Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company, the Minnesota and Manitoba Railway Company, the Minnesota and Ontario Bridge Company, the Saskatchewan North Western Railway Company, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, the Alberta Midland Railway Company, the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.

2. What subsidies either in land, money, or by way of guarantee of securities have been granted to any of the railway companies, mentioned on account of the main or branch lines or both, of the said companies, either by the Dominion government, or the provincial governments of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, or any municipality through which their lines run.

3. What portion of these subsidies have been earned to date.

4. How many miles west of Edmonton a line of railway is constructed and in operation by the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

5. What work other than location survey work has been done west of this point up to date, how much and of what nature.

6. What portion, if any, will eventually form part of the proposed line to Vancouver.

7. When the location plan of the route of the Canadian Northern railway between Edmonton and Vancouver, by way of the Yellow Head Pass was approved by the Minister of Railways and the Board of Railway Commissioners.

8. What applications, if any, have been made since to change or in any way alter this location plan.

9. To what extent, if any, the government of Manitoba has exercised its right of control of freight rates under section 8 of schedule B of the Act 1 Edward VII., chapter 53.

10. What effect, if any, this section of said Act has had in reducing freight rates in the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Smith, (Nanaimo.)

For a return showing:

1. How many derailments have taken place over the Intercolonial railway during the year 1909.

2. At what points of the railway each of these derailments took place, and at what dates.

3. The report made in each case, and the cause or causes mentioned in such report.—Mr. Talbot.

BRIDGES OF THE BEAUHARNOIS CANAL.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between Celestin Pregent, of Melocheville, province of Quebec, either personally or through his attorney, and the Department of Railways and Canals, concerning certain bridges on the Beauharnois canal.

He said: On this motion I merely wish to remark now that the Beauharnois canal, having passed into the hands of a company headed by Messrs. McIntyre and Robert, it is claimed that they are not fulfilling the obligations that they assumed at the time to keep the canal in proper order for navigation and to maintain bridges. A number of complaints have been made that bridges are condemned and not repaired, and that in other respects the canal is not kept in the same order or in the state of repair in which it was kept when in the hands of the government. That is the reason I move for these papers. I will discuss the matter more fully when we are considering the estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has perhaps escaped the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that in the reply given by me to a question the other day, a categorical answer was given to statements similar to those he has now made. Of course, there is no objection to the motion. But when the papers come down I think it will be found that the contract is being carried out. Certainly the department will see to it that it is carried out.

Mr. MONK. I was not in the House at the time referred to, but I assume that the minister stated that the purchasers or lessees of the canal were bound to fulfil the same obligations as the government. I presume that was the answer given.

Mr. GRAHAM. More in detail.

Mr. MONK. The reason I am asking for the correspondence is to bring to the notice of the House cases of individual hardship at Melocheville and elsewhere, in order that the government may more strenuously insist on the carrying out by the company of its said obligations.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSAL TO SELL INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. J. B. BLACK (Hants). Mr. Speaker, in moving the resolution on the subject of the Intercolonial which stands in my name, I desire, with the approval of my seconder the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Pickup) and with the consent of the House, to add a sentence to the resolution. With this addition, the resolution will read as follows:

That in the opinion of this House it would be in the best interests of the maritime provinces and for the general good of Canada that the Intercolonial railway be operated and controlled by one of the companies operating the Canadian Transcontinental lines, or by such other corporation as may offer the best facilities for the development of the country tributary to the Intercolonial.

I add these words because some of my friends have insinuated that I was moving the resolution in the interest of the Canadian Pacific railway and some others have suggested that I was doing it in the interest of the Canadian Northern. I add these words so that we may give everybody that wants to lease the Intercolonial railway an opportunity to lease it. I am perfectly disinterested in this matter. Fortunately or unfortunately I am not acquainted with a single official of the Canadian Northern or with a single official of the Canadian Pacific railway. I represent a county through which the Intercolonial railway runs. My object in moving this resolution is simply to promote the interests of the maritime provinces, whose interests lie very near to my heart, for I was born in one of those provinces and have lived for forty-seven years in another. Before going further I may say that I am very sorry that I had arranged to introduce this resolution today. Had I known that the House was to adjourn at six o'clock, I would have left the resolution over. But as I had asked other hon. gentlemen who preceded me on the Order Paper to allow me an opportunity, I shall go on with it. As the time afforded for discussion is short, I shall make my remarks as brief as possible. There are gentlemen in this House who will speak against this resolution, I am sure, who, in their hearts, are in favour of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BLACK. I think I am perfectly in order. I think that on this question some of the maritime members are in the same situation as certain representatives of Newfoundland on the question of confederation. Certain interested parties have drilled it into the minds of the people of Newfoundland that confederation with Canada would ruin that colony, and no politician would feel safe in advocating such a union. This question I now bring before the House is a very delicate question for a member who, in advocating it, has to stand in the face of the opposition of his constituents. I, fortunately, from certain circumstances, am in a position—I will not say of indifference—but I am perfectly prepared to advocate the leasing of this road to some company that will make a better use of it than the present commission or any of the managers of the past have been able to do. I regret exceedingly that some of the maritime newspapers, as soon as this order was put on the order paper, went off at half-cock and criticised it and commented on it adversely

without waiting to know the merits of the case. I will quote the evidence from a paper in the maritime provinces, which said:

The leasing of this road would be a confession that the Liberal party is unequal to the task of satisfactorily administering a great public property in the interests of the tax-payers.

So far as the Intercolonial is concerned, I think the sooner the Liberal party makes that confession the better. I think that, like every other honest confession, it would be good for the soul of the party. There has been no government since confederation that has administered the Intercolonial railway satisfactorily, and there never will be a government that will manage that road in the interest of the country, because it is impossible under the circumstances by which the country is bound. It is impossible that the government can compete with other railways, or that they can adopt modern railway business methods. Now here is another sentence in the same paper:

There are certain Nova Scotia interests which favour the alienation of the Intercolonial.

I suppose that was intended to hit somebody, I do not know who, but it does not hit me at all. But I quite agree with the editorial, that it is in the interest of Nova Scotia to favour the alienation of the Intercolonial, as we will see by and by. Another paper, this time from Moncton, attacked my resolution a litte more vigorously than the paper to which I have referred. It shouts 'Hands off the peoples' railway.' Sir, I have remarked for a great many years that when you couple the name of the people with a corporation or an individual, there is something about the corporation or the individual that wont measure four square all round. I do not care whether you shout the peoples' railway, or the peoples' Jimmy, or the peoples' William, there is always something at the bottom that is not just four square. The people of Moncton, in shouting 'Hands off the peoples' railway,' are very much like those people mentioned in ancient history, who shouted without reason 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians,' because they thought their calling was in danger. I think we can safely assure the people of Moncton, that if the Intercolonial is handed over to a private company, their craft will not be in danger, their city will be even more prosperous than it is now. I would like to get at the bottom of this cry about 'The peoples' railway.' What people is it? Who owns the railway? Does Nova Scotia own it any more than British Columbia? Does it belong any more to the people of New Brunswick than it does to the people of Ontario? Who gets the benefit of it? How much benefit are the people getting from this peoples' railway beyond what they are able to pay for? If any of the people want to travel on the peoples' railway, I think they have to pay about as much as they do on any other railway. If any of the people want to send freight from Montreal to St. John they pay just exactly as much money to the peoples' railway as they pay to the Canadian Pacific railway. If any person from Halifax, say an invalid who wants to go to Montreal to take the waters, purchases a ticket, he will find that he pays exactly the same price for it over the peoples' railway that he does over the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman not aware of the fact that there was a return brought down to this House some years ago showing the cost of carrying wheat over that road per mile and over the Canadian Pacific railway and other roads in this country, and it was shown that it cost about one-fourth as much to carry it over the Intercolonial per mile as it did over the other roads?

Mr. BLACK. I have never read any proof of that assertion. There are many things being said in the House that lack proof.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a matter of a return brought down to this House.

Mr. BLACK. I am not advocating this transfer in the interest of Ontario or of the western wheat growers. Two-thirds of the freight that goes over that road goes east, from which we are getting no advantage whatever. Western drummers come down to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to solicit orders; their goods come down over the railway, and if there is no reduction in the freight rate, what benefit is it to the people in the maritime provinces? We know that the freight rates and the passenger rates from Montreal to Halifax and St. John are just exactly the same as the rates from Halifax and St. John to Montreal. Furthermore, all the rates are under the control of the Railway Commission. The question of the reduction of rates is a mighty small thing when compared with the want of development of the country through which that railway runs. Forty or fifty years ago a man worked for 75, 80 or 90 cents a day; would that man like to go back to old times and take the small wage he was getting then? This country has gone ahead since the railway was built, we can afford to pay higher wages. The people can afford to pay higher freight rates now than they did before. There is nothing more important to the interests of a country than transportation. Transportation lies at the foundation of the commerce and the manufacturers of a country.

You cannot successfully manufacture, you cannot successfully trade, you cannot prosper without adequate transportation. I want to say that we are not getting adequate transportation, we are not getting that development of our country that we should get. The functions of a modern railway, Mr. Speaker, are not merely to carry passengers and freight, a modern railway does much more than that. If you look into the industrial transportation of the United States, you will find that the railways of that country have to a large extent engaged in industrial enterprises, and have at all times lent their aid and assistance to the establishment of industrial enterprises along their lines, and have been the chief actor in the development of many successful industries in the United States. As I have said, the functions of a modern railway are not merely to carry freight and passengers, but they are to make freight, to add to population, to get passengers, to bring in immigrants, to promote industry in the country. A modern railway engages in manufactures, engages in mining——

Mr. EMMERSON. And rebates.

Mr. BLACK. The hon. gentleman says rebates. He has run a railway, and knows more about it than I do. They engage in shipping, they conduct schools for technical education, they assist in developing the industries of a country. The Intercolonial, I take it for granted, is not doing anything of that kind in the maritime provinces. As a matter of fact not only are our industries, our agriculture, our manufactures, our mines, our immigration not assisted by the Intercolonial railway in the maritime provinces, but our industries are actually injured, our population is depleted by the Intercolonial railway joining with the Canadian Pacific railway in taking loads of our young men every autumn to the west for almost nothing. Any man knows who lives in the maritime provinces that every autumn thousands of the healthiest, the strongest and the ablest young men are carried by the Intercolonial railway to the nearest connection with the Canadian Pacific railway, and from there transported west.

Mr. SPROULE. How would that be remedied by giving the Intercolonial railway over to the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. BLACK. Well, wait until I get through. I am making the statement that the Intercolonial railway, the peoples' railway, is helping to carry the people out of the country. You might not remedy it if the Canadian Pacific railway owned it, and I am not advocating particularly that the Canadian Pacific railway do own it, but what I say is that the Canadian Pacific railway is a private owned railway and it is interested in taking the people out while the government owned railway is helping it to depopulate the maritime provinces. Go into any station from Halifax to Amherst or in New Brunswick and you will see posted inducements to young men to go in immigrant trains at reduced rates or at almost nothing. That is the way the Intercolonial railway is assisting the industry of the maritime provinces. There are very remarkable things done for the people by the peoples' railway. I would like to know how much regard there has been in the prompt dismissal of hundreds of employees without a week's notice. This is the peoples' railway. I would like to know if it is in the interests of the people that the commissioners takes the big stick and threaten a newspaper if it criticise the management. That it will get no more patronage and not only threaten, but carries out the threat. That is the way the peoples' railway is managed for the people. God save us from the peoples' railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has turned into a prayer service.

Mr. BLACK. I think there are some things in connection with the Intercolonial railway that need the prayers of good men. The policy of the modern railway is to develop the industries of the country. Now, the question will be readily asked: What industries have we now in the maritime provinces that any railway company would be interested in developing? Speaking for Nova Scotia, where the largest part of my life has been spent, I may say that there are no provinces of Canada with greater probabilities or greater possibilities than the little province of Nova Scotia. There are such varieties of undeveloped industries, and there are varieties of industries that are partially developed that a modern railway could assist and, in their own interest would assist in building up. I may say that in the way of minerals we have immense deposits of coal, only part of which are worked at the present time. We have iron and we have salt. Sixteen separate deposits of salt have been discovered in that province. We have building stone of the finest quality, and I remember that while our quarries of beautiful stone in the maritime provinces are left idle, stones for the new wing of the parliament buildings here were brought all the way from Ohio. The people's railway might have assisted in developing a stone quarry at least and thereby added to their freight tonnage. We have coal, we have iron, we have building stone, magnesium, antimony, tin, copper, and gold, all of which a modern railway coming into that country would find it in its interest to assist. Over and above these there is the leather tanning industry, with immense forests of hemlock available for that purpose, and an abundance, particu-

larly in New Brunswick, of wood for pulp and paper manufacturing. We have also the preparation and transportation of fish for the inland provinces. It is a remarkable thing that with the wealth of fish gathered in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick from the sea, Ontario and the other inland provinces depend upon the New England states for their fresh fish. It seems impossible to make any arrangement with the people's railway to transport fish to the inland markets. We have an abundance of wood for furniture making and wood-working establishments. We have an apple and pear culture which can be developed at least one hundred times greater than it is at the present time. Would a modern railway engage in agriculture or fruit growing? I read an interview with Sir Thos. Shaugnessy of the Canadian Pacific railway, a short time ago in which he says:

> We propose to prepare land for this class of small holder, to build his house, fence his holding, break a part of the soil and sow it so that he can come out and find all ready to settle down. This will be within the reach of the English countrymen who has £100 capital to make a start.

What would it mean to Nova Scotia if somebody in a position like Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and his Canadian Pacific railway would take tracts of 10, 20 or 30 acres in the counties of Hants, Kings and Annapolis, plant them in young apple trees, put small houses on them and make them ready for the fruit grower? There are thousands of acres yet unused in these counties for fruit growing that could be advantageously and profitably used if a railway company would undertake this work. Agriculture in all its branches—and we have a magnificent agricultural country down there—should be developed by a private railway. Another great thing—I speak particularly for Nova Scotia—is the summer tourist travel. How much has the Intercolonial railway done in the way of summer tourist travel? How much has it done to bring wealthy tourists into the country? I notice that on their folder time table there is the head of a moose which represents to the world that the maritime provinces are an immense forest where moose range at large and may be shot down by the man who is inclined that way.

All around Nova Scotia are beautiful spots for summer tourists. They come in thousands, but if there were first-class hotels and proper facilities for transportation the wealthy classes would come in hundreds of thousands. In that beautiful spot called Chester, with 365 islands in its basin, wealthy tourists from Baltimore discovered it not long ago, and notwithstanding there were no hotels and the transportation facilities were bad, they came in hundreds and continue to come in increasing numbers. Out of their wealth they have built what they call cottages but which we would almost call mansions. They have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in hotels, in beautiful residences, in yachts, and more would come were encouragement given them. Nova Scotia is the natural playground for the wealthy man from the eastern states, and were the Intercolonial railway owned by a private company, hotels would be erected and proper steamers would be put on the water route and tourist traffic attracted. We have a line of steamers which are allowed to carry I believe 400 passengers, but I have seen 800 or 900 on board, and I have seen women obliged to sit up all night without a place on which to lay their heads. Then, would it not be in the interest of a private railway company to assist the maritime provinces in developing their mines, in increasng their fisheries, in building proper steamers to carry travel in that direction. We can only tell by what has been done by the Canadian Pacific railway, for instance, which has erected a line of first-class hotels from Quebec to Victoria, British Columbia. Before the Canadian Pacific railway built the Chateau Frontenac in Quebec the tourist traffic was comparatively nothing, and any one who studies the history of that hotel can realize what a well equipped and modern hotel can do to attract travellers. In Quebec, have you anything more attractive for the tourist than we have at Halifax, or at Chester, or at Mahone, or Yarmouth, or Digby.

Mr. ROY. We have.

Mr. BLACK. My hon. friend (Mr. Roy) knows the beauties of Quebec, and they are great, but I know the beauties of Nova Scotia and they are magnificent. Business methods adopted by a modern railway company would develop the maritime provinces, build up our industries and increase the products of our natural resources. My own belief is that if you hand the Intercolonial over to a first-class company with capital, that that company will within a short time be bound to expend at least $5,000,000 in the establishment of industries and the erection of hotels in the maritime provinces. Were the Intercolonial handed over to a strong private company, I believe we would see the maritime provinces blossom like the rose. Can the Intercolonial, as it is situated today, engage in any such enterprise? No. They have to come back to parliament for a vote before anything can be done, and just imagine the countenance of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) if this House were asked to vote an appropriation to build an hotel in Halifax. I would like to hear what the Conservative members from Ontario and the west would have to say were they asked to vote $100,000 to develop the pulp industries of New Brunswick or to

open up the vast mineral deposits in Nova Scotia. The Intercolonial railway simply cannot do these things. The commission cannot do them if they wanted to. See the circumlocution that has been going on for two years and more about the purchasing of the branch lines as feeders. Two years ago (Mr. Emmerson) introduced the question, and to-day it has not got far enough that it has not to come back to parliament again for ratification, when the commission decide what railways they shall buy, if any. Were the Intercolonial handed over to a private company, that company would do all these things without delay. The present Intercolonial Railway Commissioners not only cannot help the industries of the maritime provinces but in their present state of mind they don't want to. They don't know anything about the needs of the maritime provinces, they are not maritime province men. I think one of them has been imported from Vermont by way of Ontario, and what does he know about the growing necessities and needs of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or of Quebec? Nothing at all. Are their interests our interests? Is their heart in sympathy with our wants and all we need? Not a bit of it. I say that the present management of the Intercolonial by the commission is the worst we have had for many years, and since the man of brains and the man of ability has gone out and left the commission we will go from bad to worse. I have no hope for it at all. What would Halifax be with a private company owning the Intercolonial, with a line of steamers such as the Canadian Pacific railway are running, say to Liverpool or Glasgow, with a proper line of steamers to take up that splendid opportunity of trade with the West Indies? What have we got down there now? We are subsidizing Norwegian steamers, if I am not mistaken, to run between Halifax and the West Indies, and I think they are doing the same thing at St. John. Do not misunderstand me, I think that the Thompsons of St. John have a large subsidy for running steamers to the West Indies, but they are handing a large part of that work over to Norwegian steamers. Pickford and Black had a large subsidy for running steamers, such as they are, and they never were much, —down to the West Indies. If I am not incorrectly informed, Norwegian steamers are carrying on the service there. Are we assisting the trade and commerce of the maritime provinces by such things as that? I think not.

I wished to reply to some of the arguments and criticisms of the opponents of this scheme, but I do not think it would be fair to the other gentlemen who desire to speak on this subject. I think I have shown that the Intercolonial railway cannot help us in our industries in the maritime provinces and will not. We have vast

industries there that need developing. Somebody may say: Why do not your Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers do it themselves, they go to Trinidad and Mexico and invest money, why do they not invest in their own country? That is the strange part of human nature. It is so in other countries, it is so in England. It was stated by one of the Rothschilds not long ago that for investments outside of England, any quantity of money could be raised, but for investments in England it was almost impossible to raise any. I presume it is a case of:

> Far off fowls ha'e feathers fair,
> An' aye until ye try them.

The great cry on the part of the people's railway is the reduced freights, and the claim that if the company had the road, freights would go up. Every one knows that the freight rates are not left entirely to the railway companies, that they are controlled by the permanent railway commission and that a railroad cannot charge whatever it pleases. For my own part I believe that if this road was handed over to a company the increase in industries and the development of the undeveloped possibilities of the maritime provinces would be such that we could afford to pay higher rates, but I do not believe we would have to pay higher rates.

I beg to move the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. D. H. McALISTER (Kings and Albert, N. B.) I seldom encroach on the time of the House by making a speech, but as this resolution concerns the people whom I represent I think it my duty to say a few words upon it. Public sentiment in the contituency I have the honour to represent, is absolutely opposed to such a course, and I must confess that I am opposed to this resolution. Furthermore I am really surprised that a resolution of this description should ever be introduced in this House by a maritime province member.

Mr. BLACK. I dare say.

Mr. McALISTER. If it had been introduced by a member from the west or from the Yukon district the matter might be explained. I do not believe the government have any mandate to get rid of the Intercolonial railway. They have no right either directly or indirectly through the Department of Railways to lease that road to a private company or syndicate. If this government should take it to be their duty to do so and declare that to be their policy, they should dissolve this House and go before the people to secure their verdict. I am quite sure that if they did so, the members supporting this government from the beautiful little provinces down by the sea would be minus.

Their number would be very different from what it is to-day. If I went before the people of my constituency advocating this resolution, I would not get 1,000 votes from the beautiful united constituency of Kings and Albert.

I would like to read a few newspaper clippings in regard to the Intercolonial railway being handed over to a private syndicate or company. The first is from the Toronto 'Globe' and purports to be the words of Mr. Robert Meighen, president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company. It reads:

> I would not stand for the control of the Intercolonial railway being given to any corporation. I don't care whether it is the Canadian Pacific railway, of which I am a director, the Grand Trunk, or Mackenzie & Mann, I think it would be wrong. I could give my reasons, but as a railway director perhaps I had better not.

Another business man of Montreal says:

> If it goes into the hands of Mackenzie & Mann or any other company there will be a revolution in the maritime provinces. I spent 25 years there, and I know the feeling such a step would arouse.

The Moncton 'Transcript' quotes from the Toronto 'World', a paper also of some account saying:

> The 'World' takes up the question not only in behalf of the maritime provinces, but from the standpoint of the people generally. Replying to those who have been crying out against the Intercolonial, it says:
>
> We have ust two things to say to these exploiters—and they are exploiters for themselves pure and simple:
>
> First, the Intercolonial is owned by the people of Canada at large, not by the people of the maritime provinces as such; that they've put their good eighty millions of dollars in it, both because they engaged to build it as a part of the pact of confederation, and because they see that it is or can certainly be made a substantial check on the other roads, and, in an emergency, of the supremest importance to Canada as a state and as a part of the British empire

There have been a great many fallacies in regard to the Intercolonial railway, and one of the greatest of these is that the deficits have been due to party political causes. If that be the case, what caused the surplus when the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) was Minister of Railways and Canals? If the deficit in 1907 was due to party political causes, what caused the expansion of its revenues nearly threefold since 1907? No doubt the management of the Intercolonial railway has been defective in many respects, but it is equally undoubted that it has become considerably improved since this commission has had control. I am sorry to find my hon. friend (Mr. Black) jump on the Intercolonial railway commission before that commission has had the opportunity to submit a report of its administration and before, therefore, he is in a position to know what it is doing. I think he should have waited until its report was submitted before making his criticism. As regards the resignation of Mr. Butler, that is an event which we all must regret. From what I have known of Mr. Butler's control, he has always conducted the affairs of the Intercolonial railway from a perfectly fair and non-political standpoint; but while I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Black) that the resignation of Mr. Butler will cripple the commission to a certain extent, I cannot go the length which the hon. gentleman did. I think that if Mr. Pottinger had been allowed the same free hand some years ago the Intercolonial railway would have shown in all probability different results.

No doubt that railway has cost the people of Canada some $80,000,000, but in return we have a valuable asset; and the best proof of the value of that asset is the fact that a number of private corporations are doing their best to get hold of it. In my opinion, a good many of the reports we read about that railway are sprung by individuals who are anxious to get control. It would be very unfair to the people of Canada if, after they had met the deficits on the Intercolonial all those years, they should now, when it has a good chance to make a profitable showing, be induced to hand it over to some private individuals. The maritime provinces are to-day on the eve of a great commercial development. Our new Canadian navy, if we should decide to have one, will no doubt be built at St. John and Halifax and will no doubt start a boom in the maritime provinces, and add considerably to the traffic of the Intercolonial railway. In mining and shipbuilding, I look to see a great increase in the near future, and I have no doubt that those shrewd individuals who are trying to get control of the Intercolonial railway are doing so in anticipation of this turn of the tide. But when people talk of what the Intercolonial railway has cost the country, if they will figure out the land grant of the Canadian Pacific at one dollar an acre they will find that that railway has cost the people considerable more than $80,000,000, and yet the people down by the sea have never complained. Then take the enormous sums that have been expended on our canals, and we have suggestions made for millions more of canal expenditure in the near future. So that if the Intercolonial railway has not been a paying proposition so far, neither have our canals. The policy of the government regarding canals is that of free tolls, so that if you add the interest on the ex-

penditure to the annual cost of maintenance and operation you will find that the amount we have spent on our canals is enormous. Yet the people of the maritime provinces do not complain. They realize that the people who use the canals are getting the benefit, and in the same way the people who use the Intercolonial railway are reaping the advantage. We often hear the Canadian Pacific railway held up as a shining light in comparison with the Intercolonial railway. Well, no one doubts that the Canadian Pacific is a well organized and a well managed road, but I am going to give you some figures showing the rates charged on the Canadian Pacific railway and the Intercolonial railway which may perhaps cause some people to reflect. There are ten classifications in tariff rates on the Canadian Pacific railway, and from St. John to Woodstock, N.B., a distance of 137 miles, the ten classifications are per 100 lbs. as follows:

No. 1, 40 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 2, 35 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 3, 30 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 4, 25 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 5, 20 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 6, 18 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 7, 15 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 8, 16 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 9, 16 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 10, 13 cents per 100 lbs.

While for the same distance, St. John to Amherst, N.S., the Intercolonial railway charges as follows:

No. 1, 29 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 2, 26 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 3, 22 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 4, 18 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 5, 15 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 6, 14 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 7, 11 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 8, 12 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 9, 11 cents per 100 lbs.
No. 10, 9 cents per 100 lbs.

Taking another point, St. John to Perth Jct., a distance of 184 miles, the Canadian Pacific charges: .42 .37 .32 .26 .21 .19 .17 .17 .17 .15, while from St. John to Wentworth the same mileage, the Intercolonial charges: .33 .29 .26 .21 .17 .16 .14 .14 .12 .11. Just one more case, St. John to St. Leonards, a distance of 223 miles, the Canadian Pacific charges: .48 .42 .36 .30 .24 .22 .18 .19 .19 .16, while the Intercolonial charges, St. John to Brookfield, N.S., the same mileage: .36 .32 .27 .23 .18 .16 .14 .15 .14 .12.

These figures show that from St. John to Amherst, which is exactly the same distance as from St. John to Woodstock, the people pay 38 per cent higher freight rates on the Canadian Pacific railway than they do on the Intercolonial railway. This is a matter which ought to be seriously considered by the hon. gentleman who presented the resolution we are now discussing. Does he really think that any private company would build these beautiful hotels he speaks of to develop this great province of Nova Scotia? No, Sir, such companies are looking out for themselves, whereas the government is looking out for the development of the whole country. Does he think that if a private company owned the Intercolonial railway it would haul coal as cheaply from the coal mines of Nova Scotia as the Intercolonial railway does?

Mr. BLACK. A great part of that coal is hauled by water.

Mr. McALISTER. My hon. friend knows that the sale or lease of the Intercolonial railway to a private corporation would cause great loss and inconvenience to the large industrial plants in Sydney and other points in Nova Scotia. It seems to me that the object of this resolution is to induce the government to give over $80,000,000 worth of railway to a private corporation without a quid pro quo, and would make the rich richer and the poor poorer. What is wanted in the maritime provinces is population, and those who are advocating the sale of the Intercolonial railway would do much better by urging on this government and the local government of Nova Scotia a more energetic immigration policy as regards that province. What we require is not to get rid of the Intercolonial, but to bring in a larger immigration.

There is one thing I have not spoken of and that is the accommodation we get by the Intercolonial railway. Members from the west do not appreciate this, but if they lived along the Intercolonial they would. I may say that in the little town of Sussex where I live, we have an express train that leaves every day for St. John, stopping at every station, and returning the same day, and that service is just as good as any street car service you can find in any city. I would like to ask the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) if he thinks we would continue to enjoy that luxury if the Intercolonial was handed over to a private corporation. I do not think so. If the Intercolonial had been charging the same rates last year in the province of New Brunswick as the Canadian Pacific railway, we would have had to pay $1,874.878 more for freight, and $120,331 more for passenger rates. If we had paid the same rates on the Intercolonial as are charged by the Canadian Pacific railway in New Brunswick last year, we would be $2,000,000 out of pocket. That is a question that needs to be seriously considered. I am surprised at this hon. gentleman advocating the lease or sale of the Intercolonial. I travelled through my constituency last fall during an election

campaign, and in almost every farm yard I saw Massey Harris machines, a Massey Harris reaper, a Massey Harris mower, and what does that mean? It means that the people in the lower provinces are getting the advantage of cheap freight rates on their agricultural machinery that comes from Ontario. Now, I do not think we should denounce a railway that procures us these favours, but we should rather encourage it. To be sure the purchaser of this machinery paid the freight rates, but he gets them cheaper on the Intercolonial than by the Canadian Pacific railway, that is a known fact. Now, the freight trains per train ton per mile last year on the four principal railways of Canada were as follows: Canadian Pacific railway, ·778; Grand Trunk railway, ·672; Canadian Northern, ·873; Intercolonial, ·584. The Intercolonial, therefore, carries freight much cheaper than the other roads, and the people who pay for the freight get that much advantage over people shipping by the other roads. It is the people who use the goods, of course, who ultimately pay the freight, but the people of Canada as a whole get the advantage of the cheap freight rates over the Intercolonial, just as they get the advantage of free tolls over the canals. I am sure there are other gentlemen from the maritime provinces who will oppose this motion of the hon. member for Hants; if they do not I should be ashamed of them. I think the hon. member for Hants would have been better advised if he had supported the motion moved the other day by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) in favour of the Intercolonial acquiring the branch lines in close proximity to it. I think that policy would prove an additional source of revenue to the Intercolonial, and it would enable the management to reduce the freight rates on the branch lines. Very few people, I think, realize the fact that goods shipped to western points are not shipped over the Intercolonial, but over the Canadian Pacific railway, and if these branch lines were absorbed by the Intercolonial, there would be much less cause of complaint on the part of local shippers.

Mr. S. W. W. PICKUP (Annapolis). The resolution introduced by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) is one of great interest to the maritime provinces. The question is whether it would be advantageous to the maritime provinces to have the Intercolonial railway continue under the present management, or to hand it over to the control of one of the great railway companies. It is to be remembered that the Intercolonial railway was undertaken for political purposes as well as for the interchange of products and people between the maritime provinces and the western provinces. It has been a great success in all these purposes, though the balance has not always been on the right side. But the districts served had the advantage of cheap rates and excellent service. Towns have sprung up along the line, which have afforded considerable trade, and the road itself has afforded excellent transportation facilities for the manufactured products of Ontario and Quebec, of which the maritime provinces are large consumers. The object for which the road was undertaken has been met, and now the question arises whether it would not be better to develop the natural resources of the maritime provinces by giving the road over to the control of one of the transcontinental railways, whose policy we know to be the acquisition of branch lines, the extension of existing lines and the construction of new lines in any district where they are required for the development of trade and the natural resources of the district.

Some Quebec and Ontario papers have made the statement that the maritime provinces are the dead ends of the Dominion. This is not a fact. I would like to call the attention of the House to the great natural resources of the maritime provinces in agriculture, fisheries, minerals, forests, timber and water-power, all of which need development. The federal government and capitalists have been devoting much attention to developing the natural resources of the great western provinces, building up cities on the plains and on the Pacific coast, improving canals and building railways, so as to bring their products to the markets of the world. This is a commendable project, and the government are doing it well. But our eastern provinces should not be neglected, and if capital and population can be induced to go to the maritime provinces some effort should be made in that direction. The maritime provinces furnish their proportion to the fisheries of Canada, which are almost inexhaustible around our shores. If these fisheries were properly organized, and the best methods were adopted of catching, packing, canning and marketing the fish, they would be great wealth producers. Our forests are timbered with woods of good commercial value, both for manufacturing and building purposes. We have pulp wood in considerable quantities, fair water-powers, coal, iron and gold in abundance. Gypsum and limestone are to be found in all the maritime provinces, and with capital and population, there is no reason why they should not become one of the great industrial centres of Canada.

At one time the maritime provinces owned and controlled the largest amount of shipping, according to population, of any country in the world. In 1874 they built 183,000

tons, and the total number of tons registered in Canada at that time was 1,634,330, nearly as much as Great Britain, which had 1,896,000 tons. The maritime provinces built the largest and best ships, and assisted in doing the carrying trade of the world. There is no reason why this history should not repeat itself, and by the organization of two or three iron and steel ship building plants, ship building in the maritime provinces might be revived. Judging by the past, our people are eminently fitted for the construction and management of shipping, and have been exceedingly successful. Every facility and encouragement should be afforded to the people of the maritime provinces to enable them successfully to carry on their business, and to afford them the necessary transportation facilities. Our manufacturing in the maritime provinces is confined to a few towns that are good distributing centres and have good service and cheap rates. In the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec there are many manufacturing towns. Their people are no more intelligent, have no better business ability, and their natural resources are not greater than are those in the maritime provinces. But they have better transportation facilities. Two or three lines of railway pass through a great many of the towns, and afford excellent facilities for the transportation of their products to market at reasonable rates. But in the maritime provinces our products have to pass over two or three lines of railway before they reach the markets, and from over the branch and trunk lines, and we have to pay from twenty to thirty per cent higher over these branch lines than is charged over the main line. This is unfair to the people of the maritime provinces, who have to contribute to the construction of these roads, and it is unjust that they should be compelled to pay a toll in excess of that charged in other parts of Canada. If these branch lines were consolidated and under the control of one of the Transcontinental railways, they would be operated more cheaply, give a more efficient service, and at the same or less cost than at present.

At the time of confederation, there was an agreement to build a railroad from Truro, in the province of Nova Scotia, to Rivière du Loup, in the province of Quebec, for the general advantage of Canada. It was extended to St. John and Halifax for the purpose of extending the trade of the country, affording facilities for the ports of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. It was further extended to Sydney and Cape Breton by acquiring the eastern extension, and the government concluded that it should be further extended to Lévis and Montreal, and they acquired the Drummond line and also rights over the Grand Trunk railway to Montreal. The province of Nova Scotia built a line between Pictou and Oxford Junction which became part of the Intercolonial railway, as also did the Canada Eastern. It seems that the government, recognizing the importance of taking over branch lines in the interest of the people and also building up the Intercolonial railway, found that it was good business in the interest of both. Last year the government appointed a commission to look into the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway, and I have their report which gives the physical conditions of the roads, and also recommendations showing the advantage those roads will afford to the Intercolonial railway, and their importance in the development of the natural resources of the districts through which they run, if taken over by the Intercolonial railway. Two paragraphs of the report are as follows:

> The want of proper facilities for the conduct of even the existing traffic is detrimentally affecting the business interests of the districts interested in these branches, and preventing that development of industries, enhancement of property values, and general betterment that would undoubtedly follow on an improved service.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is a well established fact that in nearly every case where branch lines have been absorbed by trunk lines, and extended markets have thus been opened up for business along the main line, such a policy has not only proved to be of great value to the branch lines themselves, but has provided additional revenue for the main line, they becoming valuable feeders, increasing the traffic and the earning powers of the trunk lines.

I have failed to find any report of the largest and most important branch line that would be a feeder to the Intercolonial railway. I refer to the Dominion Atlantic railway in the province of Nova Scotia, running through some of the best portions of Canada, including the famous 'Land of Evangeline,' which attracts thousands of tourists. This line runs between Halifax and Yarmouth, through the counties of Hants, Kings, Annapolis, Digby and Yarmouth, a distance of 217 miles, with a branch between Truro, in the county of Colchester, and Windsor, in the county of Hants, a distance of 58½ miles, the Cornwallis Valley road, from Kentville to Kingsport, 14½ miles, and Tor Brook line into the mines, 3½ miles, making in all 292½ miles, including the Windsor Junction branch which is under lease from the Dominion government, and running rights between Windsor Junction and Halifax, 14½ miles, and 4¾ miles of branch lines and spurs. Besides the counties named, this road serves to a less extent, the counties of Lunenburg, Shelburne and Queens, with a population of 260,385 people according to the census of 1901. The road is equipped

and does a large business. For the year ending June 30, 1907, it shows net earnings of $280,586 on total of $778,572. Few roads in Canada can make as good a showing. The Dominion Atlantic railway earned $380,158 in passenger service and $398,414 from freight service in 1907, the highest proportion of passenger traffic of any road in Canada. This road would be valuable to one of the transcontinental railways, as the shortest, most direct and quickest means of communication between the west and Great Britain. By establishing a car ferry, running across the Bay of Fundy, 40 miles to Port Wade, and thence by rail to Halifax, 159 miles, it would afford the quickest route to deliver the passengers, mails and express parcels to Great Britain from the west, besides being valuable in directing passenger and freight traffic from the United States through Digby and Yarmouth. Also, the Halifax and Southwestern between Halifax and Yarmouth is also capable of very great development. New roads should be constructed in Inverness, Guysborough and the eastern part of the province. If these were consolidated and acquired by one of the transcontinental roads, with the condition and agreement that they take over the branch lines existing and construct new lines, no hardship would be involved, as this is in accord with their present policy. They should also find capital to develop the natural resources of the maritime provinces. By building hotels, developing mines, manufacturing and other resources, which is their policy, they would greatly promote their own interest.

Under the supervision of the Railway Commission, I believe it would be in the best interest of the maritime provinces and the districts through which the system runs, to have the Intercolonial railway under the control and management of one of the transcontinental roads.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North). Had I known that so many hon. members wished to express their views upon this subject, I do not know that I should have come to any determination to speak upon it. But it is not often that a subject presents itself in the House that gives an opportunity to a representative from away down in the eastern part where I live an opportunity of dealing with matters of vital importance to his own part of the country. That being the case, I am pleased to take advantage of this opportunity to say something along the lines of the development of the country served by the Intercolonial or some other road that will or may take its place. It is a well-known fact that there is only room for one main line of railway in the province of Nova Scotia, particularly in the eastern part. We differ in this regard from Quebec, Ontario and the wider fields of the west, where almost any number of roads can parallel one another with ample room and plenty of trade for all. In the comparatively narrow peninsula of Nova Scotia, with one main line stretching along that country, there is no room for another line to parallel it. East of Amherst you cannot be more than fifty miles from the sea at any point. That fact shows that the territory is comparatively narrow, and, with the industries we have, it will readily be admitted that we have not more than will satisfactorily feed one great line of railway. That being the case, we are dependent largely on the way the Intercolonial railway, which is now there, conducts itself in the way of the extension of its branches and in its management of the business within the scope of the road as now located. My great trouble, and the trouble of my people, is not so much with the management of the Intercolonial railway as with the extent of it. If we had more Intercolonial railway we should have very little fault to find. But our difficulty is that the Intercolonial railway does not stretch itself along the country rapidly enough. If it is the pronounced policy of the government, if we are to understand from the government and the Minister of Railways that they have gone as far as they intend to go, that they have reached their limit, that they do not propose to make any further extension to reach out into the territories where we have no railways, I would at once fall in line with the resolution of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) and say: Take away this management and give us something else, with the hope that that something else will do better than the Intercolonial railway is doing. I may briefly describe to the government and the Minister of Railways the history of Intercolonial extension so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. It was not the Intercolonial that built from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso, though the road thus built became a part of the Intercolonial after a few years. The prophecy was then made that the traffic of that part of the road would not pay for grease for the axles, that it would be a dead failure. It was, on the contrary, a great success as a railway enterprise and is a most profitable part of the Intercolonial. It was operated for about ten years before it was extended further. We in the beautiful island of Cape Breton may be excused if we thought it long because for those ten years the road was allowed to stand at the Strait of Canso and we had not a foot of railway on the island of Cape Breton. After ten years the road was extended from the Strait of Canso to the city of Sydney, then the town of Sydney, with a branch to North Sydney, where I myself reside. What is the history of this road in the Island of Cape Breton? I venture to say that there is not another section

of the Intercolonial that has such a magnificent traffic as that of this section.

I can point to one company that last year paid no less than $160,000 in cash for the handling of their freight traffic, without making any mention of the passenger traffic on that road. When I talk about extensions into the island of Cape Breton I have something substantial to talk about. We have had the main extension into the island since 1892. Since then great developments have arisen in the island. We have to-day the greatest industries of the kind, I presume, in the whole of Canada, in the island of Cape Breton. All of them were organized since the days of the extension of the Intercolonial railway. I do not say that the Intercolonial railway is entitled to all the credit, but it was of course a great factor in bringing about the important industries that we have to-day. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) has made reference to Mr. Butler leaving the management of the Intercolonial railway. When Mr. Butler left the government employ he left what is regarded as a very lucrative position. The government could not afford to pay him any more money, but I think that when four times the amount he was receiving from the government is paid to him by one small company in Cape Breton, from which I come, it gives me some strength when I ask that some money be expended in the further development of this great island of Cape Breton. The principal resources that are now being developed are those of coal and iron. The development of iron has given rise to the development of other resources; it has given value to other minerals which before that time had really no value at all. Take, for instance, the matter of limestone. As a rule we do not regard limestone as a very valuable asset, but to-day in Cape Breton it is a most valuable asset and will from time to time become more valuable until perhaps ten or twenty years from to-day we will have to import it or pay a very high price for it within a range of fifty or sixty miles from the steel works, because such large quantities are required as a flux in the production of iron and steel. We have in the county of Victoria, which I have the honour to represent, large deposits of this material. We have large deposits of iron ore and we have large areas of timber which are required in connection with these great industries but none of which can be made readily available without the extension of the Intercolonial railway. I appeal to the government and I appeal to this House with confidence, because I know they will not allow the paltry amount of the few thousand, or the few hundred thousand dollars that may be necessary for the development of the country, to stand in the way, especially when we put forward the successful results of the expenditure to extend the Intercolonial railway into a certain section of the country and when we show that with the proper development of the materials that exist in other sections of the country similar results will follow. It has been brought out in this House that we buy our fish at two prices in Ontario and other western provinces, in Quebec, and even amongst ourselves at certain seasons of the year and that we have to buy fish that has gone around by Boston and other United States cities and come back to us. It is a most extraordinary state of affairs and one which you could hardly make a stranger believe. Notwithstanding, such is the case. What is the difficulty? The difficulty is that we have not facilities for catching the fish in our own country. Take for instance, a part of my own riding of Victoria. We have on the eastern coast of that county about seventy miles of the best fishing grounds that we have in any part of the maritime provinces and, when you compare any fishing grounds in the maritime provinces you are comparing them with the best fishing grounds in the world. But the difficulty is that for thirty-four miles of that distance of seventy miles there is not a single harbour that you can approach with safety in a storm. What is the result? The fisherman will not go out if he finds any prospect that he cannot get back. If he sees a storm coming on and if he has to face the rocks and there is no harbour for which he can steer his craft he will not go out in the morning at all because the safety of himself and his property and the security and support of his family are of greater importance to him than any money he might make upon any certain day and therefore he stays at home. If we had a railway along that coast and if we had a few hundred thousand dollars expended in opening a few of the harbours that are almost finished now we could every day go out and fish because we would know that we had a haven that we could steer for any time a storm might come up. That condition is not only true in my own county but it is also true as respects Guysborough, Inverness and Richmond. When we are talking about stretching out the arms of the Intercolonial railway, we are asking them either to let us take our chances with some other company or let the government look carefully into this thing and no longer stand still but extend its branches into different parts where it is necessary. I pointed out a moment ago that we had only really one great railway in Nova Scotia. If these branches are not built by the Intercolonial railway no company will build them. No company except the Intercolonial railway would build them because the lines would be too short and it would not pay. We have a sample of that in the

small railway that was built from the Strait of Canso to St. Peters. It is too short a line to pay without connection with the larger system. Therefore, we must ask the main system to build branches, whether that main system be owned by the government, or whether some company takes the place of the government. Sometimes, when we from the maritime provinces, representing these large counties and these large interests, prevail upon the Minister of Finance to help the fishermen with a landing or in other matters along the same line we are criticised unfairly by hon. gentlemen of the opposition when we get this money on the ground that we have obtained it not for the development of the country but with some other motive, and that it is squandered and used for election purposes and no other purposes whatever. I think I can say here with the greatest boldness that in the province of Nova Scotia and particularly in that part known as the island of Cape Breton I will challenge any man in this House or out of it to show where one dollar of any money that has been voted for the last thirteen years has been mis-spent or squandered in any section of the country. We have a most vigilant opposition. I have sat in this House for a little while and I have watched its proceedings. Not one of these vigilant and energetic searchers out of trouble has put his finger on one dollar that has been spent improperly in connection with public works in Cape Breton or Nova Scotia.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. member whether it was absolutely necessary in the interest of good government to have all those fishery commissioners appointed in the hon. gentleman's own constituency just before the last election?

Mr. McKENZIE. I certainly say that in so far as I know they were appointed in the interest of the fishery protection. It shows the extremities to which people are driven in endeavouring to find fault with any expenditure in that province that they have to come down to the paltry question of whether in the whole of the large county of Victoria, with a coast line, including the inland waters, of something over 150 miles, there were too many fishery inspectors or not. With all this coast line, with the streams and creeks which require protection, with the northern part of Cape Breton which is in my riding also extending to the Gulf of St. Lawrence and with the inland waters of the Bras d'Or lakes, there happened to be in that year ten guardians in the whole of those two counties more than there had been for the last ten years. It is mentioned to-day as a great scandal that these ten have been appointed, but I believe that they have rendered valuable service to the country and I think it was found necessary to reappoint them last year notwithstanding the severe criticism in the press and in the House. I have no desire to appoint too many guardians, but if the hon. gentleman ever exercised patronage in any county he represented he will know that ten times as many people will be looking for a position as can be appointed. It is not an easy matter for the member to tell the exact number that will be required, but he can send the applicants to the inspector and if he takes them on well and good. That is what has happened in my county, and if there is anything wrong about it it is a thing that happens in the greater part of Canada where a member is called upon to exercise patronage. It would appear that this is the only criticism of a public expenditure in the last 13 years in the whole province of Nova Scotia and possibly in the maritime provinces at large, that the hon. member has to make.

My purpose in rising Mr. Speaker, was to bring to the attention of the government and the House the disabilities we labour under in the island of Cape Breton and in the county of Guysboro which may be called the non-railway counties. I submit that it is up to the government now to extend the Intercolonial railway into these counties, and if the government does not do so then it should induce some other concern to take hold of the railway on condition that that other concern will engage in that development which the government does not think it advisable to undertake. That is my position in this matter. When we from the maritime provinces seek for the expenditure of public money to develop our country and to assist our fishermen and agriculturists and miners, we do desire to have the sympathy of members of the opposition as I think we should have it. We are proud to assent in public moneys being expended for the development of the far west. The farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, have abundance of wheat but it is of little value to them unless they have a railway to take it to the markets and the same is true of the farmers and fishermen of Nova Scotia. The fishermen may have abundance of fish but if he cannot transport it to the market regularly it is of no use to him. We all concede that the farmers of the west should have facilities for transporting their abundance of wheat, and the same is equally applicable to the farmer, fisherman, and the miner in the east who must have transportation facilities if he is to reap the reward of his industry. We have a most excellent market for almost everything the farmer or fisherman can produce on the island of Cape Breton, but we have no system of regular

transportation. The hotel keeper must know that a supply of fish and eggs and other products will be at his disposal regularly every day, and while the man in the northern part of the county of Victoria may have abundance of these things, yet he cannot guarantee a regular supply to the hotel keeper, and the hotel keeper cannot deal with him. He wants a railway by which we can be assured that day after day when we put the products of our fisheries and our farms on board the train they will be delivered at the market on schedule time. It is for the lack of such facilities that our people are suffering. I shall not commit myself one way or the other upon this resolution. I simply say to the government that the position we take in my county is that we are perfectly satisfied with the Intercolonial railway provided we get enough of it and provided it is extended into districts where we have no railroads now. My hon. friend from Hants exclaimed: God save us from the peoples' railway, and if we are not to have railway facilities provided by the government we would almost be inclined to join with him in calling on some higher power to remove that dog-in-the-manger policy, and to seek some means which will assist in the development of the industries of our country.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B.) I have so little time at my disposal that necessarily I shall have to make my remarks brief. I have listened with considerable interest to the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) and I would much rather he had come out straight and declared whether he was in favour of the resolution or opposed to it than that he should take the middle course as he has done.

An hon. MEMBER. He is foxy.

Mr. CARVELL. He is. However, there is no uncertain sound about the statement of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) because he openly declares he is in favour of placing the Intercolonial in the hands of some company—he does not say which, but from his remarks I should judge he has no choice. We know very well there are only three large corporations in Canada which can take the Intercolonial over, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Northern railway, and if the Intercolonial were disposed of to any company it must be one of these.

Mr. BLACK. Some other company might be born.

Mr. CARVELL. Not in our day.

Mr. BLACK. I think so.

Mr. CARVELL. I have not time to discuss this question along the lines as to whether the correct policy is now being pursued with reference to the Intercolonial railway, and I am sorry indeed that before this discussion came up we have not had one full year or even two years of the results of the present Board of Management. I am not now in a position to judge whether the Board of Management has made good or not. I have been told there is a possibility of a fair surplus in the operations of this year, and if that be true then they have done better than the old management in some past years. I think, however, I am safe in saying that the Intercolonial is not managed along the very best possible lines. I believe there is room for improvement, but after all that is not an argument why this property of the people should be taken away from the people and handed over to some one else. It is rather amusing to me, and I say it advisedly, to hear hon. members, who live on the line of the Intercolonial, grumbling in parliament because they have not proper facilities for transportation. I would like to see my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Black) and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) living on the Canadian Pacific railway at any portion of it where they control the transportation without opposition, or, alongside the Grand Trunk, or alongside the Canadian Northern under similar conditions, and I would like them then to compare what they would be getting with what they are getting from the Intercolonial railway. I have no hesitation in saying that to my mind—and this is a strong statement—the greatest reform that is required along the line of the Intercolonial is to reduce the number of trains by about one-third, which necessarily means a reduction of employees. I can say this because I have no electors on the Intercolonial. I have, I think, one solitary constituent who occupies a position on that line. I have never asked, and never intend to ask to have my people put on the Intercolonial railway, which does not come within sixty miles of my constituency. I have no interest in the Intercolonial railway at all, and I can discuss this question perhaps with as free a mind as any member of this House and yet I live near enough to it to have some practical knowledge of its workings. While the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) was speaking to-day I looked up some of the accommodation they are getting along the Intercolonial as compared with what is furnished by the Canadian Pacific railway. From Halifax to Truro, even in this winter season, they have seven trains a day each way, and in the summer, up till last year, they had eight trains a day each way. From Truro to Moncton, which is not through such a very important territory, they have six trains each way. From Moncton to St. John they have six trains all the way, and seven trains from Sussex. At the other end of the line, from Montreal to Levis, they have

three trains a day five days in the week, and four trains on Saturday; from Levis to Rivière du Loup, four trains every day, and five trains on Saturday. From Campbellton to Moncton, four trains a day each way.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is better than the main line of the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. CARVELL. Better, I believe, than any other portion of the Dominion of Canada possessing the same business and population. I cannot very well compare Nova Scotia because that is all Intercolonial railway, but if you take the Annapolis Valley, which is served by the Dominion Atlantic, I am told they have two through trains each way per day, yet the territory from Yarmouth to Halifax produces more agricultural produce than all the rest of Nova Scotia put together, and has more people per mile than any other part of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend says we must have four or five trains everywhere the Intercolonial railway runs. Then take my side of the province of New Brunswick, with only the Canadian Pacific railway. We produce more agricultural products in Carleton county, and I think we export more, than all the rest of New Brunswick put together. I can certainly say that the four upper counties of New Brunswick export more agricultural produce than all the rest of that province. We have more people, more traffic, more business, than any other portion of New Brunswick, but from the town of Woodstock to St. John we have only two trains a day and one of these is an accommodation. From the town of Woodstock north to Edmundston, 112 miles, through the garden of New Brunswick, we have only one express train a day and a freight that will sometimes carry passengers and sometimes will not. That is the accommodation you get on a company-owned railway. Take the Canadian Pacific railway on the north shore of the province of Quebec. There are three through trains per day from Montreal to Quebec on the north shore of the river and a few local trains in addition. On the southern side of the St. Lawrence, which is certainly no more important and has no greater traffic and no more population, you have three through trains per day on the Intercolonial railway and, I presume, two or three more on the Grand Trunk railway. I mention this to show wherever the Intercolonial railway runs you have about twice the accommodation you have on company-owned roads or you have a kick about it. I may be talking plainly, but it is necessary for somebody from the maritime provinces or from near the Intercolonial railway to talk in this way.

Mr. TURRIFF. If these are the facts of the case why not cut off a number of these trains and make the railway come nearer paying expenses?

Mr. CARVELL. That is what I am talking about. My hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. McAlister) discussed the freight situation so carefully that I think I could not improve on what he said, but let any gentleman in this House or any business man in Canada investigate for himself and see if every word he said in regard to freight rates is not true. Within the last month I had occasion to send a piece of machinery from Ottawa to Woodstock, in connection with a company in which I have an interest. We paid $68 freight on that piece of machinery, or 68 cents a hundred I found that I could have sent that same piece of machinery the same number of miles on the Intercolonial railway for $50, a saving of $18 on that one piece of machinery. I could have sent it to St. John by Canadian Pacific railway, a distance of 45 miles further than to Woodstock, for $56, or a saving of $12. I admit that this is because St. John is a competing point, but St. John is a competing point because of the existence of the Intercolonial railway. If you hand the Intercolonial railway over to the Canadian Pacific railway, then instead of paying $68 as I did you would pay about $75, because they would add on the other 45 miles to St. John. It is well enough for hon. gentlemen on the Intercolonial railway to talk glibly about passing over this great heritage that belongs to the people to a private company. It was, as I said, a pact entered into by the rest of Canada with the people of the maritime provinces in entering confederation. It is a great transportation route without which confederation never could have been brought about, because without the Intercolonial railway the maritime provinces never would have entered into confederation. I ask these gentlemen to be careful to consider the interest of their people before handing over such a means of communication and such a rate controller as this, into the hands of a grasping corporation—because all corporations are alike when it comes to making money, they will all charge every dollar they can, and if you hand this road over to any corporation in Canada you will find that the rates will go up until they are exactly on a par with the rates of the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk railway. Hon. gentlemen say that the Railway Commission can control this. Assume that this road gets into the hands of the Canadian Northern. Does not the commission control the rates on the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk railway, and have they reduced them any? Would they reduce the rates on the Canadian Northern from Halifax to Montreal any lower than the rates for the same distance on the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk railway? It is no use talking nonsense like this, but

I want to ask these hon. gentlemen to face these things as they are. I am willing to admit that it is hard for a government, municipality or any public body to operate a public utility as cheaply as a corporation can, but I repeat that so far as the maritime provinces are concerned, if we want to be true to ourselves, and I have not much use for the man who is not true to himself—we must stand by this railway, which is keeping the freight rates down to some kind of a living rate.

That brings up the next question, one which has been dear to the heart of my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) the last three or four years. I took the trouble one day last week to read the speech made by that hon. gentleman on introducing the Intercolonial railway budget in 1907 when he was Minister of Railways. It will well repay every hon. member to read over that speech carefully and see whether it will not lead him to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman deserves more credit from the people of the maritime provinces than he is ever likely to receive for advocating the acquisition of these branch lines by the government. In that I agree with the hon. gentleman. All one has to do is to go to the maritime provinces and see these branch lines run by little local companies without sufficient capital or rolling stock, unable to equip their lines in proper shape, and then let him look at the enormous quantities of second hand engines, cars, steel rails and all these things retired by the Intercolonial railway as no longer good for the main line, but which would be well suited for the branch lines, and he will find that there is sufficient of that discarded material on the Intercolonial railway to equip and fairly operate every branch line in the maritime provinces. When we find an hon. gentleman talking about building hotels, that is a pretty small argument for getting rid of the Intercolonial railway. Does the Dominion Atlantic build hotels? There is no portion of the Dominion which possesses greater possibilities of tourist traffic than does that part of Nova Scotia traversed by the Dominion Atlantic—yet has that company built a hotel? Has the Grand Trunk railway built hotels? Has the Canadian Pacific ever built a hotel in the province of New Brunswick?

Mr. BLACK. Yes, at St. Andrews.

Mr. CARVELL. No, the Canadian Pacific did not build a hotel in St. Andrews, but the hotel there was built by another company and taken over by a company allied to the Canadian Pacific railway, and if you go to St. Andrews how many people do you find in that hotel? You will find a few wealthy magnates; the ordinary man has not money enough to live in it. How many ordinary American tourists go up the Algonquin?

I admit that if the Canadian Northern want to go into Halifax or St. John they ought to get there, and if the Canadian Pacific railway wants to go to Halifax they ought to get there. But I do not forget that this parliament has provided by statute that when the Grand Trunk Pacific reaches Moncton, it will have an absolute right to utilize the Intercolonial railway tracks to St. John and Halifax. Therefore, when we talk of handing the Intercolonial railway over to some private company, we must not forget that there are certain rights which cannot be trampled on. You cannot hand over the Intercolonial railway to a private corporation unless you entirely disregard the rights granted the Grand Trunk Pacific. There is no reason why the Canadian Northern should not get into Halifax or St. Johns without building a mile of railway beyond Levis. I know that if you ask the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway why they cannot utilize the Intercolonial railway tracks, they will say it is not possible. For my part, I do not believe them. I believe it is possible to have three or four times the traffic over the Intercolonial railway that we have to-day. That might possibly necessitate double tracking the road.

Mr. BLACK. Would you advocate building a road over the Cobiquid mountain?

Mr. CARVELL. No, I said I would never advocate building a railway over a hill if I could get it through a valley. I would double track the Intercolonial railway and I am told there would be no trouble getting around the Cobiquid mountain.

I have looked up the traffic receipts on the Intercolonial railway, and I find they average $5,000 per mile. Take the New York Central, the Pennsylvania, the Reading and the other big railways, and you will find that their traffic receipts average from $30,000 to $50,000 per mile. Does any one say that we have not brains enough to operate four times as many trains on the Intercolonial railway as we do to-day? It is a reflection on our railway people to say that we could not operate increased traffic on this line, but I would give every railway that wants it, running rights over the Intercolonial railway, but I would not give any railway the right to do local traffic along the Intercolonial railway. Subject to that reservation, if the Canadian Northern, the Canadian Pacific railway or any other railway company wants to get into Halifax or St. John, I see no reason why it should not. No one need tell me that we have not the means at our disposal to accommodate these other railways or the

ability to handle the additional traffic. For these various reasons, I am very much opposed to the proposition to hand over the Intercolonial railway to any private company; and as it is now six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the ordinary rules, this will go to the graveyard of embarassing motions and perhaps never be resurrected. I understand, however, that quite a number of members from the maritime provinces and from Quebec as well, desire to say something on this question, and I would like to know whether we could not have some understanding that an opportunity will be given to have it discussed some day in the near future.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not imagine there will be any objection. I know of no reason, but for the present prefer that the ordinary procedure should be followed.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 25, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the International Waterways, Canal and Construction Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Royal Guardians.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. STAPLES moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) to amend the Interest Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to make it impossible for a mortgagee, or any person or persons who may have a right to pay off a mortgage, to do so by giving reasonable notice to the mortgagee. It also provides to prevent the mortgagor or mortgagee from tying up the property indefinitely, and therefore to stand in the way of sale.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House remembers that under the terms of the Act authorizing the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, it is provided that the portion of the railway from Winnipeg to Moncton is to be constructed by a board of Railway Commissioners under the joint supervision of the chief engineer of the commissioners and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Naturally differences of opinion arose as to the classification of material, between the engineers of the Railway Commissioners and the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I say naturally, because it would have been extraordinary indeed if in the construction of a road of that magnitude, where there is such a variety of soil, it had not been the subject of some differences of opinion. The Act, however, provided that in case of a difference of opinion, a third person should be appointed as arbitrator. The board of arbitrators therefore was to be composed of the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, the chief engineer of the company, and a third arbitrator to be selected by the two, and if they did not agree, by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. As there were differences of opinion between the engineers, a third arbitrator was appointed in the person of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. After the board of arbitration had proceeded for some time, Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer of the commissioners, resigned, in a letter which is to be found at page 28 of the blue-book which was brought down to the House a few weeks ago. On the 25th of June, Mr. Lumsden addressed the following letter to the commissioners of the Transcontinental railway:

My recent trips over portions of districts 'B' and 'F' in connection with the arbitration on points in dispute regarding the classification and overbreak between the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and myself (which arbitration might have been proceeded with more than eight months ago but for delay on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific) have led me to the conclusion that neither the general specifications nor my instruction regarding classification have been adhered to, but on the contrary large amounts of material have been

returned as solid rock, which should have been classified as loose rock or common excavation, and material has been returned as loose rock which was or could have been handled by plowing or scraping, and should have been returned as common excavation. On several residencies there seems to have been no attempt by the engineers to carry out my instructions and measure rock returned, either by showing the same on cross sections, or by measurements of individual pieces, but they simply appear to have guessed at the amount by taking percentage of the total cutting. In some cases where cross sections were prepared showing ledge rock, they proved to be erroneous, resulting in a very much larger amount of the solid rock being returned than actually existed. What is known as overbreak has also been returned in many places where it was caused by excessive use of explosives, and where the material was wasted this should not have been done.

Such being the case, I must decline to certify to any further progress estimates in districts 'B' and 'F,' in view of the general disregard of my instructions, and having lost confidence in the engineering staff, I have concluded to resign my position as chief engineer, and have to-day written to the Hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to that effect, inclosing him a copy of this letter.

(Sgd.) HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

And in another letter, written on the following day, Mr. Lumsden says:

Dears Sirs,—Referring to my letter of yesterday wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff, I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie Crossing in district 'F' lately gone over by me.

(Sgd.) HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

P.S.—In order to make the matter clear, I may say I assume my resignation as chief engineer also carries with it my resignation as arbitrator in matters of dispute with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but as there is a doubt raised by you, I also resign as arbitrator.

(Sgd.) HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

Before proceeding further I may say that the vacancy which was caused by the resignation of Mr. Lumsden was filled by the appointment of Mr. Gordon Grant, who has also been acting since as an arbitrator. The arbitration is now going on, the board as constituted being composed of Mr. Grant, Mr. Kelliher, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. The House will notice that in the letter of resignation of Mr. Lumsden he states that he has reason to be dissatisfied with the classification which has been made on the road. He thinks that there is a classification to the prejudice of the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

commissioners and of the government. If this be true, and that is the very thing that is now being investigated by the board of arbitration, the over-classification may have arisen from one of three things. It may have arisen from the negligence of the local engineers in charge, it may have arisen from incompetency on the part of those engineers, or it may have arisen from bad faith on the part of those same engineers. But, whatever was the cause of that over classification, whether it was negligence, incompetence or bad faith, the result is the same so far as it is necessary to ascertain the amount of the over-classification.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the local engineers to whom did they owe their appointments?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To the chief engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understand the chief engineer was responsible for the appointment of these engineers and they were appointed upon his recommendation. I say this upon the information of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) who will be able to give further particulars to my hon. friend. I was saying when I was interrupted that at the present time, if there has been over-classification, it is a matter which is now being investigated by the board of arbitration. It matters not whether it was caused by incompetence, negligence or bad faith. The question whether there was or was not over-classification is now under consideration by the board of arbitration and, therefore, although it is obvious that it is the duty of this House to look into this matter, at the present time, so far as my own judgment goes, there is no cause to put an investigation over the investigation that is now going on. There is no occasion to go deeper into the subject to ascertain what is the amount of over-classification. The House will reserve judgment on that point. Later on the House will determine whether it should go further or not, but at this moment we do not think that there is any occasion to put another investigation on top of the investigation that is going on. But, there is one thing in which the House is very deeply interested and as to which we are all of the same opinion. It is the fact that Mr. Lumsden positively alleges something akin to bad faith, if not actual bad faith on the part of his staff of engineers. I call the attention of the House especially to this part of his letter:

In view of the general disregard of my instructions, and having lost confidence in the

engineers staff, I have concluded to resign my position as chief engineer.

That is a very broad, a very general statement. One perhaps might question the judgment of Mr. Lumsden as to whether he was well advised, if he thought there had been bad faith on the part of his engineers, in tendering his resignation. At all events that is the step he took. He qualified his statement to some extent in a letter which he addressed to the commissioners on the following day in these words:

Referring to my letter of yesterday wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff, I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff who, were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F' lately gone over by me.

In other words, on the 25th June, Mr. Lumsden had stated that he had not been properly served by the whole of his staff, but on the following day he qualified his statement by applying it only to those engineers who had gone over portions of district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing district 'F'. Such was the position on the 30th December when I received from the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission the following letter:

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa.
Office of the Chairman.
Thursday, 30th December, 1909.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—A printed copy is before me of the return asked for by the House in regard to our former chief engineer's resignation, forming sessional paper No. 42A.

When his retirement became known, it was the signal for a general attack upon the government as well as the commissioners by a section of the press. Comments and inferences were made most unfair to both, and which a lack of information does not justify.

The matter is one to which we cannot remain indifferent, especially in view of a certain statement regarding his staff contained in Mr. Lumsden's letter, pages 28 and 32. His words conveyed a serious, though vague, imputation on which, however, Mr. Lumsden had not seen fit to enlighten us further. Letters passed between the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (pages 48, 49 and 50) and myself on this subject.

In another such instance, the charges made by one of our officers were investigated, with the result that they had to be withdrawn.

So far, we have waited to see whether an inquiry in this case would also take place, inasmuch as Mr. Lumsden held a still more important office.

Now that the House is possessed of these documents bearing on the question, I would beg leave to ask, on behalf of our commission, that an inquiry be ordered which will enable parliament, the general public and ourselves, to know what reasons, or facts, Mr. Lumsden had to justify his resigning on these grounds.

The commissioners are satisfied that they have always been guided by public interest in the performance of their duties. If the full investigation court should bring out any facts of which they were not aware, or dispel misapprehensions that might have been created by adverse criticisms, they will consider it to have served a useful purpose and their trouble well repaid.

Believe me to be,
Dear Sir Wilfrid,
Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) S. N. PARENT.
Chairman.

I think the position is fairly put in this letter and that the House is entitled to know and probe the circumstances which led Mr. Lumsden to take the position he did in regard to his staff. Therefore, I beg to move the following motion:

Whereas it appears by a return made to this House during the present session, being Sessional Paper 42A, that Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden, late chief engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway, in a letter dated 25th June, 1909, addressed to the commissioners, resigning his position as such chief engineer, uses the following language: 'In view of the general disregard of my instructions, and having lost confidence in the engineering staff, I have concluded to resign my position as chief engineer'; and in a second letter, dated 26th June, 1909, addressed to the commissioners, the said Hugh D. Lumsden writes as follows: 'Referring to my letter of yesterday, wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff. I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff, who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in District 'B' and east of Rennie Crossing, in District 'F,' lately gone over by me.'

And whereas, while this House deems it not desirable to take any action which might prejudice the position of either of the parties to the arbitration proceedings now in progress between the Grand Trunk Pacific railway company and the said commissioners, yet the said recited allegations of said Hugh D. Lumsden, stated by him as the reasons for his resignation of the said position of chief engineer, are in the opinion of this House of such great public interest and involve such grave charges against a portion of the engineering staff of the Transcontinental railway, as to make it desirable that the same should be investigated by a committee of this House;

Therefore, it is resolved, that a special committee of five members of the House, to be named hereafter, be appointed to investigate the said charges and allegations of the said Hugh D. Lumsden against a portion of the said engineering staff of the said railway; that such committee have power to send for persons,

papers and records, to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the statement of the Prime Minister to ascertain if possible the scope of this investigation, and for some days I have been endeavouring to find, from such records as the government have been good enough to furnish us, whether the resolution introduced by the leader of the government would adequately serve the purpose of giving to he public the information they desire in regard to this railway. I venture to say that this is but a very slight step in the direction of affording the public information. The Prime Minister does not propose, if I understand him correctly, that this investigation shall trench in any way upon the investigation which he says is being made by the three engineers appointed under the Act. The Prime Minister has told us that this investigation is proceeding, and while I understand it may be said to be 'pending' I am not aware that it is actually proceeding. If I am wrong in that, I would like to be corrected right now.

Mr. GRAHAM. In one sense it is, and in a strained sense it is not. It is not proceeding, just as parliament is not proceeding between the hour of adjournment and the next day's sitting.

Mr. HUGHES. Have they started yet?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, and they have only stopped work because they are not able to proceed during the winter months. They will begin again early in the spring.

Mr. LENNOX. It is just as I anticipated. For two and a half years we have been following this government from season to season; we have been urging them in the spring and in the summer to get to work with the investigation, and in the autumn when these engineers organize and get ready to work they cannot work because it is impossible to proceed during the winter. The statement of the Prime Minister that this investigation is proceeding is absolutely misleading, because while these gentlemen have been brought together into being as a committee of investigation under the Act, not one step will be taken by them to proceed with the investigation until next spring.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to make a statement which is not based on fact. They have started and have done some work on the arbitration.

Mr. LENNOX. I will be greatly surprised if any return can be brought down by the government showing that they have made any substantial progress in reference to this matter. But, what the country is interested in is, that this inquiry has been tied up since 7th October, 1907, and will be tied up for another six months, and that in the meantime great injury to the public will accrue by reason of this wrong classification—this dishonest classification I am inclined to think, but this wrong classification at all events—being continued to be made and the contractors paid upon progress estimates from time to time. But that is not the only point; the Prime Minister wants us to understand that he is doing something in the public interest. He wants us to understand that, on his motion he had determined that action should be taken which will result in the public knowing how this matter stands. Now the Prime Minister knows perfectly well that if the instruction which he has given to those who represent the government on this proposed committee is carried out, and it will to the letter, there can be absolutely no investigation under this inquiry. What are the facts? Mr. Lumsden says:

> Neither the general specifications nor my instructions regarding classification have been adhered to but on the contrary large amounts of material have been returned as solid rock which should have been classified as loose rock or common excavation.

He also adds that large quantities of overbreak have been allowed which should not have been allowed, and these are the actual items which are referred under the statute to this arbitration of three experts who are said to be now proceeding with the work. And so we will be confronted with this. It is not a material question whether Mr. Lumsden has lost confidence in the engineering staff; we are not going to have a special committee of this House sitting from week to week to investigate that, when the gist of the whole thing is, not that he has lost confidence, but that he finds that his instructions with regard to classification and overbreak have been disregarded. Therefore, the very essence of the thing, the basic point of the whole matter, is to ascertain whether or not that over classification has prevailed. Until you ascertain whether as a fact there has been over-classification and whether or not there have been allowances made with regard to overbreak which should not have been made, there can be no judgment come to by the committee as to whether Mr. Lumsden was justified in writing the letter he did, and whether there was a disregard of his instructions which would justify his losing confidence in a certain number of the engineers upon that work. But, Mr. Speaker, the matter narrows itself down a great deal more than that. The country is not concerned, alone, as whether or not there has been over-classifi-

cation, or too large an allowance upon some other items upon the small section of the road which was investigated by these three engineers at the time to which Mr. Lumsden refers. What the country wants to know, if I understand it, is the methods by which this road has been constructed, the principle upon which it was launched, whether or not, in the original surveys and location, honest methods prevailed, or whether there is need and right to condemn the government, having regard to the enormously increasing cost to which this road is mounting, whether this is to be attributed to ignorance and incompetence on the part of the engineers, to the careless or dishonesty of those in charge of the road, not in an isolated section of 150 miles or so, as referred to in this resolution, but in the 1,800 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg. What the country wants to know is, was the government justified in 1903 in announcing by the Prime Minister and subsequently, in detail figures, by the Minister of Finance, that this road was to cost the country a total of $13,000,000?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend may laugh if he likes—a total cost to the country of $13,000,000, whether that mistake was an honest mistake or not, whether it was made with some knowledge of the facts or the government intended at the time to mislead. My hon. friend the judicial gentleman who has laughed, has filled his function very well in that regard, but I want to tell him that we have the statement of the Prime Minister deliberately made in the House that it would cost $13,000,000 and not one cent more, and it was stated as the heading of the campaign literature on which that hon. gentleman was probably elected, that it would cost $13,000,000, and no more. The members in this House probably did all understand that the Prime Minister to mean that the total expenditure in the construction of the road would be $13,000,000, but that it would cost the country, as money they would pay out and not get back, a total of $13,000,000—yet there is great reason to believe having regard to the subsequent facts and even having regard to the language in which the hon. gentleman employed, that while it was not hoped that it should mislead the house, it was hoped that it would, and it did in fact mislead, and misguide a large section of the electors of this country. The point the people want to know, the point the people ought to know, is whether their money has been squandered or stolen in the construction of this railway or both.

When hon. gentlemen are making election speeches—and no one can make them better than the Finance Minister—I do not wish to tie them down to too narrow a margin, there ought to be some latitude allowed to a gentleman in his position, when he tells the country how much a road will cost, some little margin of 10 per cent or 15 per cent; but when we find that that gentleman told us as a matter of computation and investigation, after having time for inquiry, and after making inquiry, that he came to the conclusion that the total cost would not only not be greater but would actually be less than $13,000,000 and when in 1908 we have the present Minister of Railways and Canals telling the country that upon the same basis of computation and leaving out the Quebec bridge, the eastern division of this railway is actually costing the country $38,000,000 of money which it is never to get back, the public begin to feel that with a Public Accounts Committee stifled and gagged as our Public Accounts Committee is, there should be some method of relief, some method of demonstration to the public, if it can be demonstrated, that the government at the worst have been honestly blundering and have not been criminally negligent of their duties in reggard to the construction of this great public work.

The Finance Minister said on the occasion of the introduction of this Bill on August 12, 1903, speaking of the section from Moncton to Quebec:

> I am advised by competent authorities that, from the general knowledge possessed of that country, that road can be built at a very moderate cost. From Quebec or Levis to near the point where the railway will leave the province of Quebec it can be built at a comparatively low cost.

And that comparatively low cost figured out by the Minister of Finance, and he is not a poet, a Finance Minister must be a business man—figured out as he tells us on actual investigation, was a cost for the section from Moncton to Quebec of $25,000 a mile.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is conveying the impression that I gave, of my own knowledge or information, estimates of the cost of this road. He knows me well enough to know that I would not presume to give information of that character. I gave the statement upon the authority of an eminent engineer and his name was given to the House.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend is not so good a listener as he is a talker. I shall read what he said again:

I am advised by competent authorities that, from the general knowledge possessed of that country, that road can be built at a very moderate cost. From Quebec or Levis to near the point where the railway will leave the province of Quebec it can be built at a comparatively low cost.

The public want to know what the government meant by that.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend knows what the government meant. It meant the information given by the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, C.M.G.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought probably some thing of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course.

Mr. LENNOX. I have something more for my hon. friend. I hope he is not losing his temper. He is an excellent gentleman until he gets excited, and I have respect for him even more in his calmer moments than when he is excited. He was giving us a judicial statement on that occasion, and he will admit that it is hard to square them with the facts of to-day. He told us that founded upon competent information and high authority—not upon isolated consultation but on many authorities—he had ascertained that the road from Lévis to Moncton would cost $25,000 per mile. The section of 1,475 miles from Quebec to Winnipeg would cost a little more, or $28,000 per mile. Taking the two sections together, the cost of the whole road from Moncton to Winnipeg he estimated at $41,300,000. To that, he told us, we must add the interest during construction, which would bring the total cost up to $54,609,675. Then he went again into an elaborate computation and made out that the total interest charge on the country would be a little over a million dollars per year, and the actual cost ot the country all told less than $13,000,000 for the whole undertaking. Contrast those figures with the figures given by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) in the session of 1908. According to his figures, the outlay, not taking the Quebec bridge into account, computed upon the same basis as the $13,000,000 were argued or by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, would be a capitalized interest bearing fund of $38,000,000. And again as the Minister of Railways told us a year and a half ago, the road, instead of costing an average of about $27,000 per mile from Moncton to Winnipeg will actually cost $63,427 a mile.

In view of these facts, and the startling declarations made by Mr. Hodgins—declarations which were not withdrawn, but were stifled and suspended on the promise that he would be brought immediately before a committee of three experts who were then said to be at work, and give his evidence to them—in view also of the fact that a gentleman who, out of all the engineers in Canada, was selected as the one best fitted for the position of chief engineer, and his statement that, after he had been in charge for some years, he found the most glaring disregard of his instructions, and in view still further of the startlingly damaging disclosures made by Mr. Woods, the assistant chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific railway, is it not amazing that the right hon. the Prime Minister should propose to us this gold-brick in the form of the resolution we are now discussing. But the Prime Minister is not responsible. He is simply doing what he has been commanded by the power behind the throne. There was a time when, in my simplicity, I thought that the right hon. gentleman, as Prime Minister, ruled his party and controlled the destinies of Canada, but I have since learned that there is a stronger hand than his—the hand of the chairman of the Transcontinental. That gentleman could afford to ignore even the Minister of Railways and reject a public document affecting the interests of the people and which should have been submited to that minister. Two years ago that same gentleman demanded that the Prime Minister should have an investigation for the purpose of castigating Mr. Hodgins, and the same gentleman again is the moving power in this matter as revealed by the letter of the 30th of December read by the right hon. gentleman this afternoon. It is an amazing condition of things, but perhaps were it not for that communication, the Prime Minister would not have been aware of the existence of this Lumsden letter at all. Mr. Lumsden resigned the 25th June last. His resignation was published in every newspaper in the country. It was considered everywhere a matter of great significance, yet apparently the Prime Minister knew nothing about it. He knew nothing about that resignation until this gentleman behind the throne said to him: You must have an investigation, you must whitewash me once more. And hence we have the preamble in this resolution: 'Whereas it appears, by a return made during the present session, &c.' Is it not fortunate that there is a leader of the opposition, that there is an opposition in this House, as otherwise the Prime Minister would probably not have known of the Lumsden letter at all.

I have been moving for returns and they come down very slowly, but we have obtained some. We have succeeded in obtaining material which in a large degree sub-

stantiates the statements made by Mr. Woods and Mr. Lumsden, corroborated to some extent by Mr. Grant, for Mr. Grant also admits that there has been over-classification to a very considerable degree, and thus refutes the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite a year ago that there was absolutely nothing of the kind. We have evidence that the discrepancies between the original estimates and the actual returns, as the work was done, are so startling, so utterly inconsistent with any hypothesis of honesty or competency, that a most thorough investigation is required and not such a misleading, narrow, hide-bound investigation as the right hon. gentleman proposes. What is required is an immediate, broad, general and thorough investigation of the business on the eastern division of the Transcontinental, which will show the methods which have been followed in its construction and which have resulted in the enormous expenditure which has startled the country. One would suppose that before letting any work, investigations must have been made by thoroughly competent engineers in order to enable the government to judge whether the tenders were reasonable or not and which is really the lowest tender; and one can realize that unless the estimates of the engineers are unreasonably accurate, one cannot expect a satisfactory result. It is an absolute farce, a leap in the dark, if these estimates upon which the tenders are based and accepted are not reasonably accurate. I am informed, and by competent engineers, too, that, in this matter of classification, the very most that is to be allowed for margin of error is twenty per cent. If you find that the estimates as tendered upon do not work out within a margin of twenty per cent at most, there is immediate need for investigation, for the result must come either from incompetence—or dishonesty—of the engineers who located and estimated upon the line, or from the incompetency—or dishonesty—of the men who are classifying the progress estimates from time to time as they are put in. Therefore, I hope I need not apologize for referring to some figures, for I am only giving to the House information that I should have been glad had the government given it to us long ago. Now, taking district 'F' and the McArthur contract extending for 244 miles east from Winnipeg, we find that the estimate of quantities of the engineers who laid out the work represented a total expenditure of $13,010,398. That was the amount that the government led the country to understand the work would cost, approximately. There was a change in the location effected by Mr. Hodgins, as he testified during the Hodgins investigation, which resulted in an estimated reduced expenditure of $1,010,398.92, leaving the estimated cost of the entire contract in round numbers, $12,000,000. Now, compare that with the returns actually made and with the allowancee on which the work was paid for. In the figures I am about to give, 'S.R.' stands for solid rock, 'L.R.' for Loose rock, and 'C.E.' for common excavation:

COMPARISON OF ESTIMATE AND RETURN.

—	Estimate.	Yards returned.	Rate.	Estimated cost.	Actual cost.	Difference.	Increase.
	c. yds.	c. yds.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	p. c.
S. R.	3,696,336	6,492,923	1 70	6,283,771 20	11,037,969 10	4,753,898 10	75
L. R.	733,454	2,029,325	0 60	440,072 40	1,217,592 00	777,522 60	176
C. E.	11,233,247	2,123,151	0 30	3,369,974 10	636,945 30	2,733,028 80	
Totals	15,663,037	10,645,399		10,093,817 70	12,892,509 40	2,798,691 70	28
Less—Yardage by 33 p c.		5,017,638					
Cost increased by				2,798,691 70			
	15,663,037	15,663,037		12,892,509 40			

This contract has a feature in common with all the other contracts that have been brought down—solid rock grows, loose rock grows, common earth shrinks. When I was a boy going to school I used to read:

Stones grow; vegetables grow and live; animals grow, live and feel. We are animals; we feel.

The stones handled under these contracts have grown; they have grown enormously. And the memory of the over-classification—aye, and, I believe, the dishonesty—that characterizes this work will live and grow in the knowledge and recollection of the people of Canada. Common excavation shrinks in these cases. It was only worth

thirty cents a cubic yard; it was not worth keeping. And, though it was estimated to cost about $3,500,000, it actually cost only $636,000. But, though we saved on that about two millions and three-quarters, it was like feeding the peas to the pig in the story—we gained on the pig but we lost on the peas. And the whole thing works out disaster and loss to the people of Canada. Here we had 15,000,000 of a total estimated yardage of material to be moved. In the result only about 10,000,000 has to be moved, an error of upwards of 5,000,000 cubic yards in the total by a 'competent' engineer. And the chairman of the commission tells us with pride that they have upon the line practically the same engineers as they had at the time the line was located. It was to cost about $10,000,000 for the whole 15,000,000 cubic yards; but the actual cost is $12,890,000. That is, while we have a decrease in the quantity of about one-third, we have an increase in actual cost of $2,798,791.

Mr. SPROULE. That's the way the money goes?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, that's the way the money goes. And yet the right hon. Prime Minister, in the interests of the public, as he says, would ask us to have an investigation as to whether Mr. Lumsden was right in losing confidence in his staff—but you must not touch the substance of the question, namely, the cause of that loss of confidence. The figures I have given show that the average rate, according to the classification, was 64 cents a yard, but the average rate as now classified is $1.21 a yard. That is, it was to have cost 64 cents for each cubic yard removed; as a matter of fact it has cost $1.21 per cubic yard. The quantity is five millions less to remove, but it is costing us $2,750,000 more to move it. The whole work, everything of the 103 schedule items which appear in the returns brought down, covering everything, except rails and ties and things of that kind, the total expenditure on the contract was to be, as I said, $12,000,000 for 103 items; the actual expenditure for three items alone is $12,900,000, or in round figures $900,000 more for these three items than it was to be for the 103 items entering into construction of this whole 244 miles of road. Now, the Minister of Finance—I am sorry he has run away—made careful estimates upon competent authority, and he found that this section of the road was to cost on an average $28,000 a mile. What does he think of it? Does he think that an investigation is necessary or not, when I tell him that these three items alone average, for this 244 miles, at the rate of $53,000 a mile. Well, that is the McArthur contract, and there is more of it.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. A lot of election fund came out of that.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a way of manipulating figures so that the wrong man gets the contract. If you will just place the items unevenly, estimate some of them extraordinarily high and others extraordinarily low, and particularly if anybody gets behind the scene, or the screen, and ascertains how those figures are running, there is a vast temptation and there is a great chance to have dishonest tenders. Now McArthur's contract, I want to state here, Mr. Speaker, was absolutely not the lowest tender. If there had been a competent or honest estimate at the time, and competent and honest returns and classification as the work progressed. The Pacific Construction Company's tender was the next lowest, and there was only a difference of $18,000, and this seeming difference only between those two tenders. It does not take much manipulation to change those figures. Just take half a dozen items which we have on record now, and they wipe that out. Take these items: 4, 5, 6, 8, 12 and 24. Now I need not go into many particulars, but I want to say that, taking the difference in prices in favour of the Pacific Company on those six items alone, they result in this, that Mr. McArthur was not the lowest tenderer but was actually a higher tenderer than the Pacific Company. Endeavouring to shorten this as much as I can, let me give only a few of the figures. Take these items we have been dealing with. On those items, as the estimates were advertised to the public, the Pacific Company appear to be $221,000 lower than the McArthur figures. Actually worked out upon quantities as returned and allowed, the Pacific Company's figures were really $426,112 lower. So you see upon these two items alone, under the changed conditions of things, more than enough, enormously more than enough, to give the tender to the Pacific Company. There were 2,750,000, in round numbers, more yards of solid rock than was estimated. The Pacific Company was five cents per yard better on the tender than the McArthur Company; that in itself makes $139,000. On loose rock, there was a differnce of 1,250,000 yards; that, at the rate of five cents a yard, makes $64,000. And so on these five items alone there is a difference of only $18,000 to start with, it shows that we would have been $186,000 in round numbers, better off by giving it to the Pacific Company than by giving it to the other company.

Now we come to a very interesting contract, and a very interesting section of the road, and that is from mile 0 to mile 150 west of the Quebec bridge. That contract, so far as I can understand, was let to McDonell & O'Brien, or Hogan & McDonell. I have ascertained through Mr. Ryan, the secretary of the board, that there is no confusion as to the particular work in hand, and so we need not trouble ourselves as to which of the contractors handled it. Mr. Ryan explains to me that, by some subsequent arrangement with M. P. Davis, M. P. Davis and J. T. Davis became contractors for the first 50 miles. I am only concerned to show the extravagant, the wholly incompetent or dishonest estimates in regard to quantities. Now as regards the difference of quantities. We have the estimates showing a little over a million cubic yards, and we have the actual returns allowing for more than 3,500,000 cubic yards. We have the estimated cost, upon the estimates of quantities, at $1,750,000, we have or alleged actual quantity, mark you, on this one item an actual expenditure of $5,512,102. We have a difference here of $3,758,377 a startling difference which ought to arouse the Prime Minister's attention, convince him of the necessity of a further investigation and bring him to a keener sense of his duty. We have an actual difference in this estimate of 214 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very much like the cost of the Quebec bridge.

Mr. LENNOX. Very much the same. That went down, this goes up. Now, we have loose rock estimated at the very modest quantity of 316,800 yards. It grew into one and three quarter million yards. It was to cost $158,400; it actually cost $868,282 or $709,482 of an increase or 440 per cent. Common excavation shrinks as it almost always does. From 6,000,000 yards it became 2,000,000 yards. At the trifling cost of 21 cents a yard it was to cost $1,323,000 instead of which it cost $500,000. So, we have this result: The total estimated cost upon which the contract was let was $5,297,257. We have these three items amounting to $6,880.08; so that the actual cost of three items of a total of 103 exceed the estimated cost of the whole 103 by $1,583,251. According to the Prime Minister the cost of this road was to be $25,000 a mile from Moncton to Quebec and $28,000 from Quebec to Winnipeg. Actually for these three items alone, the cost is upwards of $45,000 a mile.

Now, did I refer to the question of unbalanced bids?

UNBALANCED BIDS.

McDONALD vs. MULLARKEY.

Comparison on Estimated quantities.

McDonald and O.B. Tender.				O'Brien & Mullarkey Tender.			
Solid Rock	1,169,150 cu. yds	at $1.50	$1,753,725.00	Solid Rock	1,169,150 cu. yds.	at $1.45	$1,695,267.50
Loose Rock	315,800 "	.50	158,400.00	Loose Rock	316,800 "	.45	142,560.00
Com. exc.	6,303,682 "	.21	1,323,773.22	Com. exc.	6,303,682 "	.25	1,575,920.50
McDonald			$3,235,898.22	Mullarkey			$3,413,748.00
							3,235,898.22
				Apparently in favour of McDonald by			$ 177,849.78

Unbalanced bids are worked out in this way. The estimates, for instance, represent that there is only going to be a very small quantity of solid rock, there is only going to be a very small quantity of loose rock and there is going to be an enormous quantity of low priced material, or of common excavation. Tenders are put in on that basis. But, it works out the other way. There is an enormous quantity of high priced material and a very much smaller quantity of low priced material. That is how it worked out in this case. Take the McDonald tender and take the next lowest tender, that of O'Brien and Mullarkey. Solid rock in this case was to be a little more than a million yards. According to McDonald's figures it would cost $1,753,000. By Mullarkey's figures, which were $1.45 a yard instead of $1.50, it would cost $1,695,267. Loose rock was estimated at 316,000 yards. It was estimated on McDonald's figures at $158,400 while at the figures of Mullarkey it would cost $142,560.

Common excavation according to McDonald's tender would have cost 21 cents a yard, an excessively low price. It was estimated that there was an enormous quantity of it—6,313,682 yards—and at the rate of 21 cents a yard it cost $1,323,773. By O'Brien and Mullarkey's figures, which were four cents higher, or 25 cents a yard, it appeared to amount to $1,575,000. The result was that upon being figured out on the basis of the estimated quantities Mullarkey was $177,849 behind.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. You mean lower?

Mr. LENNOX. Mullarkey appeared to be higher by $177,849.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the estimated relative quantities?

Mr. LENNOX. On the estimated quantities, as put in because of this reason that although he was lower on the smaller quantity he was four cents higher on the larger quantity. If the large quantity had remanied that would have been just. As a matter of fact it was not so at all. On the actual quantities it worked out in this way. Solid rock grew into 3,674,735 yards which at $1.50 a yard amounted to $5,512,102 and at $1.45 a yard, Mullarkey's price, it amounted to $5,328,365. There was a considerable gain there because the quantity had increased and the five cents a yard difference counted all the time. The loose rock had again increased and with the same result, common excavation decreased and of course did not count so much against Mullarkey as did the larger quantity that was estimated before and upon which low priced material he had put in a higher price. The result was that McDonald's price was $6,880,408 while Mullarkey's price, on the actual quantities allowed and paid for was $6,695,347. There was an actual difference and there would have been a gain to the country if Mullarkey had got the contract of $185,000. But that is not all. Mullarkey appeared to be $177,000 on the wrong side of the account as I showed a moment ago. The result was that upon the actual figures it would have worked out at $363,000 less if honest estimates had obtained. Deduct from that the difference in tenders and you would still have in favour of Mullarkey and in favour of the country $110,000. If you take a half dozen other items in connection with this same matter, the particulars of which I need not go into, you will find that wherever Mullarkey was low the quantities increased—and wherever Mullarkey was high the quantities decreased strangely enough. Taking only these items at the head of the list and adding them we have another $175,000 in favour of Mullarkey's tender.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT BY RESULTS.

At McDonald's Prices.				At Mullarkey's Prices.			
Solid rock..	3,674,735 c. yds.	at $1.50,	$5,512,102.50	Solid rock...	3,674,735 c. yds.	at $1.45,	$5,328,365.75
Loose rock..	1,736,564 "	0.50	868,282.00	Loose rock..	1,735,564 "	0.45	781,453.80
Com. exc...	2,383,166 "	0.21	593,525.00	Com. exc....	2,382,166 "	0.25	596,529.00
			$6,880,408.86				$6,695,347.55

McDonald	$6,880,408.86
Mullarkey	6,695,347.55
Difference in favour of Mullarkey	$ 185,061.31
Add apparent balance against him of	177,949.78
A turnover of	$ 363,011.09
Deduct difference in tenders	252,946.68
Net amount in favour of Mullarkey	$ 110,064.41

Now I have dealt with the two sections of the road that have been most frequently referred to. We have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite and far more by the Grit press of the country that the country is perfectly safe because the Grand Trunk Pacific railway will look after this. Why, the Grand Trunk Pacific are contractors in this matter. When we formed the scheme of building this road—and it was a scheme—the Grand Trunk Pacific said the most they could undertake to do was to build the prairie section, but they did not stick to that. They wanted to make something beyond that. When the country undertook to build the difficult div-

ision, the division that it is said will never pay, then the Grand Trunk Pacific railway company became contractors themselves for the building of portions of this line, and have you heard of any complaint being made by Mr. Woods of over classification upon the portions of the road that these gentlemen are themselves building? I do not think so, and I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that you will not hear of any such complaints. But, Mr. Speaker, after an investigation of this matter I declare that the same kind of over-classification and the same growth of solid rock obtains down in New Brunswick, and between New Brunswick and Quebec, where these gentlemen are contractors. The same system prevails, and in some instances in almost the same degree under those contracts that obtains in those divisions to which reference is now made. We are told that we can rely for safety upon the action of the Grand Trunk Pacific; this company with its numerous aliases which becomes increasingly dangerous by reason of these aliases. We have the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in this transaction, and as the Minister of Finance told us, we have the old Grand Trunk at the back of it, and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company, and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Company, and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific Town Site and Development Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Express Company, and perhaps the Grand Trunk Pacific Steamship Company. And behind them all, and if there were a thousand more of them, I am not prepared to rest the interests of the people of Canada. And why? Perhaps as far as Mr. Woods is concerned it was all right and I have not referred to the letters of Mr. Woods, nor have I read extracts from the letters of Mr. Lumsden, because hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will deal with these questions; but I call the attention of the Prime Minister to this fact: that a strong fight was put up by the Grand Trunk Pacific; they were fighting for a broad general inquiry and they were hampered and opposed, and by whom? Why, Sir, by the man who should represent the people of Canada, by the chairman of the commission. What should have been his duty? Why should he not have said: We will have this investigation, broad, and generous, and free, and in the interests of the people of Canada. I do not care whether Mr. Woods objected or not, I want to ensure in the interest of the people whom I represent that there shall be no dishonest classification. But no, he fought like a tiger; he fought, I should say, almost like a fiend to prevent the extension of this inquiry, and to confine it within the narrowest possible limits. And the fight went on, and we have the experts resign, and we have the chairman of the commission upon the mere ipse dixit of some local engineers, without one word of investigation, one word of inquiry, without asking for any explanation condemn these three experts. What have we further? We have the master hand; we have one of the great and able men who form the right hon. gentleman's cabinet, we have the master mind of the Minister of Public Works entering the arena. And it was then, and not till then, that the whole situation resolved itself into one of perfect amity and dove like greetings all round. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and the old Grand Trunk Company, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Company and the various other companies that represent this one original body, collapsed, and after fighting for a broad investigation, we have in the last pages of the return brought down we have it provided and agreed that the investigation is to be confined to the narrowest limits. Was the chairman of the Grand Trunk Pacific Commission acting in the interests of the public whose interest he had a right to protect, or was he acting in the interest of the contractors when he insisted that the investigation should be so narrowed. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, having regard to the figures I have quoted to you (and you have a mind for figures), do you think we should have this investigation upon the narrow limits the Prime Minister suggests? Let me refer for a moment to the condition of things from Moncton to Quebec, where no complaints have been made, and particularly in New Brunswick, for the purpose of showing you, Mr. Speaker, that the same infamous—I think I am right in using that word—the same dishonest, and the same unfortunate classification that prevails in sections B and F, prevails on this section of the road as well. In other words, from end to end of this line we have this amazing state of things, that the high priced class of materials grow and swell, and the low priced class of materials dwindle and shrink. And the net result is that on this road, in the province of Quebec where, the right hon. gentleman in introducing this measure, described the roses as blooming in the fertile fields, and along the fertile belt in the province of Ontario, everywhere rocks are found where no rocks were expected, and the price of material is doubled and more than doubled, throughout the whole length of the line. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to dealing with figures I am not an expert, and that I do not handle them aptly, and my excuse for quoting figures now is that the people should know, and so far as it is in my power, they shall know, what it taking place in regard to the construction of

this railway. We have an hon. gentleman on this side of the House, who, in the interests of the public, is endeavouring to lengthen the day and bring more daylight to the people, but God knows, if there is anything we need in this matter it is not so much the lengthening of the day as a flood of light let in on these transactions so that the people of Canada may know what is happening.

Mr. SPROULE. You want the lime light on it.

Mr. LENNOX. You recollect what I said as to the statement of engineers as to reasonable error, a matter of probably twenty per cent.

On the first section from Moncton, fifty miles, the contract for which was, I think, let to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the total estimated cost was almost a million dollars. It was said that there was absolutely no solid rock and only 130,000 cubic yards of loose rock. That would appear to be pretty nice country. Hear how it worked out. The total quantity excavated was 1,460,000 cubic yards. The rates for the three classes of material were $1.50, 55 cents and 25 cents. The section was estimated to cost $531,000. The estimated average rate for excavating was 26 cents a cubic yard. I got returns down to December, 1908, and I found that 5,000 cubic yards odd of solid rock had been taken out and 4,000 odd remained to be removed, making a total of 10,000 cubic yards of solid rock. Where there was to be 130,000 cubic yards of loose rock, it grew into 850,000 cubic yards, and where there was to be 1,900,000 cubic yards of common excavation it shrank to 600,000 cubic yards. The average cost of that, as I said, was 26 cents a cubic yard. The result is that we saved on common excavation apparently $310,000, we removed three-quarters of the total estimated quantity and we added, notwithstanding that, $100,000 to the total cost.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is that section finished?

Mr. LENNOX. I am not aware of that. I asked for a return showing how much work had been done and how much remained to be done. They gave the quantity done and the amount remaining to be done and adding the two it gives this total amount. On this section the solid rock rose from nothing to 10,000 cubic yards, the loose rock from 130,000 into 850,000 cubic yards, an increase in the latter case of 556 per cent. Engineers call anything above common excavation classified material. In that contract we had fifty-two per cent of classified material, whereas the estimate of classified material was only seven per cent. We are paying for 1,500,000 cubic yards at 43 cents a cubic yard; we should be paying for the same quantity at 26·09 cents, or we are overpaying $238,000, or at the rate of 60 per cent beyond what we should pay. The increase on the whole contract is $600,000 or more than 70 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has that contract?

Mr. LENNOX. I think it is the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I am not absolutely sure; I did not mark it. I have some Grand Trunk Pacific contracts. Mark you they are returned as Grand Trunk Pacific, not as Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Company. Yes, this is a Grand Trunk Contract.

Mileage from 50 to 58 was contracted for by T. W. McManus. The total estimated cost was $289,000. It was estimated that there would be no solid rock that there would be 58,000 cubic yards of loose rock costing $29,000, and 529,000 cubic yards of common excavation, costing $111,000. It has increased from 58,000 cubic yards of loose rock to 247,000 cubic yards, and that class is costing instead of $29,000, $123,000. Common excavation was estimated at 529,000 cubic yards and it is now 93,000. The result is that while the estimated cost was $140,000, the actual cost is $273,000 for a less quantity. The average cost at the original estimate would be 24 cents per cubic yard. The rate of the expenditure has actually increased by 166 per cent, or, in other words, we are paying at more than two and a half times the estimated rate of expenditure. It works out in this way:

Material.	Estimate.	Actual Quantity.	Estimated Cost.	Actual Cost.
		c. y.	$	$
Solid rock.	—	85,000	—	128,100
Loose rock	58,000	247,000	29,000	123,800
Common excavation....	529,000	93,000	111,000	19,000

In other words we have it in this way. The estimate allowed for no solid rock, less than ten per cent of loose rock, and more than ninety per cent of the estimate being for common excavation. As it turns out it becomes twenty per cent solid rock, fifty-eight per cent loose rock and twenty-two per cent common excavation. We were to have had classified material amounting to less than ten per cent. As it works out, we have classified material at the higher

price to the extent of more than seventy-eight per cent.

Mr. G. TAYLOR. The whole staff ought to be dismissed.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but the chairman of the commission is proud of the fact that we have practically the same engineers on the work now as at the time when the contract was let.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I suppose they are equally proud of him?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, I suppose they are. Take mile 58 to mile 96. There had been expended on that piece of road up to December 31, 1908, $584,000 and there was then to be expended $639,000, making $1,224,000 against an estimate of $767,000, an increase of $456,723, on a matter of twenty-eight miles. The common rock estimate in that case was 29,000 cubic yards, but it increased to 75,000 cubic yards. The loose rock was estimated at 492,000 cubic yards and was increased to 545,000 cubic yards. Therefore the solid rock was increased by 240 per cent and the loose rock by eleven per cent.

District 'A', mile 96 to 164 from Moncton. The contractors are the Grand Trunk Pacific. Estimated cost $1,898,124. The increase in solid rock on that section was ninety-five per cent. That is only one instance in many to show that we cannot depend on the Grand Trunk Pacific to fight our battles in this matter. The increase there was as great almost as on any section of the road, yet naturally there was no kick over that from the Grand Trunk Pacific. What I claim is that it is the duty of the commissioners—and if they neglect it, it is the duty of the Prime Minister—to see that we have an investigation, no matter whether the Grand Trunk Pacific complain or not. In view of the startling increase in expenditure over the estimate, we should have an investigation by a committee of this House, a thorough and exhaustive investigation into every thing connected with the building of the road, so as to determine the cause of this extraordinary expenditure, which bears on its face every evidence of dishonesty on incompetency.

Take the district 'A', mile 96 to 164 from Moncton. There is an increase of ninety-five per cent in the solid rock under that contract. The result is that on this one item of solid rock out of loose rock we have 68,367 yards at $1, or $63,367 increased expenditure over estimate. We have also an increase of 231,299 cubic yards of solid rock out of common excavation at $1,18, or an increase of $272,983, giving a total increase on this one item alone of $341,300.

Take the contract district 'A', from 164 mile to 195 mile, let to Willard Kitchen & Company. The estimated cost was $1,646,000. The estimated quantity of solid rock was 253,000 cubic yards, but the actual quantity turned out to be, it is said, 525,850 cubic yards, or more than double. The estimated cost of the solid rock was $376,000 but it actually cost $783,000. There was a decrease in the loose rock and also in the common excavation, but the loose rock was all run into solid rock which is very significant. On the whole 21 contracts, there are only two cases where loose rock decreased, but in each case it went into solid rock. What is the significant point behind this? Take the whole list of tenders and none of them came near this figure of thirty-five cents for loose rock. They ranged as high as 55c. It looks as if this firm of Willard Kitchen & Company—and I believe they are pretty well known to some of the right hon. gentleman's political friends—by some unfortunate accident got inside information. At all events the matter is one which demands investigation. It was estimated that the total quantity to be removed would be two and a half million cubic yards, but the actual quantity was 1,155,137, or a difference of 1,293,000 cubic yards. How do you account for that difference when there was so much competent engineering skill at the service of the government, and when the government had mountains of information, as the right hon. gentleman told us? What was the result? They moved only forty-seven per cent of the estimated quantity, but we paid ninety-seven per cent of the total estimated cost. On one and a quarter million yards less material moved, we saved a paltry $28,000, but we jumped our price from an average of forty-one cents to eighty-five cents per cubic yard, thus increasing the cost to the country by $580,000, and we saved on the part not removed one and a quarter million yards at the rate of two and one-quarter cents per yard.

Mr. FOSTER. That is on a thirty-one mile contract?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. Solid rock increased by 107 per cent; the common excavation, which was said to be one and a quarter million yards, becomes 196,000 cubic yards, or an over-estimate by competent and honest engineers of yards, 1,027,599 cubic yards, or at the rate of 522 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. That is fairly accurate.

Mr. LENNOX. The net estimate on actual quantity was $1,116,015 and there has been expended $905,000, and there is yet to be expended $1,327,793; or this contract has increased by $1,116,000 or more than double.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost?

Mr. LENNOX. $2,232,793.

Mr. FOSTER. Pretty nearly $75,000 a mile—where is the Minister of Finance?

Mr. LENNOX. He has gone out. Those figures do not agree with him.

Now take the contract of District A from mile 195·58 to mile 256·61. The contractors were Lyons & White. The original estimate of the whole work was $1,385,941.09. The estimated quantity of solid rock was 172,709 cubic yards; the actual quantity 231,958 cubic yards. The quantity of loose rock estimated was 64,765 cubic yards, and the actual quantity was 749,383 cubic yards. The total estimated quantity was 1,913,649 cubic yards, while the actual quantity showed comparatively little shrinkage, being 1,754,531 cubic yards. The actual cost for this quantity was $286,633 over estimate, an increase of 45 per cent. Solid rock has increased more than 34 per cent and loose rock more than 1057 per cent. This is the contract immediately east of the New Brunswick boundary. This brings us to the New Brunswick boundary and that is the section which the Finance Minister emphasized as being extremely moderate—something less than $25,000 a mile. The estimated cost was to be $2,377,000. The common excavation was estimated at 633,900 cubic yards, price $1.45. estimated cost $919,155. The actual quantity was increased to 853,916 cubic yards, and the expenditure for the item was increased from the estimate of $919,155 to $1,238,178.20. The loose rock was increased from an estimated cost of $98,150 to $387,176. The quantity of solid rock was increased by 220,000 cubic yards, raising the price of this item by 319,000 or 34 per cent. And the loose rock is increased from an estimated quantity of 196,300 at an estimated cost of $98,150 to 387,176 in quantity, and $193,588 in cost, or an increase on this item of 97 per cent.

Now, I come to the last contract, with which I shall deal, a contract of M. P. Davis—and I always find M. P. Davis' contracts are somewhat interesting. This is from mile 0 to mile 150 east from the Quebec bridge. This is a big contract, as will be seen when I state that it was estimated to cost over $5,011,346.50. The following are the figures showing the estimates in this contract and the actual results:

——	Est. Quant.	Price.	Est. Cost.	Act. Quant.	Actual Cost.
		$ cts.	$ cts.		$ cts.
Solid rock	918,381	1 45	1,331,652 45	1,556,347	2,256,703 15
Loose rock	395,645	0 65	257,169 25	1,292,799	840,319 35
Com. exc	3,091,210	0 27	834,626 70	929,079	250,851 33
	4,405,236	.....	2,423,448 40	3,778,225	3,347,873 83

So, here we have excavations averaging according to the estimate 55 cents a cubic yard working out at an actual cost of 88½ cents a cubic yard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not in the habit of apologizing for the time I take in this House, but I apologize very sincerely upon this occasion for though I realize that these things take a good deal of investigation—and, as it was, as I believed, in the interest of the country, it was a labour of love—yet it is impossible to present these figures in a way to be very clear without running great risk of wearying members of the House. But, though these figures may be tiresome, yet, the fact that the government has not been giving us much information on these matters must be my apology for claiming the attention of the House at such length. I propose, in conclusion, to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—not at the instance of the powerful chairman of the Railway Commission, but at my own humble solicitation—to enlarge the scope of the inquiry he proposes. I feel that I can be lost sight of in my request. The Prime Minister can well disregard the humble source from which the request comes in his desire to discharge a great public duty. The right hon. gentleman must realize that we have now for five years been engaged in the expenditure of public money upon this great work. And, whether rightly or wrongly, whether by mistake or by dishonesty, whether blunderingly or criminally, the expenditure is vastly, enormously—outrageous, I might say—in excess of the estimates presented to the House. The faith upon which the country committed itself to the construction of this work has not been at all justified by the result. And, surely it is not unreasonable that, representing the people, we should ask now that there shall be not this little, piecemeal, narrow investigation, meaning absolutely nothing, but a broad, generous investigation. Should such an investigation justify the ministry—and I shall be glad for the reputation of Canada should that be the result—it will bring to light what the people want to know. Surely it would not be unreasonable now, at the end of five years of

rapid and enormous expenditure, to ask that the government shall take the people into their confidence to this extent, that they shall inquire fully and carefully into the methods which have obtained in the expenditure of this vast amount of the people's money. Having regard to the fact that, in the Public Accounts Committee, even if we were all working to bring in the daylight and elucidate this matter, it would yet be impossible, with the limited time at our disposal, to unravel this matter and also investigate other public questions, surely we have a right to appeal to the Prime Minister to establish a tribunal of members of this House who shall have this investigation specially in charge and shall take up all matters relating to the expenditure of public money on this Transcontinental railway, so that the people may know whether or not there has been honest and efficient administration of the public funds.

Whilst I say that, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that we have not a Public Accounts Committee such as we should have. Surely it is the common knowledge of everybody, and I hope the Prime Minister realizes it as well as anybody else, that in that Public Accounts Committee, as I have said before in this session, we are not facilitated, but on the contrary, every effort of the opposition to drag forth the truth and to let in the light, is baulked and opposed by certain prominent supporters of the right hon. gentleman. In view of these facts, and in view of the fact that even if there has been a fair, honest, and to some extent a mistaken expenditure of public money, and that if this is the fact and this fact is established, it will redound to the credit of Canada and the benefit of the government. I hope the right hon. gentleman will not, in his power and in his might, call in his supporters to vote down the amendment I offer to the House. If these reasons are weighty, and of some effect, then they are intensified, I submit, by the manifest attitude of the chairman of that commission, by his attitude in baulking as far as he can an investigation of matters relative to this railway. This again is a matter which I commend to the right hon. gentleman as an additional reason why we should have a thorough and full investigation. In addition to all this, the peculiar, the significant surrender of the Grand Trunk Pacific, after fighting for a time, suggests that it may be profitable to again and again surrender to the government if a quid pro quo is given them. It is clearly the duty of the government to declare that they will not allow the New Brunswick end of this construction to remain wholly uninvestigated, where the Grand Trunk Pacific are operating as contractors under the government and a sufficient reason in itself why the minister and the First Minister should grant the reasonable request I am making. In the interest of the people of Canada, I demand that the Prime Minister give to this committee full power to investigate the affairs of the eastern division of the Transcontinental. I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'whereas' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:—

Hugh D. Lumsden in tendering his resignation as chief engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway has made grave chages touching the expenditure of public moneys in the construction of the said railway, which charges ought, in the public interest, to be thoroughly investigated.

And whereas the cost of the eastern division of the said railway, according to the latest estimates of the government, will be so enormously in excess of the estimates submitted to parliament in 1904 and 1905 as to arouse the most serious alarm and to call for the fullest inquiry.

Therefore be it resolved that a committee of seven members be appointed to investigate the said charges and all other matters connected with or relating to the construction of the eastern division of the said railway and the expenditure of public moneys thereon.

That the said committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). If any further proof were necessary to show the extreme wisdom of this parliament in placing the settlement of disputes as to classification under a tribunal that would not be swayed by political partisanship, the speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) this afternoon has given that reason. Now I want to compliment my hon. friend on the great study he has given to this case. He has gone into details very minutely that only the hand of an engineer could properly work out, and I congratulate him on collaborating these figures so industriously. But I want to point out just one or two things in which I think he will discover he is in error, though I do not intend to go into the details of classification as he has done. In the first place, I think my hon. friend is altogether wrong when he says that the Board of Arbitration has done no work. The Board of Arbitration has done work and good work. But he must remember this, that under the agreement the third arbitrator was only to be called in when the chief engineers of the company and of the commission respectively could not agree, and since the appointment of the new chief engineer, quite a large number of differences have been settled without the third arbitrator being called in. But the third arbitrator has been called in, I think, in several cases, and a good deal

of work has been done by the Board of Arbitration. Another thing in which my hon. friend I think was in error, was in saying that no exception had ever been taken to any of the Grand Trunk Pacific contracts. I think my hon. friend could not have studied even this 42a closely. I want to call his attention to one item, it is not large, but it proves that exception has been taken to some of the classification on a contract held by the Grand Trunk Pacific. In a letter dated September 14, 1909, to the commissioners, signed by Gordon Grant, engineer, I find this paragraph:

Dear Sir,—With regard to my recent trip of inspection on the Macdonell & O'Brien contract on district 'B,' mile 50 to 150, west of the Quebec bridge, and from Mile 150 to Mile 163 on the Grand Trunk Pacific contract, which contract extends from Mile 150 to Mile 200 west of the Quebec bridge, I may say that the deduction I propose making on the 13 miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific contract for excess overbreak and over-classification will be approximately $15,000.

That is a small amount. The contract was for 13 miles, but it verifies what I thought was the case when I raised the point that exception had been taken to at least one case of over-classification on a contract held by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. LENNOX. What I said was that I had not heard that Mr. Woods had taken exception, and that I would be surprised if he had done so. I knew perfectly well about the item that my hon. friend is dealing with.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may have been what was in my hon. friend's mind, but that is not the impression that I, or the House, received, or that, I think the unrevised 'Hansard' will show. Now, the whole question comes down to this, after all my friend has said: Are the people of Canada getting value for the money expended on the Transcontinental railway?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a good thing that hon. gentlemen on the left of Mr. Speaker are not the people of Canada, nor the voice of the people of Canada, because this matter of the cost of the Transcontinental railway has been threshed out thoroughly at least on one occasion before the people, and they have said that they want this road constructed, even at the additional cost, and my hon. friends have put it as high as they possibly could. Just let me for a moment put on record the comparative cost of railways in some parts of the world. While I am not doing this as a justification of the cost of the Transcontinental railway, I want to point out that when hon. gentlemen go into hysterics about the proposed cost of this line from Moncton to Winnipeg they certainly have not studied the construction of railways in other lands, or even on this continent, because, while there is some difference, there is not any greater difference than the difference in the conditions existing a few years ago and at the present time would warrant. The cost per mile of building railways is as follows:

	Cost per mile.
South Australia	$ 37,250
New South Wales	64,365
Germany	107,272
France	126,350
Italy	109,560
Russia	83,080
Austria Hungary	87,816
Great Britain	272,291
United States	58,664
Canada as a whole	55,638
Intercolonial Railway	62,885

This road is estimated, if I remember the figures correctly, at $63,500 a mile from Moncton to Winnipeg. Taking into consideration the cost of everything that goes into the construction of the railway, taking into consideration that for a great distance it is very difficult construction, I say that even at the figures given by my hon. friend, the Transcontinental railway will not cost more than the average cost of railways in the Dominion of Canada, present conditions considered.

But, Sir, my hon. friend referred to a statement about $13,000,000. I shall not detain the House to refute that, because he refuted it himself before he got through, saying that he understood it perfectly but that the people at large would not. I have great faith in the judgment of the people at large and I think they will understand it fully as well as my hon. friend. Let me point out one or two things more. What the people want to know is: Are we getting value for our money? My hon. friend says we are not getting value for our money because the road is costing more than the original estimate. In fact, his charges would resolve themselves into perhaps three divisions; first, an attack on the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, Mr. Parent; second, an attack on the work of the chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, and thirdly, an attack on the construction of the road implying dishonesty, or collusion, between the contractors, the chief engineer, the commission and the government. So that nobody might escape, I think he covered the ground pretty well in his own mind. I want to go over the history of this situation, not with reference to classification particularly, but rather having in view the resolution before the House which the remarks of my hon. friend did not relate to very much. What is the method adopted by any railway company

or by this commission? They have a chief engineer and they have under him a staff of engineers. The Prime Minister of Canada knows no more about classification than the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, but he knows just as much. These men on the commission, the members of the various departments of the government. the men in business on the other side of the House, the great railway companies, depend absolutely for their estimates on the engineers they engage to give them these estimates. I admit at once that the original estimate made for the Transcontinental' railway has been largely exceeded. I took up some of the time of the House last session in pointing out what to me seemed good reasons why this increase existed and how it was brought about. I shall not detain the House again, but just let me impress this on the hon. gentleman and on the country that the road to be constructed, known as the Transcontinental railway, cannot be compared with the original construction of any other line on this continent. It can be compared with the present state of other lines that have been practically rebuilt, regraded and reballasted, because when the Grand Trunk Pacific starts to haul traffic in a completed state it will be a line that has not been equalled in its original construction by any other line on the continent of America. That means something, and it is fair to compare the Transcontinental railway, when it begins operations, with other lines that have reduced their grades, reduced their curvatures, straightened their tracks and rebuilt their bridges all over the country. But we depend absolutely on the engineers. If they have made an error in their estimate we accept the situation and do the best we can with it, but that does not affect the people. If the people are getting a line of railway that is worth the money they are putting into it they will be satisfied.

Just let me go over the history of the case leading up to the resignation of Mr. Lumsden, because that is the matter really before the House. In the first place, it was anticipated by this parliament—every man on this side of the House anticipated it as every hon. gentleman on the other side, and I think nobody objected to the proposition —that there would be disagreements as to classification. That opinion was universal, and why?—because such disagreements have occurred between contractors and every company that has ever built a mile of railway in this or any other country. It was common sense to believe that these differences would arise. They have arisen not only in connection with the construction of railways, but they arise in connection with the construction of all great public works—yes, and works whether they are being carried out by governments, companies, or private individuals. Well, parliament, in its wisdom, knowing that these differences would arise, devised a means by which they could be settled, and that means was through a board of arbitration. That was the wise way. I might have a very strange view of the question. Possibly I might be a political partisan and it would not do to leave it to me. I might see something in it that would be a very great temptation to me, and I might say the same thing with reference to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Possibly some of them might be as weak in that respect as I. Parliament thought that the safest thing to do on behalf of the whole country, was to take it away from us and give it to a board of arbitration. That was consented to, I believe, by every hon. member on both sides of the House. Let us see what was the basis of the specifications. After a good deal of discussion between Mr. Wood, representing the Grand Trunk Pacific, and Mr. Butler, representing the Transcontinental Commission, than whom there is no abler man on this continent, it was decided that the specifications for this work should be based on the report of the American Railway and Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association. After studying the whole question and after getting the best reports of engineers for years, they devised the specification, and the Transcontinental Commission through Mr. Butler and the Grand Trunk Pacific through Mr. Woods accepted this as the basis of the specification throughout the whole line, not only on the eastern division but on the western division. There was, I believe, one exception made, and that was with reference to the cement and concrete work, and originally the specifications for the cement and concrete work were the specifications of Mr. Butler himself, accepted in toto by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Knowing Mr. Butler as I do, and having had business relations with him for some years, I think that is a sufficient answer to anything that could be said as to the specifications in their entirety for the work to be done on the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental. At the risk of wearying the House I want to put on record some of the provisions made in these specifications. The contracts were under the chief engineer. No matter what my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) may say, the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission had full responsibility for the carrying out of every contract on the eastern division, and no money could be paid without his sanction and no work could be accepted without his certificate. I want to read the interpretation given of the word ' work ' and of the word ' engineer,' so that we can see where we are at, and that we may know what

great authority the chief engineer had. Now, the word 'work' is interpreted in the agreement to mean:

Meaning of word 'Work.'

1. In this agreement the word 'work' or 'works' shall, unless the context requires a different meaning, mean the whole of the work and materials, matters and things required to be done, furnished and performed by the contractor under this contract.

The term 'engineer' or 'chief engineer' is interpreted to mean:

Engineer, Chief Engineer, defined.

2. The words 'engineer' or 'chief engineer' when used in this agreement or in the specifications hereunto annexed, shall mean the chief engineer of the commissioners, for the time being, acting as such either directly or through the assistant chief engineer, district engineer, division engineer, resident engineer or inspector, having immediate charge of a portion of the works limited by the particular duties entrusted to him. All instructions and directions or certificates given or decisions made, by any one acting under the authority of the chief engineer shall be subject to his approval and may be cancelled, altered, modified and changed as he may see fit. In all cases where the contractor or the commissioners are dissatisfied with the decision of the engineer or inspector in immediate charge of the work, an appeal to the chief engineer may be made.

Section 15 of the agreement says:

15. The engineer shall be the sole judge of work and material in respect of both quantity and quality, and his decision on all questions in dispute with regard to work or material shall be final, and no works or extra or additional works or changes shall be deemed to have been executed, nor shall the contractor be entitled to payment for the same, unless the same shall have been executed to the satisfaction of the engineer, as evidenced by his certificate in writing, which certificate shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to be paid therefor.

Mr. J. HAGGART. May I ask whether the specifications were prepared before the quantities were taken out by the engineers on which the tenders were received?

Mr. GRAHAM. These were the original specifications made before any contract was let.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I understand that, but what I want to know is whether the quantities estimated by the engineers of the department were taken out on the classification that was prepared and agreed to by Mr. Butler and the engineers.

Mr. GRAHAM. In every case they were based I think on the specification thus prepared because these were the specifications agred to by both parties.

Mr. J. HAGGART. In every case?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so, that is my information. Now, section 34 of that same agreement I shall read, and this is a point that will be of interest as I go further on:

34. Cash payments equal to about ninety per cent of the value of the work done, approximately made up from returns of progress measurements and computed at the prices agreed upon, or determined under the provisions of this agreement, will be made to the contractor monthly, on the written certificate of the engineer that the work for, or on account of which, the certificate is granted has been duly executed to his satisfaction, and stating the value of such work computed as mentioned, and upon approval of such certificate by the commissioners; and the said certificate and such approval thereof shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to be paid the said ninety per cent or any part thereof. The remaining ten per cent shall be retained until the final completion of the whole work to the satisfaction of the chief engineer for the time being having control over the work; and within two months after such completion the remaining ten per cent will be paid; and the written certificate of the engineer, certifying to the final completion of the said works to his satisfaction, shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to receive or to be paid the said remaining ten per cent, or any part thereof; provided, however, that if and when it is shown by the contractor to the satisfaction of the commissioners that the application of the said ten per cent or any part thereof will enable or hasten the completion of the work, and that the same will be so applied; and if and when, in the opinion of the commissioners it appears that the deposit made by the contractor as security for the performance of this contract is ample security for the completion of the work, the said ten per cent or any part thereof may be released by the commissioners in such instalments as may from time to time be agreed upon. The commissioners shall be at liberty from time to time to take over as completed any portion of the work certified to by the engineer as having been completed, and the contractor shall, thereupon, be entitled to payment in full for the work so completed in like manner, and subject to the same conditions, as if the said completed portion comprised the whole work to be done. The commissioners shall be entitled from time to time to the use of any portion of the line of railway not theretofore accepted as completed under the terms hereof for the transportation of all steel superstructures or other materials, and no such use of any part of the said railway shall be deemed to be any acceptance or taking possession thereof.

Section 39 is along the same lines and I propose to read it to show the powers held by the chief engineer and the absolute dependence of the public upon his report in every case:

39. The progress measurements and progress certificates shall not in any respect be taken as binding upon the commissioners, or as

final measurements or as fixing final amounts; they are to be subject to the revision of the engineer in making up his final certificate, and they shall not in any respect be taken as an acceptance of the work or release of the contractor from responsibility in respect thereof, but he shall at the conclusion of the works deliver over the same in good order, according to the true intent and meaning of this agreement.

Without going into any further explanation I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), if he had been the Prime Minister of Canada, if he had been the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, if he had been the Minister of Railways, what other protection could he have thought of to place in an agreement than is placed in this agreement. Is it not full, ample and secure so far as the people of Canada are concerned. And Sir, if there is any deviation from the terms of that agreement we will be able to find that out. But as to making provisions for the protection of the people of Canada I say that that protection was made as ample for the people of Canada as is made by any company on the face of the earth for its protection against contractors. Differences were anticipated as I pointed out and the parliament of Canada wisely provided that these differences should be decided not by partisans or by members of this House who might have a political interest in them, but by an independent board, one member of it to be the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission. Surely the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission ought to be able to look after the commissioners' side which is the public side, ought to be able to defend his own work, the work of which he has approved in the months past, and be able to give reasons for the decisions arrived at. On the other hand, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific ought to be able to defend the contention of the Grand Trunk Pacific in placing their objections to any part of the work. These two of course would each be prejudiced in favour of his own view, and a third was to be appointed to decide when these two did not agree. As a matter of fact, under the agreement, the third was not to have a voice until the other two disagreed. It was thought that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had to pay the interest and bear the burden of the cost of this line, this was ample protection that they would do their utmost to see that the cost was not too great. It was thought that the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission would look after the interests of the commission and the people, as was his duty, and if these two agreed on a certain specification I say now in the face of what my hon. friends say that the people of Canada would have no cause to object to the decision they arrived at, because, in all probability, it would be just in every respect and a fair compromise between the two extreme opinions they held. If they could not agree, a third was to be appointed, and to follow the line of my hon. friend who has just spoken, in order that the public may understand as he understands, I propose to read to the House a couple of clauses of the agreement made and now forming part of the statute of 1903 in reference to this matter. Section 4 of the said agreement reads:

4. The said western division is further, for convenient reference, considered as being divided into two sections, one extending from the eastern terminus thereof westerly, to the eastern limit of the Rocky mountains (herein designated as the 'Prairie section,') and the other extending westerly from the said eastern limit of the Rocky mountains to the western terminus of the said division (herein designated as the Mountain section). The said eastern limit of the Rocky mountains shall be established after the location of the line, and after actual surveys have determined the profile thereof upon such location, and shall be fixed and agreed upon by the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the government as the result of such surveys, having regard to the physical features of the country, and to the cost of construction, and endeavouring as fairly as possible to determine where the more easy and less expensive work characteristic of prairie construction comes to an end, and the more difficult and expensive work characteristic of mountain construction begins, and, in case the said engineers shall differ, the question shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen by them, and, in the event of their inability to agree on a third arbitrator, the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada may appoint the said third arbitrator, and the decision of the majority shall be final.

I admit that that refers to the western section, but when I read section 7 of the same agreement hon. gentlemen will see that it refers to the section I have already read and makes the clause referring to arbitration in the western division applicable to the eastern section. Clause 7 of the said agreement reads as follows:

7. In order to insure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of, by the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer

of the company, and, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

That was the agreement passed upon by parliament; that is the section under which the work was undertaken, that is the agreement under which the contract was made by which the Grand Trunk Pacific undertook to operate the eastern division of the great Transcontinental railway to be constructed by the government. That is the agreement that this parliament made and now hon. gentlemen ask us to depart from that agreement practically and take it from the hands of the body they themselves have named to arbitrate these difficulties and to give it into the hands of a committee composed of several men from this side of the House and several from the other side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what language does the hon. gentleman rely for that argument?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has the amendment, I have not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I mean on what language in the statute does he rely as taking away any rights parliament had before, any rights of investigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. That question is clear, the other was not. It can take away no rights from parliament; parliament is paramount and supreme. But this parliament being paramount and supreme, devised a scheme—and it forms part of the contract—by which these differences should be adjusted. Parliament would not be acting wisely if, in its supreme power, it proceeded at this stage of the contract to undertake the settlement of these differences which they have given to another tribunal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there had not been any such arbitration agreement the matters in question would have been decided in the Exchequer Court in the ordinary course. Does the hon. gentleman argue that the substitution of an arbitration agreement places parliament in any different position from that which it would have occupied if the original remedy had been left?

Mr. GRAHAM. To a certain extent it does.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what respect?

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the circumstances outlined by my hon. friend parliament would have said: We will leave it to the Exchequer Court. Parliament has said they will not leave it to the Exchequer Court but have devised another means of adjustment and have consented to it. Parliament having consented to the other means ought to adhere to its own arrangement which forms part of an agreement and contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what principle does my hon. friend argue that the substitution of one tribunal for another takes away any rights from this parliament in respect of investigation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have tried to explain to my hon. friend that this parliament is paramount and it can exercise its rights now if it likes. Parliament exercised its right to name an independent tribunal, it exercised its right fully.

Mr. BARKER. Then why has the right hon. gentleman moved his resolution?

Mr. GRAHAM. The right hon. gentleman has moved his resolution to inquire into a charge made by the chief engineer against some of his subordinates, he not having named them or named the crime of which he says they are guilty. But let me follow the hon. gentleman on. If this case were in arbitration or in the Exchequer Court today, being decided, would hon. gentlemen think they should investigate the evidence being taken before the Exchequer Court?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. Take it on that ground. This case is now under arbitration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point the hon. gentleman is now referring to is a question between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, but there is another question altogether and that is the question between the government and the people or the government and parliament representing the people. I come back to my starting point.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has evaded my question. I asked him if, taking his view, this case were before the Exchequer Court for investigation and adjudication, he would think it advisable that a committee of this House should undertake to go through the evidence and form a decision on the very case submitted to another tribunal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With an expenditure so outrageously in excess of the government estimate in 1903-04, I would say at once that parliament ought to do it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to get that reply because it may come in useful at some other time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is perfectly welcome to it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me emphasize this point again. It was not the Prime Min-

ister, or the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission, or the chief engineer, but this parliament which decided that this case should go before a tribunal outside the Exchequer Court and outside of parliament. Parliament passed a statute, they made it part of the contract that this tribunal was to be formed and how it was to be formed, to decide on such questions as those now under discussion. Having exercised its right to take these matters from the Exchequer Court to another tribunal, parliament ought to leave them where it placed them after due thought and consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Would the hon. gentleman explain how the Transcontinental Commissioners can be said to represent the people as against the railway company in a case of over-classification, and illustrate his explanation by an example.

Mr. GRAHAM. I submit that that is a little out of my line of argument, but I shall try to satisfy my hon. friend. In the first place the commission represents this parliament and this parliament represents the Canadian people. This parliament said to the commission selected by it: go on and build this railway; a chief engineer is to be appointed, and if there be any difference or dispute between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Commission, then a tribunal must be formed to consist of our chief engineer, who is the engineer of the people, and the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and these two shall select a third; or if they cannot agree, then the Chief Justice of Canada shall select a third on behalf of the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. minister give us an example to show how the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission can represent the people in a dispute with the Grand Trunk Pacific regarding over-classification?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have indicated as clearly as I can how the people are protected, and I think my view will be evident to my hon. friend if he will only study the situation a moment. Let me now go on with the history of the case. On June 29, 1906, a joint conference was held in Ottawa by the commissioners, Mr. H. D. Lumsden, chief engineer, Mr. Morse, Mr. Kelliher, chief engineer, and Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer, and Mr. Morse submitted a memorandum as follows:

Memo. from Mr. Morse.

Grand Trunk Pacific to appoint an engineer on each district as it goes to construction.

Whenever a district goes to construction, the Commission to supply the Grand Trunk Pacific at their Montreal office, with the two prints of the map and profiles of final location. Map to show contour lines and all other usual data, profiles to show approximate quantities in each cut and film with classification and all other information usually shown on a final location profile.

Engineer for Commission to supply Grand Trunk Pacific engineer, at their Montreal office, with copies of all cross-section notes, &c., necessary to compute quantities for progress and final estimates.

The relative district engineers to discuss fully any matter pertaining to the economic and efficient construction of the line, its buildings, structures and yards. In the event of an agreement not being arrived at, all matters to be referred, through the relative chief engineers, to the general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Commission for decision by them.

The Grand Trunk Pacific chief engineer, or his representative, to have facilities for examining all estimates, vouchers, &c., so he will be able to advise his company and ensure the least delay to the approval of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

'On August 17, 1906, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific, wrote to the chairman in part as follows:

Referring to joint conference between yourself, the Commissioners, chief engineer H. D. Lumsden, chief engineer B. B. Kelliher, assistant chief engineer H. A. Woods, and myself in your Board room on June 29, relative to a joint supervision of the eastern division at which time we left a memorandum giving roughly the manner in which we suggested this should be carried on, and which suggestion was approved of by you and your colleagues, and at which time you were kind enough to say that you would have prepared certain records and data for us, and that the arrangement would be put into effect upon my writing you.

I will say I presume that by now the information referred to in the memorandum I left you is ready to be placed in the hands of our engineering department. We are also ready to take up the work of joint supervision, and I herewith repeat the request presented to you in memorandum, which is made in accordance with section 7 of the agreement of July, 1903, which provides for the joint superintendence, inspection and acceptance of the work on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway by the chief engineers of the government and the railway company.

The personnel of our engineering department having connection with this joint supervision will be Mr. B. B. Kelliher, chief engineer; Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer; Mr. W. E. Mann, district engineer; Mr. John Armstrong, district engineer.

It is the intention that Mr. Woods will devote almost exclusively to this portion of the line, and Messrs. Mann and Armstrong will at the present be assigned by you to sections 'F' and 'B.'

'On August 27, 1906, the commissioners passed a resolution as follows:

Hon. S. N. Parent in the chair.

Correspondence in regard to the request of the vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for certain information to enable that company to, jointly with the Commissioners, supervise the construction of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, was submitted, and it was

'Resolved that the information requested be furnished to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that their engineer assigned to the eastern division be given access to the records of the commission's district engineers, so as to enable them to become acquainted with the situation.'

The following was also passed on the 25th day of August, 1906:

Resolved that the chief or acting chief engineer be authorized to consult from time to time with the chief engineer or assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, in compliance with clause No. 7 of the schedule of the National Transcontinental Railway Act.

On October 3, 1907, Mr. Morse, in a letter to the chairman, requested that copies of all cross-section notes governing payments that had been made be sent to him, and that hereafter this information be sent monthly together with a copy of the detailed monthly estimates.

The chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, on October 9, 1907, wrote the board stating that he had instructed district engineers, where construction is in progress, to make duplicate copies of cross-section notes for use of the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers, and discuss fully with them any matters pertaining to the economic and efficient construction of the line, and to give them every facility to examine the estimates, etc.; and further, that copies of such had been sent to the Grand Trunk Pacific as soon as received.

Now in so far as carrying out the arrangement for joint supervision, in so far as carrying out the instructioins of parliament were concerned, everything was done by the government that could have been done by any incorporated company to protect itself

Now, let me turn to some points in the history of the case. As my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) pointed out, Hogan & MacDonell got the first contract west of Quebec, 150 miles. This was assigned to Macdonell & O'Brien, who assigned fifty miles to the Davis Company. McArthur got the section from Winnipeg to Superior Junction, approximately 245 miles. The work of construction was begun. I find that Mr. Woods, acting chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, wrote letters on October 7, October 8 and November 4, 1907, discussing the question of classification and objecting to certain things, some on general principles, and some in more detail. I desire to read a part of one of his letters. This was fully dealt with in the Hodgins investigation, but I wish to call the attention of the House to it again, as it forms part of the present record, and to point out one or two things in connection with it to show that Mr. Woods was altogether in error in the assertion he made. I quote from the letter of October 7, 1907:

As before stated, these over-classifications are not made through error in judgment nor upon the decision of the resident or division engineers, who are fully acquainted with the character of the work, but by arbitrary orders from their superior. To such classification as mentioned above, increasing the cost of the work to such an alarming extent, we most seriously protest and respectfully request that either yourself or the assistant chief engineer visit the work and pass judgment upon the classification as made. Please note that the percentages given above indicate the work done to August 31. We are not advised what the September estimate will be.

Now, the point I wish to refer to in that is that of engineers not being allowed to go on their own initiative or their own knowledge. After I received this return, No. 42a, I sent this message from Brockville to the Secretary of the Transcontinental Commission:

In a letter of H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer, Grand Trunk Pacific, dated October 7th, 1907, last paragraph, I find these words: As before stated, these over-classifications are not made through error in judgment nor upon the decision of the resident or division engineers but by arbitrary orders from their superiors. If you have any idea as to his meaning, kindly explain.

In reply to that, I received a letter calling my attention to certain evidence given in the Hodgins investigation, pages 398, 399, 400 and 401. You will find there certain statements over the name of one of the divisional engineers. And, in a letter signed by Mr. Lumsden himself as chief engineer (page 402) occurs the following:

An interview was held on the car after our return at which ourselves, engineers and contractors were present, and, from the conversation which took place and the statements of Mr. Doucet, Messrs. Grant, Heustis and Hervey, confirmed by letters from Messrs. Bourgeois, Matthews and Girdwood, it appears Mr. Woods must have been in error when he stated that 'the specification had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made, not by reason of an error in the judgment, but, as I understand, by special instructions from the assistant district engineer, or, as stated by him in the latter part of his letter, by arbitrary orders from their superiors.

Thus we see that they got together and, after a full conversation and discussion of this point, Mr. Lumsden came to the conclusion—as, I think, was pointed out in the

evidence in the Hodgins investigation—that, whatever Mr. Woods may have thought at that time, he was absolutely incorrect in his statement that these engineers were influenced by their superiors in making their report.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—Mr. Verville.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Forget.

Bill (No. 115) to incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Fowke.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 33) to incorporate the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the appointment of a special committee, and the amendment of Mr. Lennox thereto.

Mr. GRAHAM. When the hour of six o'clock arrived, I had been dealing with certain phases of the contract made with the Grand Trunk Pacific, the specifications, the precautions taken by the government in every detail for the protection of the people of Canada, including a joint supervision by the company and by the commissioners of the Transcontinental railway on behalf of the government. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), in his remarks, left the inference that there might be collusion between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the commission to allow the cost to be very high, for the benefit of somebody not named. Well, Sir, if my hon. friend were in my position for two or three weeks, I think he would tell the country that there was absolutely no foundation, near or remote, for any such suggestion or insinuation. My experience with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and with all railway companies, is that they are quite prepared to take all they can get, and it is no easy task, I assure my hon. friend, to deal with any railway company on behalf of the people of Canada, and give as little as possible to the railway, and guard at every point possible the interests of the public. Railway compaines engage the best men that they can get, and unlike parliaments, they are not bound by any salary limit, they pay as high a salary as is necessary to get the best men, either at home or abroad, legal or business men. It is with these men that the members of the government and their officials have to do business, it is these men we have to meet day after day, and do what we think is right in the interests of the people and not yield one iota that we think is not fair. Now, I want again to impress the House that there is not the remotest foundation for the insinuation; no such idea ever percolated through the mind of any member of the government or any person, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the government are in collusion, or that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company is willing to allow a dollar to be added to the cost of the construction of this road.

Reference was also made to the fact, and it was perhaps the most lengthy part of my hon. friend's remarks, that when contracts were let, the final working out of these contracts did not always substantiate the contention that they had been awarded to the lowest tenderer. To those who have not had some business experience along those lines, that will appear somewhat strong. However, the method adopted by large companies, the method adopted by the best engineers in the world, I think, now, is to let contracts on what is known as schedule rates. They only approximate the cost, but they put a certain price on every kind of material, so much for earth, so much for loose rock, and so much for solid rock; and although the approximation may seem to a layman very far removed from the reality, the fact remains that the country or the company only pays for the material taken out, and that at the prices named for that material. I discussed the question a good deal with some of my engineers, and other engineers, and they are strongly of the opinion that the fair way to let these contracts, not only on this kind of work, but in all great works, is by schedule rate; for although they may differ from the approximate cost first worked out, as the quantities may vary somewhat, they do not differ much from the rate named in the contract. These contracts were let in the ordinary way, with the approval of the chief engineer who, with his staff, had the

approximate quantities moneyed out, and they were let to the lowest tenderer in every case.

Now, I come to a point in the discussion which my hon. friend touched upon, and I do not want to be misunderstood at all. We came to a point where the Grand Trunk Pacific itself became a contractor. I discussed this question with Mr. Morse, then general manager, not before they became contractors, because, if I remember correctly, that was before I became a member of the government. But, in discussing the question of the work with him one day, I called his attention to the fact that they had become contractors for the construction of this line. His reason to me was that they had become contractors so that in every case they would tender on work and be prepared to take it at what they thought was a fair value. Any contractor who would accept work at a less rate than the Grand Trunk Pacific offered to do it for would afford fair evidence to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company that they were getting the work done at a proper value. That was his reason as placed very strongly before me, and I give it to the House and the country. The fact remains that the Grand Trunk Pacific had become contractors. Now, I want to appeal to business men as to the situation as it then struck me and as it still strikes me. Here we found a company that not only was to be the lessee of the line when constructed and to pay the interest on it, but it was also to be a contracting company, assisting in the building of a line and in addition it was to be the inspector not only of its own work but the inspector of the work of competing contractors. Under these circumstances, a new condition arose altogether. If the Grand Trunk Pacific had not become contractors then I believe there would have been no occasion for the next step that was taken, and was rightly taken as a business step in fairness to all parties. These new conditions having arisen, one can readily understand that the contractors said: We are not only in competition with the Grand Trunk Pacific but we are subjected to the inspection of our competitors as well as that of the government. In order to make it fairer, I and the commissioners too said to the Grand Trunk Pacific: There ought to be some basis arrived at by which you will make the complaints so that no unfairness or injustice may be done to any person. You ought to make your complaints as to classification promptly, you ought to file them so that they can be investigated at once, if necessary, and other contractors besides yourself can settle with their subcontractors without being hindered. If that position were not taken I again appeal to business men if the Grand Trunk Pacific would not have been in the position of being able to hold up every bit of work on the eastern part of the Transcontinental railway. By refusing or neglecting to inspect or pass upon work they could have made it impossible for any other contractor to complete any work that he had undertaken. That would not have been in the interest of the work, that would not have been in the interest of the country and it certainly would have been a great injustice to the men in the Dominion of Canada who invest their money in contracting. So, we did have a conference—nothing secret about the conference. My hon. friend seemed to rather ridicule the idea. It was a straight business proposition, above board and nothing whatever secret about it. We did have a conference, and at that conference, if I remember correctly, were Mr. Hays, possibly his engineer, Mr. Parent, I think Mr. Biggar, their solicitor, and one or two members of the government, including myself. After a good deal of discussion the situation as it existed was pointed out, and I take the full responsibility for pointing it out. I said: We ought to come to some arrangement by which these complaints as to classification, or as to anything else, shall be made promptly and so that in no case can a contractor be held up by the Grand Trunk Pacific as being an interested party, as contractors as well as inspectors. After the discussion on January 10, 1908, this memorandum was drawn up:

Monthly estimates for contractors shall be submitted promptly from time to time by the chief engineer of the commissioners to the company's assistant chief engineer at Montreal for approval. If he has any objection to such estimates he shall promptly file the same with the chief engineer of the commissioners, and any objections from time to time filed shall thereupon be considered, and, if possible, determined by the said engineers, and in case of their failure to agree, may then or at any time before or at the time of the final payment, at the option of either party, be considered and determined by arbitration as provided in the agreement of the 29th July, 1903, but in no case shall the payment of monthly estimates be delayed except with the consent of the commissioners.

In case the chief engineer of the commissioners and the assistant chief engineer of the company disagree as to the final payment, the same shall be withheld until the matter is determined by arbitration, as provided in the said agreement of 29th July, 1903.

This memorandum was initialled by Mr. C. M. Hays, Mr. Lumsden and the Hon. Mr. Parent. After this memorandum was agreed to, the progress estimates were sent to the Grand Trunk Pacific at Montreal, and objections were subsequently filed by Mr. Woods on behalf of the company as to classifications in districts 'B' and 'F', and 'over-break' in the latter district.

After this memorandum was agreed to, progress estimates were sent to Montreal and objections were subsequently filed by Mr. Wood on behalf of the company to classifications in districts 'B' and 'F,' and to the over-break in the latter district. They adopted that memorandum, and I want again to call the attention of the business men of the House to the absolute fairness of the arrangement as to the protection of all parties that it afforded. That did not look, as my hon. friend suggested, as if the government were in collusion with the Grand Trunk Pacific. If such had been the case no such memorandum would have been drawn up, because we would have done just what the Grand Trunk Pacific wanted, or they would have done just what we wanted. But in order that all parties might get fair play this memorandum was drawn up, agreed to and the objections made to the work were afterwards made according to that agreement.

A good deal has been said as to classification. I do not intend to go into the classification in detail, but only to mention it in passing. In January, 1908, questions having arisen as to the methods of work, and after Mr. Lumsden had made a journey over the sections of the railway, he gave his interpretation of the specifications to the various engineers. Had Mr. Lumsden given that interpretation without the concurrence of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company we would have said at once that the Grand Trunk Pacific had a right to object, but I find that the interpretation given by Mr. Lumsden was concurred in by the Grand Trunk Pacific engineer, although in fairness he pointed out later on that the interpretation given by Mr. Lumsden was not adhered to by the engineers, and that largely is the question before the arbitrators now, as both parties were agreed absolutely to the interpretation. With the permission of the House I will read the correspondence in reference to this so that there will be no mistake. On February 14, 1908, the following letter was written to Mr. Lumsden:

RE-CLASSIFICATION.

Dear Sir,—Referring to correspondence and conversation on this subject, I understand that you have recently issued instructions to your district engineers relating to same. Will you be good enough to send me a copy of these instructions, so that my assistants may know just what to expect with regard to classification while going over the work.

From reports received from our district engineers on districts 'B' and 'F' we understand that, in their judgment, the work in places is largely over-classified, particularly in borrowed material, where no ledge exists. Would it not also be possible that resident engineers, in returning estimates, should show in cuttings the amount of material found in ledge, also the amount of material classified as solid rock and boulders and what, I understand, you term 'assembled rock.' If this could be done I think it would be of advantage not only to us, but would give you information in your office, which would be of great use to you in questions arising between this company and the commissioners.

H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

On February 17, Mr. Lumsden wrote the following letter:

Ottawa, February 17, 1908.

H. A. Woods, Esq.,
Assistant Chief Engineer, G.T.P. Ry.,
Montreal, Que.

Dear Sir,—In reply to yours of the 14th instant I inclose herewith copy of my interpretation of clauses 34, 35 and 36 of our general specifications, with blue print and explanation of same.

I have instructed my engineers as follows:

You will please at once go over these carefully and say whether the classification in your district conforms to such interpretation. If it does not, steps must at once be taken by you to have your division and resident engineers, who are personally acquainted with the work, take up the matter, and as far as now practicable, have an estimate prepared showing the difference such classification would make with that which has heretofore been used by you. In future all classification must be in conformity with my interpretation. Measurements must be made and full notes kept showing such classification on cross-section where rock or other classified material is met with in large quantities, or by measurements made by an assistant of rock, or loose rock in boulders. In short, actual measurements shall be made of all classified material returned, and not by percentages, except in cases where measurements are impracticable in the judgment of the engineer in charge.

I also stated in another letter that it must be understood that actual measurements (a record of which are kept either by cross-sections or measurements) must be made as a rule of all work, and if at any time you find it necessary to put on an extra man for this purpose, you can do so.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer.

Here are the specifications:

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Chief Engineer's Interpretation of Clauses 34, 35 and 36—General Specifications.

Clause 34—Solid Rock Excavation.

'Solid rock excavation will include all rock 'found in ledges or masses of more than one 'cubic yard, which, in the judgment of the 'engineers, may be best removed by blasting.'

I am of the opinion that rock found in ledges or masses as specified must (firstly) be rock, and (secondly) it must be in ledges, conglomerate form (known as plum pudding

stone), boulders or ledge rock displaced (in pieces each exceeding one cubic yard in size), rock assembled, also shale rock, such as in the judgment of the engineer may be best removed by blasting.

I attach a diagram in explanation of the above, which, in my opinion, is all that is included under clause 34—solid rock.

Clause 35—Loose Rock.

'All large stones and boulders measuring 'more than one cubic foot and less than one 'cubic yard, and all loose rock whether in 'situ or otherwise, that may be removed by 'hand, pick or bar, all cemented gravel, in-'durated clay and other materials that can-'not, in the judgment of the engineer, be 'ploughed with a 10-inch grading plough, 'behind a team of six good horses properly 'handled; and without the necessity of blast-'ing, although blasting may be occasionally 'resorted to, shall be classified as loose rock.'

Under this heading I would include:

(1) All large stones and boulders more than one cubic foot and less than one cubic yard:

(2) All loose rock in situ or otherwise that may be removed by hand, pick or bar.

(3) All cemented gravel, indurated clay and other materials that cannot, in the judgment of the engineer, be ploughed with a 10-inch grading plough behind a team of six good horses properly handled, and without the necessity of blasting, although blasting may be occasionally resorted to.

Clause 36—Common Excavation.

'Common excavation will include all earth, 'free gravel or other material of any charac-'ter whatever not classified as solid or loose 'rock.'

(Sgd.) HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer.

Ottawa, January 14, 1908.

Now here are the interpretations:

On February 20, 1908, Mr. Woods writes this letter:

February 20, 1908.

Mr. HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer, Eastern Division,
National Transcontinental Railway,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 17th instant, file 7787, giving your interpretation of clauses 34, 35 and 36 of our specifications, with blue prints, and explanation of same, also copy of your instructions to your engineers.

We are quite satisfied with your interpretation of the specifications and with your instructions, which are explicit. I do not know the date of those instructions or when they are supposed to have become effective, but, from reports from my assistants at Winnipeg and Quebec, there does not seem to have been any change in classification of work previously reported, the percentage of classified material being steadily increased.

We are satisfied that on some parts of the line the work previously estimated was not classified according to your recent instructions, being overestimated in both loose and solid rock. The attention of your District Engineers has been called to this fact, but apparently without effect. If your instructions were effective when the January estimates were made we certainly will have to object to the classification as rendered on certain parts of the work.

H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

The reason I am reading these in detail is to point this fact out: That when it came time for the carrying out of this in its detail and when difficulties arose the interpretation of the specifications had to be agreed upon. The interpretation by Mr. Lumsden as chief engineer was made, sent to a staff of engineers along the line and was approved by the engineer on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Therefore up to this point we have the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Commission agreeing on a memoranda as to the method by which they should promptly make their complaints as to the classification, and further, a month later we have them agreeing as to the interpretation of the specifications made by Mr. Lumsden, and therefore any difference as to detail which came after ought to be judged along the line of these two documents. On April the 21st and 23rd, 1908, Mr. Woods for the Grand Trunk Pacific made definite complaint. On April the 24th, the very next day, Mr. Lumsden asks for arbitration on these complaints. He feels that he will not agree with the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific and he immediately takes steps under the Act and under the contract and asks for a board of arbitration. So that there may be no mistake, allow me to read the letter written by Mr. Lumsden then chief engineer of the Transcontinental:

Ottawa, April 24, 1908.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ont.

Sirs,—I beg to submit three letters from Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the first dated the 21st instant, in which he takes exception to the classification on about 153 miles of district 'F,' and gives a list of 196 points at which the classification is claimed to be excessive; the second letter, dated the 23rd instant, in which he objects to the classification generally in district 'B,' east of the St. Lawrence river, and especially mentions five cuttings at various points and also refers to the classification in borrow pits between miles 15 and 23; the third letter is dated March 24, and in this he makes a general complaint as to the classification in both districts 'B' and 'F,' but gives no definite points at which these objections are raised.

As he has now taken objection in a definite form to our classification in both districts '. and 'F,' and as, in my opinion, these are questions which it was intended should be settled under the agreement made between

you and the Grand Trunk Pacific on January 10 last, in conformity with clauses 7 and 4, chap. 71, 3 Ed. VII, I am writing Mr. Woods to appoint a day at as early a date as possible where we could have a conference either here or in Montreal so as to arrange dates for arbitrating the points in dispute promptly and for the appointment of the third arbitrator.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer.

So far as Mr. Lumsden is concerned, so far as the commission is concerned, the moment the Grand Trunk Pacific placed these complaints in proper form and made them definitely Mr. Lumsden wrote a letter asking that he and the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific should meet to go over the matter and if necessary appoint a third arbitrator. Apparently, this not having been done, I find that on May the 11th, the Prime Minister wrote this letter:

Ottawa, May 11, 1908.

Hon. S. W. Parent,
Chairman, Transcontinental Railway Commission, Ottawa.

My Dear Parent,—It is very desirable, in my opinion, that the commission should at once, by formal letter, instruct Mr. Lumsden to proceed with the arbitration contemplated by section 7 of the Transcontinental agreement, and arrange for a conference with the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. By so doing, the tribunal, which is to determine the correctness of the engineers' classification would be constituted, and all matters of differences would properly be before them and be dealt with and decided upon by them.

WILFRID LAURIER.

On October 8, 1908, for reasons given in this letter Mr. Lumsden suggested that the chief justice appoint a third arbitrator. I am not going now to enter into any discussion as to the reasons why it seemed difficult to get along with the appointment of the arbitrator; I leave that correspondence to speak for itself. But, Mr. Lumsden in all his correspondence takes the ground strongly that he tried time and again without success to have the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific agree to a third arbitrator and if necessary proceed with the work of settling these difficulties promptly. On October the 8th, Mr. Lumsden writes:

Ottawa, October 8, 1908.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ont.

Sirs,—On July 22, last, I wrote to Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway stating that I could not agree with him re classification, and suggesting the names of the following as a third arbitrator under clauses 7 and 4 of the agreement in 3rd Ed. VII, chap. 71.

Henry McLeon, C.E., Ottawa, Ont.
Wm. McCarthy, C. E., Winnipeg, Man.
T. E. Hillman, C.E., Hamilton, Ont.

To this I have had no definite reply, though on July 28, August 18 and September 10, I have asked for same by letter or wire, and verbally on October 5.

I am given to understand that Mr. Morse is at present in the west, but suggest if this matter is not settled immediately after his return, application be made to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada to appoint the third arbitrator in accordance with clause 4 of the agreement above referred to, so that disputes may be settled promptly and not held over until the contracts are completed.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN.
Chief Engineer.

Hon. gentlemen will agree with me that Mr. Lumsden urged strongly and did his best to see that that board of arbitration should be formed and that the work of settling any difficulties be proceeded with.

On November 16, after it was suggested that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court should be requested under the Act to appoint the third arbitrator, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, Mr. Kelliher, suggested the name of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber. On March 16, Mr. Schreiber accepted and was appointed to that position. The terms of the submission are all in that correspondence and I shall simply trouble the House by reading the letter appointing Mr. Schreiber so that there may be no mistake to its contents. That letter is as follows:

Ottawa, March 16. 1909.

Collingwood Schreiber, Esq.,
General Consulting Engineer to the Government, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—By clause 7 of the agreement between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated the 29th July, 1903, being schedule to 3 Edward VII, chapter 71, in regard to the construction of the eastern division, it is provided, that the work shall be done according to the specifications approved of by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the railway company, and in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator to be chosen by them.

Some such differences having arisen as a result of objections filed by the company, we hereby beg to choose you as third arbitrator for the determination of the questions now in dispute, and on which we have failed to agree after visiting the work, and shall be pleased if you are agreeable to accept the office. In the event of your acceptance, a formal sub-

mission will be prepared and handed to you later.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer, Transcontinental Railway.
B. B. KELLIHER,
Chief Engineer, Grand Trunk Pacific Ry.

I hereby accept the above appointment.
COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

March 22, 1909.

We now come to a point in the discussion of this question where difficulties seemed to arise. It had been a rather strenuous undertaking to get this board of arbitrators formed and if my hon. friend who spoke so strongly this afternoon had been a party to getting it formed he never would have made the insinuation he did this afternoon that there was any chance of collusion by the government with the Grand Trunk Pacific in reference to this board.

I may mention here a certain memorandum of agreement to which my hon. friend referred this afternoon as having been sent by the Grand Trunk Pacific to the commissioners for their signatures. It was quite a lengthy document and purported to be an agreement to be signed by the minister or the commission, I forget which, and already signed by the Grand Trunk officials, pointing out how this work of arbitration was to be carried on. The chairman of the commission declined to sign that memorandum of agreement prepared by the Grand Trunk officials, and said that the work would be carried on under the terms of the statute and the agreement. That was not an agreement, it was a piece of paper on which certain things were written by the Grand Trunk Pacific and signed by them and which they asked to have made an agreement by having attached to it the signature of the government or the Transcontinental Commission, which was never done.

The board went west and started to work, just after Mr. Schreiber's appointment. In a short time they returned from the west, certain objections having been made to their work. I had better leave it to Mr. Lumsden himself to state why he returned and resigned rather than explain, because I wish to be absolutely fair to all concerned in the matter. The board started to work and immediately there were protests from the engineers in charge. I want to ask hon. gentlemen one question. I do not know whether the board of arbitration were carrying out their work properly or not, I am not here to judge, but I ask hon. gentlemen to say, if they were in the position of these engineers—and my remark is fully substantiated by my hon. friend's words this afternoon—whose reputation as engineers, whose characters for honesty, and ability were at stake in this work being performed, if these gentlemen had been in the position of these engineers and thought their work was not being fairly arbitrated upon would they not have done just what the engineers did? I am free to say that I would have done the same thing. Were I in charge of a work and did I believe I had performed the work honestly and when it came to be adjudicated upon by a tribunal appointed by parliament I thought they were not doing me justice or giving me a chance to show my side of the case, I would have appealed to some power to change the mode of procedure. That is what the engineers did. The board as then constituted, returned home and Mr. Lumsden resigned. His letter of resignation is as follows:

Ottawa, June 25, 1909.

Hon. George P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—Herewith I beg to inclose copy of a letter written by me to-day to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental and for the reasons therein mentioned, I beg to resign my position as chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway, and trust that I may be relieved of the duties connected therewith at as early a date as may be convenient.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer.

Then Mr. Lumsden wrote the letter giving his reasons, which was read this afternoon by the Prime Minister, and I shall not detain the House by reading it again. He added to that letter in which he said certain things about his officials, another letter dated June 26, 1909, as follows:

Ottawa, June 26, 1909.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sirs,—Referring to my letter of yesterday wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff, I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F' lately gone over by me.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

P.S.—In order to make the matter clear, I may say I assume my resignation as chief engineer also carries with it my resignation as arbitrator in matters of dispute with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but as there is a doubt raised by you, I also resign as arbitrator.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN,

In order to have the record complete I shall insert my replies to these two letters. They are as follows:

Ottawa, June 30, 1909.

Hugh D. Lumsden, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, T. C. Ry. Commission,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th

instant, inclosing correspondence sent by you to the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners and also proferring your resignation as chief engineer. It will be considered in due course.

GEO. P. GRAHAM.

Ottawa, June 30, 1909.

Hugh D. Lumsden, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, T. C. Ry. Commission,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge yours of the 26th instant, inclosing a letter of explanation sent by you to the commissioners in reference to the reasons given for your resignation.

GEO. P. GRAHAM.

I find that on July 14, 1909, there is this minute in the records of the Board of Transcontinental Railway Commissioners.

On July 14, 1909, I find this minute in the minutes of the Board of Railway Commission:

The chief engineer reported verbally that it would be impossible to give an estimate of the amount of money involved in the disputes as to classification owing to the fact that where cross-section notes of the engineers disagree with the present appearance of the work, re-measurements will be necessary, and that the engineers who classified the work were not examined or requested to produce their books showing the monthly classification of the work as it progressed and that he is still of the opinion that the resident engineers who see the work from day to day, are in the best position to make the classification, if they are capable and honest; as far as their knowledge is concerned they are the best men, and everything being equal they are the best men to judge the work, seeing it done day by day.

I come now to the objections raised by the engineers. I have referred to their objections before and do not propose to go into them at any length because they are all in the correspondence brought down to the House; but several of the divisional engineers did make certain complaints and placed them before the commissioners. They did so, I think, on the same day that Mr. Lumsden resigned, but before his resignation was submitted to the board, if I remember correctly. The summing up of their objections is to be found in these paragraphs:

(*a*) That they were based in whole or in part on the said draft agreement of May 14th, 1909, which had been rejected, and which had no existence in fact;

(*b*) That the examination of the work was of a hasty, insufficient and superficial character;

(*c*) That the engineers on the line who classified the work were not afforded a sufficient hearing and an opportunity of presenting evidence;

(*d*) That the contractors were not afforded an opportunity of showing cause; and further to say that the commissioners insist, in the public interest, that the proceedings of the arbitration tribunal shall be exhaustive, final and conclusive; shall cover all the objections filed on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that the report of the arbitrators, when made, shall be supported by substantial evidence, including details of quantities, &c., which will safeguard the position of the commissioners in any litigation which may arise with the contractors as a result of any action which may follow the report of the board of arbitration.

Sir, whatever differences there may be among us, if the board of arbitration finally bring in a report according to clause (d) of these objections, that will cover everything that could be covered by any board of arbitration or by any tribunal. The question was put to me before recess how it could be possible that the commissioners could in any way represent the people and I was asked to give an illustration. It is possible that a case might arise, if the engineers in charge were not given full opportunity to make their side of the case clear and give reasons for their classifications, if the fullest evidence were not taken and placed on record a case might arise in which the contractor could collect from the government and the government could not get the interest from the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the government have a contract which provides for an adjustment of any differences between them by a board of arbitration and under which the government would collect interest on the amounts established by the board as the cost of construction. But if the evidence were not sufficiently complete to substantiate the findings of the board, a condition might easily arise under which the contractor could collect a greater amount from the government than the government could compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to pay interest on; and that is where the commissioners would stand for the interests of the people in making the Grand Trunk Pacific pay interest on the amount the government might be compelled to pay under the contract. My hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) saw the point at a glance the other day because he put a question on the order paper to this effect: Does the government intend to hold the contractors responsible for any reduction in classification and if so are the contractors to be represented on the board of arbitration? The hon. member for North Ontario with his legal acumen, saw exactly the situation. He saw that it might be possible for the contractors to collect from the government an amount greater than the amount on which the government could collect interest from the Grand Trunk Pacific, so that in order to protect the people it is absolutely necessary that every finding of the board of arbitration shall be sub-

stantiated by evidence that could be taken in the Exchequer Court in support of the government's contentions.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Is the defence of the engineers published in their evidence?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two or three letters in sessional paper 42a.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Did they give evidence before the arbitrators?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, what they complained of is that they were not allowed to give any evidence before the board, and they protested that they should be allowed to give evidence to show why they made their classifications.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Have they not done that at any time since?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not that I am aware of. I do not know just all the details, but some adjustment work has been done. The chief engineers have come to an agreement concerning some of their differences. In one division in one contract, they have practically settled all the differences between them—that is after the new board was constituted and Mr. Grant became chief engineer.

As regards Mr. Lumsden's resignation, I would not criticise a man of his intelligence, ability and integrity. Mr. Lumsden has been known in this country a great number of years, and I have the utmost respect for him, but I think his friends will not find it amiss if I make this comment. Had I been chief engineer, and had my instructions not been carried out, I would never have resigned but would have seen that the other men, who did not carry out my instructions, were forced to resign. After all, whatever deviations from duty occurred, if any there were, they all come back to this, that the chief engineer was responsible, not only for the instructions he gave, but also for the carrying out of his instructions. Had I been chief engineer, no combination of circumstances would have driven me from my post, but I would have stayed and insisted on the dismissal of any engineer who disobeyed my instructions. About the time of the resignation, I was absent from the country, and during my absence another chief engineer was appointed; but on my return from the old country, I wrote this letter, which it may not be necessary to quote, but which I think it is just as well to put on record.

Office of the Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, August 31, 1909.

Hon. S. N. Parent, K.C.,
Chairman,
Transcontinental Railway Commission,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Parent,—As I was leaving for Europe some time ago the resignation of the chief engineer of the commission, Mr. Lumsden, was received, and I left it with my colleagues for consideration. I find on my return that in his letter of resignation Mr. Lumsden intimated that he had lost confidence in certain of his staff.

I have no doubt that his intimation is unnecessary, but wish to emphasize the government's attitude in this matter. Should it be found that any member of the staff has been dishonest or wilfully negligent in the performance of his duty, he should be summarily dealt with.

What you desire and what we all desire is justice to all parties and the fullest protection of the public interest. Any employee who has forgotten this, or has failed to act on this principle cannot be retained for a moment.

GEO. P. GRAHAM.

On September 2, 1909, I received this letter:

Ottawa, September 2, 1909.

The Honourable
Geo. P. Graham, P.C.,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

Dear Mr. Graham,—The views expressed in your letter of the 31st ultimo coincide exactly with our own, and I need hardly say that we are prepared at all times to act along these lines in the matter of our staff and any other within our control which might affect public interest.

Should any reasonable proof be brought that employees in our service had been guilty of serious negligence or wrong-doing, you can rest assured that Commissioners would deal prompt justice, as we have done already in several cases.

It is not a vain word to say that our engineers in the field can bear comparison with those on any other railroad. Most of them have been connected with the National Transcontinental railway since its earliest stage, when comprehensive surveys had to be carried on from one end of the year to the other, through a rough and distant region, amid great hardships. They are men of good professional standing and experience, appointed by, or with the approval of Mr. Lumsden, and there is nothing before us to show that a single one of those retained proved deficient or dishonest, otherwise it would have been his duty to call to account the men in whom he had lost confidence, or at least to report them with the facts to the board. As no such step was taken by him, it must be inferred that the real point at issue lay elsewhere.

From a consideration of these facts and of what took place before he resigned, I should incline to understand the intimation you refer to as meaning that Mr. Lumsden had lost confidence in his ability to direct his men and exercise the authority incumbent on his position, rather than in any one's integrity or faithfulness. The lack of further explanation, under the circumstances, should not be enough to condemn engineers who had apparently up to that moment, been found worthy by him of the trust placed in them.

Still, we did not wish to leave room for the least doubt. When Mr. Grant assumed his new office, it was therefore thought proper to have him make at once a direct and careful

inquiry into the situation to see whether there could have been anything wrong.

As you are now aware, Mr. Lumsden came to resign after our board had taken strong exception to the manner in which the arbitrators had conducted their proceedings. The ground covered by them was sections in districts 'F' and 'B,' which were taken in an advanced state, if not partly completed.

Having been on the work several times while it was in progress, as inspecting engineer, there is no doubt that Mr. Grant was better acquainted with its character and aspect than his predecessor. There is nothing, however, in Mr. Grant's opinion, to show that the imputation cast by Mr. Lumsden is justified. His report on district 'F,' of which I inclose a copy, brings this fact out beyond doubt. He is now making a similar inspection in district 'B,' and I shall be pleased to let you know the result of it as soon as put before our board in writing. A thorough investigation has not, in the first case, revealed any actions on the part of the engineers to show that they had not acted in good faith, to the best of their ability and judgment. If some figures need revision, it is the duty of the chief engineer to correct them, but it does not follow that there has been any deliberate and calculated disregard of his instructions.

For the safeguard of public interest as well as our own protection, every care has been taken so far, and will be in the future, to have the closest supervision exercised over all employees from head down. The appointment of a general inspecting engineer and later of residency inspectors is proof that our constant aim has been to render this control as effective as it could possibly be made.

A letter from chief engineer Grant to his colleague, Mr. Kelliher, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in regard to disputed classification, written on his return from the first part of his trip, may further help you to understand clearly the position, as it has a direct bearing on this matter. A copy of it is therefore attached, together with copy of some recent correspondence between Mr. Hays and myself relating to the same subject.

S. N. PARENT,
Chairman.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Before the hon. minister pases from that, may I be allowed to ask a question? Has he a letter from any engineer or any evidence of an engineer in which he differs from the interpretation of the subsection of the specification given by Mr. Lumsden?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I have no knowledge of such a letter.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Or any evidence?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, so far as my knowledge goes, there is none. The Grand Trunk Pacific accepted the interpretation. The difference that exists between them now is as to the carrying out of the interpretation on which they both agreed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on my return, I found that Mr. Gordon Grant had been appointed chief engineer. I wish to place on record a letter written by Mr. Grant, and referred to, I think, in some of the correspondence. He was appointed on July 21st, and he showed business ability by, that day, getting right down to work and taking hold of his job with enthusiasm and judgment, that, I think, will be productive of good—yes, has already been productive of good. So far as I am aware, since he was appointed chief engineer no objection has been raised to the classification of any of the divisions under his supervision. Here is his letter written on the very day on which he was appointed:

Ottawa, July 21, 1909.

H. A. Woods, Esq.,
Assistant Chief Engineer,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Dear Sir,—My predecessor in office of chief engineer of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway before resigning stopped the payment of the estimates of the contractors in districts 'F' and 'B' owing to his having differed with the engineers in those districts on the matter of classification. It therefore becomes necessary for me to immediately visit the work in dispute in these districts, to see for myself the classification which has been allowed.

The work under the McArthur contract in district 'F' being of such pressing urgency, I propose visiting that district at once and I to-day informed the commissioners of my intentions in this respect. They then directed me to advise you of my intended trip, and as their agreement with your company dated January 10, 1908, is still in force, that I request you to accompany me, so that pursuant to that agreement we may go into this matter on the ground and if possible, adjust these disputes to our mutual satisfaction, and arrive at an understanding as to any difference that may have to be arbitrated so that such arbitration, if any, may be proceeded with without delay.

I need not point out to you the absolute necessity of straightening up matters in district 'F' so as to insure the completion of this necessary link between your western division and your Fort William branch, so that your company may be in a position to participate in the transportation of this season's crop.

As stated before, I intend to start at once to district 'F' and will therefore be glad if you will telegraph me a reply on receipt of this letter.

GORDON GRANT,
Chief Engineer.

This shows that on the very day on which Mr. Grant was appointed, he wrote to the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific asking that gentleman to accompany him over the line where these matters were in dispute, and, according to the Act, see if they could arrive at a mutual understanding, and, if not, appoint a third arbitrator. I may say, in passing, that Mr. Woods, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, did not accompany Mr. Grant, so Mr. Grant, as chief engineer of the Transcontinental, himself

went over the line to inspect the classification of these sections in dispute.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Why did not Mr. Woods accompany Mr. Grant?

Mr. GRAHAM. The explanation given me, as I recollect it, is that Mr. Woods was in the far west, at Prince Rupert, I think, and said he did not get the letter in time to accompany Mr. Grant.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was not Mr. Grant aware of that fact when he wrote so peremptory a letter?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that. I would tell my hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) if I could, but I cannot. I should imagine that Mr. Grant was aware of it, but, if Mr. Woods were in Prince Rupert, there might be some other engineer, Mr. Kelliher, or somebody else, possibly, who might have accompanied Mr. Grant. I am not prepared to give an opinion on the matter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was it not because the matter was under adjudication of the arbitrator, and so Mr. Woods took the position that there was no occasion for this inspection?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know. I merely state that Mr. Woods did not accompany Mr. Grant and that Mr. Grant went over the line alone. But the terms of the agreement are that, in case of a dispute arising, if possible, a settlement shall be arranged by the chief engineers, and only such things are referred to arbitration as the chief engineers fail to agree upon. If the chief engineers agree, then, even if the third arbitrator were on the ground, there is no need for him to give advice in the matter. But, if the chief engineers come to a section where they cannot agree, the third arbitrator steps in and makes a decision for them. Now, there was a reduction, I think, of $370,000 altogether on the McArthur contract, and it is only fair to say that all this was not made by Mr. Grant. There was an amount made before Mr. Grant became chief engineer of this division, and it reduced the amount of the reduction made to $202,402. I think it is not unfair to say that it may be, when the final adjudication comes, that Mr. Grant made too great a reduction, possibly; or it might transpire he had not made reduction enough. But this is the amount, in order that the commission might be on the safe side.

Mr. FOSTER. That action is final, is it not?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Let me call the minister's attention to a letter written by Mr. Woods to Mr. Grant, dated July 22, 1909, in which he says:

Mr. GRAHAM.

The arbitrators have been over the line, and while their report has not been made, or at least has not been seen by the writer, I do not consider it advisable that I should visit the work and personally agree with you on the points which may have been taken under consideration by the board of arbitrators, and might, to a certain extent, impair such report when made.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then I will retract what I said that Mr. Wood was at Prince Rupert, he was in Montreal and did not go. However, I think I am quite clear that that position was shortly afterwards abandoned by the company. Now I want to read the letter signed by Mr. Gordon Grant which explains these reductions:

Ottawa, September 20, 1909.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ont.

With reference to my letter of the 14th instant re my recent inspection of district 'F,' and in which I stated that I was deducting $370,000 from the progress estimates now due Mr. McArthur. Since writing that letter I have revised my figures, and the amount to be deducted now is $359,488.96, and my construction accountant has since informed me that Mr. Lumsden had previously deducted $140,086.80 from McArthur's March estimate, and $17,000 from the April estimate, but for what reason I do not know, though I presume it was for overbreak, but he has left no record or memorandum showing from what residency, sub-contractor or cutting he wished the above amount deducted.

Consequently, as I am satisfied that, for the present purposes, and until the arbitration has taken place, the above mentioned amount is sufficient to hold back. I have signed McArthur's estimates to date, after deducting the $359,488.96, less the amount previously deducted by Mr. Lumsden, viz., $157,086.80, which will amount to a deduction on my part of $202,402.16.

I may say here that there is another deduction made on the Grand Trunk Pacific of $15,000. Now Mr. Grant and Mr. Schreiber went to Winnipeg to meet Mr. Kelliher, on September 30, 1909. I may explain, as my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) intimates in his contention, that the Grand Trunk Pacific contended that there was no need to appoint a new board of arbitrators, that the resignation of Mr. Lumsden did not necessitate a new appointment of a board of arbitrators, but that the appointment of Mr. Grant as chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific merely filled the vacancy, and consequently any work done by the board of arbitrators stood as the work of the board, and the mere change of the personnel did not make any change in the situation. Well, as against that, as against the contention of Mr. Chamberlain, who also took that ground, and there is no doubt Mr. Woods was acting under the instruction of Mr.

Chamberlain in not going to the west, I wish to put on record the opinion of Mr. Newcombe, the deputy minister:

Ottawa, September 28, 1909.

The Deputy Minister of Justice, Canada,

I am of opinion, upon perusal of the annexed correspondence and of sections 7 and 4 of the agreement, that, Mr. Lumsden having resigned, it is necessary, or at least advisable, for Mr. Grant, his successor and Mr. Kelliher to join in a new appointment of Mr. Schreiber as third arbitrator.

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister.

Consequently the position of the commissioners, the position of the government, and the position of Mr. Grant, was upheld by the deputy minister of justice, and on his advice they were acting in saying that it was wise, if not absolutely necessary, that Mr. Schreiber be reappointed chairman by the new board as constituted including Mr. Grant, the new chief engineer. They went to the west to meet Mr. Kelliher to join in a new work of arbitration, or to proceed with the work. Now it will be said, and fairly said, that there was a great deal of dispute as to the methods to be adopted by this new board of arbitrators when they got to the west. The board of commissioners contended, and I think wisely, acting on the advice of the deputy minster of justice, first, that Mr. Schreiber had to be appointed anew, or, as the lawyers would say, de novo. They contended also that the work of arbitrations so far done ought to be recommended, or that the work ought to be started and done all over again under conditions that would meet the objection, namely, that all the evidence ought to be placed on record, and every fact stated, so that the finding of the arbitrators would be a finding upheld by the Exchequer Court in case of a suit between the contractors and the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Did the Minister of Justice agree to that?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice was in London at the time, and the deputy acting for him gave his opinion.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Not in that direction.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was merely as to the methods to be adopted, as to the mode of procedure which was to be taken on the arbitration. Mr. Kelliher refused altogether at first to sign the appointment of Mr. Schreiber anew. But after discussion, these disagreements as to the scope of the arbitration, as to whether it should be confined to the agreement made by the Grand Trunk Pacific with the commission, the other agreement made by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the commission as to the filing of complaints promptly, as to the interpretation of classification agreed upon between them, they did not agree, and Mr. Kelliher, I understand, refused to sign the appointment of Mr. Schreiber. No one can claim that the refusal was the fault of the commission, because that appointment was in the identical language of the appointment signed before by Mr. Kelliher. But it was upon that point, and I am not going to argue as to the right of the Grand Trunk Pacific to take it. They contended it was not necessary to reappoint him, and refused to sign his reappointment. They returned again without doing anything; and as my hon. friend said this afternoon, it seemed as if it was impossible to have anything done. But I submit in all fairness that it was not the fault of the government or of the commission that these arbitrators did not proceed, it was the fault of neither that it did not proceed months before it did, because, in all Mr. Lumsden's correspondence he complained that he could not get an arbitrator appointed. But in so many circumstances and so many details, it is not a matter of great surprise that strong opinions might be formed. But after the return of these commissioners from the west, it seemed there was only one way to proceed to get a third arbitrator appointed. Now the question was raised: Should Mr. Schreiber be reappointed to the position? I took the position strongly, and my colleagues upheld me, that Mr. Schreiber was an able and intelligent man, of uprightness and integrity, and the government having appointed Mr. Schreiber, they were satisfied to have him reappointed anew as the third arbitrator in these proceedings.

But, Sir, as I have pointed out nothing was done and that without any fault either of the government, or of the commission, or of the new chief engineer of the commission. When the arbitrators returned from the west I think one or two conferences were held between the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the commission to see if they could not arrive at some conclusion to proceed with this arbitration. It seemed impossible to arrive at such a conclusion, and the commission, acting under the statute, applied to the Chief Justice on November 11, 1909, to appoint a third arbitrator. This will be tedious for the House to listen to but it will have to bear with me while I read it as it forms part of the record which would be incomplete without it:

Memorandum of agreement made the seventeenth day of November, A.D. 1909, between The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, hereinafter called the commission-

ers, of the first part, and The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' of the second part.

Whereas by paragraph 7 of the agreement bearing date the 29th day of July, 1903, and entered into on behalf of His Majesty the King and the company, respectively, a copy of which agreement forms the schedule to chapter 71 of the Statutes of Canada, 1903, it is provided as follows:—

7. In order to insure for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to and approved of by the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the specifications, and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and chief engineer of the company, and in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph 4 of this agreement.

And whereas a memorandum was on the 10th of January, 1908, initialed by S. N. Parent and H. D. Lumsden, on behalf of the commissioners and Charles M. Hays, on behalf of the company, as follows:—

Monthly estimates for contractors shall be submitted promptly from time to time by the chief engineer of the commissioners to the company's assistant chief engineer at Montreal for approval. If he has any objection to such estimates, he shall promptly file the same with the chief engineer of the commissioners and any objections from time to time filed shall thereupon be considered, and, if possible, determined by the said engineers, and in case of their failure to agree, may then or any time before or at the time of the final payment, at the option of either party, be considered and determined by arbitration as provided in the agreement of the 29th July, 1903, but in no case shall the payment of monthly estimates be delayed, except with the consent of the commissioners.

In case the chief engineer of the commissioners and the assistant chief engineer of the company disagree as to the final payment, the same shall be withheld until the matter is determined by arbitration, as provided in the said agreement of 29th July, 1903.

And whereas, on the sixteenth of March A.D., 1909, the chief engineer of the commissioners and the chief engineer of the company, in consequence of certain differences having risen between them as a result of objections filed by the company, did appoint Collingwood Schreiber as third arbitrator for the determination of the said differences, by letter, in the words and figures following:—

Ottawa, March 16, 1909.

Collingwood Schreiber, Esq.,
General Consulting Engineer to the
Government, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—By clause 7 of the agreement between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated the 29th July, 1903, being schedule to 3 Edward VII., chapter 71, in regard to the construction of the eastern division, it is provided that the work shall be done according to the specifications approved of by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the railway company, and in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator to be chosen by them.

Some such differences having arisen as a result of objections filed by the company, we hereby beg to choose you a third arbitrator for the determination of the questions now in dispute, and on which we have failed to agree after visiting the work, and shall be pleased if you are agreeable to accept the office. In the event of your acceptance, a formal submission will be prepared and handed to you later.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN,
Chief Engineer, Transcontinental Railway.

B. B. KELLIHER,
Chief Engineer, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

And whereas, the said Collingwood Schreiber did accept the said appointment by memorandum upon the said letter as follows:—

I hereby accept the above appointment.
22nd March, 1909.

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

And whereas, after entering upon the work of such arbitration, but before the said arbitrators had made any report thereon, the said Hugh D. Lumsden had resigned the position of chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway, and one Gordon Grant has since been appointed in his place as such chief engineer;

And whereas the said Gordon Grant, as such chief engineer, and B. B. Kelliher, chief engineer of the company, have by memorandum bearing even date herewith, a copy of which is attached hereto, appointed the said Collingwood Schreiber as third arbitrator for the purpose of dealing with de novo and determining, irrespective of any investigation heretofore made by the said Hugh D. Lumsden, B. B. Kelliher and Collingwood Schreiber, the said matters in difference between the said chief engineers as a result of or arising by reason of such objections filed on behalf of the company;

Now this agreement witnesseth that it is agreed that the said Gordon Grant, B. B. Kelliher and Collingwood Schreiber, as such arbitrators, shall proceed to deal with and determine all questions and differences between the commissioners and the company arising or as a result of objections filed on behalf of the company with the commissioners previous to the 10th day of January, A.D 1908, and also all questions and differences arising out of or as a result of objections filed on behalf of the company with the commissioners up to the date hereof under and pursuant to the terms of the said memorandum of the tenth of January, 1908, it being under-

stood that questions and differences not covered by or arising out of such objections shall not be dealt with by the said arbitrators.

It is understood that the said third abitrator is to be called upon to act in the adjustment of such questions and differences only when the said Gordon Grant and the said B. B. Kelliher, the two respective chief engineers, fail to agree.

Each party shall have the right to produce evidence before the said arbitrators as to the matters in dispute.

Except as herein expressly agreed, neither the making of this agreement nor anything herein contained or done in pursuance hereof shall be deemed to operate as a waiver of or in any respect alter, limit, abridge or modify any of the rights of His Majesty the King, or of the company, under the said agreement of the 29th July, 1903, or under any term or provision thereof.

In witness whereof the said parties hereto have executed these presents on the day and year first above mentioned.

THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY,
By Chas. M. Hays,
President.
HENRY P. PHILIPS,
Secretary.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY,
S. N. PARENT,
Chairman.
P. E. RYAN,
Secretary.

Just before proceeding farther I want to revert for a moment to what took place when the arbitrators returned. The arbitrators returned from the west under the circumstances that I indicated a few moments ago. They reported to the commissioners, and in consequence the chairman of the board of commissioners decided to appeal to the Chief Justice to have a third arbitrator appointed. The case came up and it was postponed for a week. In the meantime the Grand Trunk Pacific, on consideration, decided that it was but carrying out the spirit of the arrangement, also the spirit of the contract and absolutely the letter of the contract, and an agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the commissioners that the board of arbitration should be formed and proceed as quickly as possible was made. They came to an arrangement by which they agreed to appoint a third arbitrator and he was appointed by the document as read by me a few moments ago. In addition to that document I want to place one or two others on the file. I have one sent by the chief engineer and Mr. Kelliher, in addition to those in the return brought down by the House:

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.
Ottawa,

Collingwood Schreiber, Esq.,
General Consulting Engineer to the Government, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—By clause 7 of the agreement between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, dated the 29th of July, 1903, being schedule to 3 Edward VII, chapter 71, in regard to the construction of the eastern division, it is provided that the work shall be done according to the specifications approved of by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the railway company and in the event of differences as to the specifications or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator to be chosen by them.

Some such differences having arisen as a result of objections filed by the company, we hereby beg to choose you as third arbitrator for the determination of the questions now in dispute, and on which we have failed to agree after visiting the work and shall be pleased if you are agreeable to accept the office. In the event of your acceptance, a formal submission will be prepared and handed to you later.

The annexed correspondence marked 'A,' 'B,' 'C,' 'D,' 'E,' and 'F,' and blue print marked 'G' are to be made a part of the record in the matter for your determination.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) GORDON GRANT,
Chief Engineer, Transcontinental Railway.
(Sgd.) B. B. KELLIHER,
Chief Engineer, Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

I hereby accept the above appointment.
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER.

Then there is this telegram:

Montreal, November 5, 1909.

B. B. Kelliher,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Winnipeg, Man.

Are you not satisfied with Lumsden's interpretation of the specifications concurred in by Woods in February last year. If not, please explain why.

W. H. BIGGAR.

That was written by the chief solicitor of the Grand Trunk because the commission rightly insisted that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, after having accepted the interpretation of Mr. Lumsden's interpretations and having the work conducted under them, could not well say: We will not abide by the classification we have adopted ourselves and ask for an arbitration on some other lines altogether. Mr. Biggar sent that telegram to Mr. Kelliher,

chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and Mr. Kelliher replied:

Winnipeg, November 5, 1909.

W. H. Biggar,
Montreal.

In the absence of correspondence cannot say what items your telegram refers to. If to diagrams January tenth, nought eight, have no objections to Lumsden's interpretation, but both he and I very much object to the erroneous application of his interpretation to the work in the field.

B. B. KELLIHER.

That proves conclusively what I said earlier in my remarks that the Grand Trunk Pacific had fully concurred in the interpretation by Mr. Lumsden, they had concurred in it away back in 1908, and that concurrence is reaffirmed by Mr. Kelliher in his message, and all there was to arbitrate between them so far as their dispute was concerned was as to whether the interpretation made by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Commissioners had been lived up to on the work. I referred a moment ago to the reasons why it was necessary that the greatest and strictest care be taken in the work of these arbitrators so that their finding might be based on evidence which would be sufficient to protect the government against contractors being able to collect from them an amount greater than the amount they could compel the Grand Trunk Pacific to pay interest on under their lease. What is the situation? I have pointed out as rapidly and as clearly as I could the different steps that have been taken along the line in reference to this work. I submit that the government and the commission has done its best to get these difficulties settled, because it was in the interest of all parties before the sub-contractors were settled with and the final acceptance of the work by the Grand Trunk Pacific should be accomplished—I don't mean the taking over of the road for leasing purposes, but the acceptance of it by their engineers as completed work—that such adjustment should take place. The point has been raised somewhere by somebody at some time, that the government might be responsible to the sub-contractors, or rather to the contractors themselves for the payment to the sub-contractors. That is far from being the case. The commission has no contract with any persons but the chief contractors, or the contractors in the first instance, and any arrangement these contractors may have with the sub-contractors, or with the secondary sub-contractors is no concern of the commission so far as the settlement goes. If the contractors themselves have settled in full with the sub-contractors and an amount is deducted from the chief contractors, they have to bear the loss and look out for any reimbursement they can get from the sub-contractors. Personally, I am inclined to think, notwithstanding anything that has been said, that the chief contractors have likely looked out all along the line and have probably protected themselves largely from any such thing as the sub-contractors being over-paid. But if they have not, that is their concern not ours. The commission deals only with the chief contractors and not with the sub-contractors. But, Sir, is the country protected? As my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will understand perhaps better than any one in the House—no doubt better than I do, because he has had such great experience—in all these contracts a certain amount of deposit is required when the contracts are let, and in addition to that under the terms of the agreement which I read this afternoon, ten per cent of the amount actually expended is deducted monthly and held back from the contractors and repaid to them after two months if it be found that the money can be used properly in a more rapid prosecution of the work. In addition to that, all the plant belonging to these companies forms part of the security for the completion of the work on the ground. I want to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that notwithstanding all that has been said, there is a large amount of money in the hands of the government to-day to protect the government against any over-classification that may be found along the line of the Transcontinental railway. In this, as in other parts of the contract, the government has been very careful to guard its position. I have tried to get these figures into such form that they will be applicable to the situation and be a conclusive argument on that point, and as such I present them to the House.

THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

STATEMENT OF AMOUNT OF 10 p. c. WITHHELD ON CONTRACTORS' PROGRESS ESTIMATES TO DECEMBER 31, 1909; ALSO AMOUNT OF SECURITY DEPOSIT.

Contract No.	District.	Name of Contractor.	Net amount of the 10 per cent. retained.	Amount of security of deposit.	Total security.
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	'A'	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	166,441 01	†	166,441 01
2	"	J. W. McManus & Co.	33,606 76	28,919 00	62,525 76
3	"	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	80,841 02	75,000 00	155,841 02
4	"	" "	169,020 11	100,000 00	269,020 11
5	"	Willard Kitchen Co., Ltd.	233,382 95	75,000 00	308,382 95
6	"	Lyons & White	81,372 96	90,000 00	171,372 96
		Total	764,664 81	368,919 00	1,133,583 81
7	'B'	M. P. & J. T. Davis	151,966 85	100,000 00	251,966 85
8	"	"	197,138 02	225,000 00	422,138 02
9	"	"	67,825 59	*225,000 00	292,825 59
10	"	Macdonell & O'Brien	252,759 94	†	252,759 94
11	"	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	220,048 51	75,000 00	295,048 51
12	"	Macdonell & O'Brien	36,570 00	150,000 00	186,570 00
		Total	926,308 91	775,000 00	1,701,308 91
14	'C'	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	12,942 90	See No. 14 'D'	12,942 90
14	'D'	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	133,756 13	225,000 00	358,756 13
15	"	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier	147,911 94	150,000 00	297,911 94
		Total	281,668 07	375,000 00	656,668 07
18	'E'	E. F. & G. E. Fauquier	93,060 79	100,000 00	193,060 79
19	"	O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Bros.	34 36		34 36
		Total	93,095 15	100,000 00	193,095 15
19	'F'	O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall Bros.	143,126 19	200,000 00	343,126 19
20	"	" "	31,439 43	25,000 00	56,439 43
20a	"	" "	65,340 39		65,340 39
21	"	J. D. McArthur	753,237 84	†	753,237 84
		Total	993,143 85	225,000 00	1,218,143 85
		Grand total	3,071,823 69	1,843,919 00	4,915,742 69

* Deposit receipt. † Deposit returned.

It will be seen from this statement that a grand total of $4,915,742.69 remains in the hands of the government as security. That is the amount now held by the government as against anything that can be found wrong with the classification. But, as I pointed out, there also stands as security to the government the very large plants which these men owned, which would approximate, at a guess my hon. friend would say, at least half of that amount, which would leave nearly $7,000,000 in cash and plant value in the hands of the government as security for any finding the arbitrators can make as to wrong classification.

I have gone over this question fully. I have arrived at the conclusions, I think fairly, first, that the government have taken every precaution to protect the people; secondly, that they have let this work exactly on the same conditions and under the same restrictions that any company would have let the same work; thirdly, that they have done their best to have any differences that arise arbitrated upon under the Act and under the agreement passed by this House and by the tribunal selected by this House after due deliberation for the settlement of differences, and above it all and backing it all they have provided for and have in their hands now, an amount of security approximately, and I think more than approximately, enough to cover any things that might be found wrong under the classification by any board of arbitration that could be selected. That being the case, what is the whole difficulty? My hon.

friend's chief difficulty was that the work has cost more really than the estimates made by the engineers, that the quantities have not worked out as estimated by the engineers when letting their contracts. I have endeavoured to answer all these suggestions and all these complaints but I come back to the original proposition that what the people of Canada want to know is: Are they getting a railway that will be worth the money they are putting into it in connection with the transportation problem of this country?

Mr. SPROULE. No matter how much stealing there may be.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend interjects: No matter how much stealing there may be. This government has not protected, and does not protect, and does not want to protect any man who is guilty of stealing one dollar from the public treasury of this country. This parliament, including my hon. friend with his wisdom, for which I always have great respect, decided that they would refer the differences on which payment of cash hung—because after all it comes back to the question of classification; if there has been stealing, it is on account of over-classification; if there has been too much money paid it has been on account of over-classification—to a special tribunal. My hon. friend assisted, every member in this House assisted in naming a tribunal, not of partisans in this House, but of expert engineers who would decide for the country, independent of party, what was the right thing to do between the Transcontinental Commissioners, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and the contractors, on the question of classification.

Mr. SPROULE. If that was their main aim and desire, I would ask how it went on so long since the first charges were made by Major Hodgins, and why the government have striven so strenuously ever since to prevent that inquiry that would bring out these allegations of fact or otherwise.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sorry I spent half an hour explaining that, and I have convinced myself at least that the government was not causing delay. I thought I had produced documents which were sufficient evidence that the government had been endeavouring to refer this matter to arbitration for months and months and were not able to get the desired result until they appealed to the Chief Justice for the appointment of the third arbitrator and then the Grand Trunk Pacific agreed to the appointment of a third man who was appointed and the commission has the work in hand.

As I said, the whole thing comes back to the question of over-classification, and parliament, I want to repeat, in its wisdom, without any objection, decided, and wisely, that any cases, whether of classification or differences of opinion as to work of this kind which should come up, should be referred to three expert engineers, who are better judges than any Committee of this House or even the Exchequer Court, and it is no disrespect to say that concerning the Exchequer Court, because if this had been left to the decision of the Exchequer Court the judge would probably have referred it to the Board of Engineers to decide, and on their report he would have acted. That has been done time and time again, as my hon. friend knows.

As I said, the people want to know about the cost of this railway, and eventually they shall know all about it, the details, everything will be examined, investigated and sifted by the tribunals appointed for that purpose. As I said to Mr. Parent returning from Europe: If it be found that any engineer or employee of the Transcontinental railway has been guilty of wrong conduct I will be the first to ask that he be dismissed and dismissed summarily, but I never ask that to be done with a man until he has had a proper opportunity to show whether or not he is deserving of that treatment.

As I said, what the people want to know is about the value of this work. I may, I think, without offence, recall to my hon. friend from South Simcoe the fact that all the horrible details that could be conceived by the most fertile imagination as to the cost or presumed cost of this railway were placed before the people of Canada in 1908. Every exaggeration that could be imagined as to what would be the ultimate cost was preached from every platform in this province and, I think, in every province of the Dominion. What was the verdict of the people? The verdict of the people was: We want the road, and we want the party who are friends of the road to finish it in the interests of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite, while pretending to be in favour of this road, give it what my countrymen would call the Irishman's affection, they give it a kick first and then expect to be considered its friend. This road has been projected by the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, and his name will be connected with it, and I say, notwithstanding all that has been urged against the project, that when history becomes to be written, the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Grand Trunk Pacific will be upon its pages to the credit of both, and that this road will work a wonderful development in the transportation problem of this Dominion, which is now the great question before the people. It has its difficulties, it has its troubles, no one knows the difficulties surrounding a work of this kind under government man-

agement better than I do myself. I do not ask for sympathy from any man living on account of the difficulties, I do the best I can, I grapple with them, honestly and fairly. If I make mistakes, they are not made wilfully, they are made with honesty of purpose, and I challenge any hon. gentleman to point to a single act of mine in connection with this road that will not bear the utmost scrutiny from the public standpoint.

This work has been undertaken by the Liberal party, it is a work for the national benefit, it is something not contemplated by any party before, because hon. gentlemen opposite when constructing one of the same kind spent nearly as much and did not own a foot of railway when it was completed.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this government own any of it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend can answer that himself. This government will own 1,804 miles under lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific for fifty years. I am willing to leave this case to the country. Parliament itself has named the tribunal and provided for its formation. The government and the commission are willing to leave the decision to the tribunal appointed by this parliament. If, after they have concluded their labours, it be found that parliament or the country are not satisfied with their findings, parliament is supreme to do whatever it chooses; but I submit as a business man to business men, I submit to men of legal learning and experience, that it would not be wise, it would not be expedient, it would not be carrying out the terms of our contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, if we proposed now to go into an investigation of a matter which is already before a tribunal selected for that purpose by us.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I put a question? Will the hon. minister be good enough to explain just what this committee, which is to be appointed under this resolution, is to investigate? We have heard what it is not to investigate. Would the hon. gentleman give us an idea now as to what it is going to investigate? If he would, he will certainly enlighten me and other members.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is rather wearisome, but I shall read again the resolution for the benefit of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the hon. minister to dispense. What I want from him is an explanation of that resolution. Any man can read it, but we do not all grasp what it means.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), with his usual precision, puts the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) right. He says the last paragraph explains it. I will read that.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read that and understand it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not see that I can use any plainer language:

> Therefore, it is resolved, that a special committee of five members of the House, to be named hereafter, be appointed to investigate the said charges and allegations of the said Hugh D. Lumsden against a portion of the said engineering staff of the said railway; that such committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Mr. Lumsden has made certain charges and they are to be investigated.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the charges?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find them in Mr. Lumsden's letter read by myself and by the Prime Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend tell us what they are in his own language?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to detain the House longer recapitulating what is so plain. I submit that the charges made by Mr. Lumsden should be investigated by a committee, and that the Board of Engineers, as regards the classifications, should be allowed to complete its work, as provided by the agreement embodied in the statute. In my opinion, the people have confidence in the government, they have confidence that the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific is for the benefit of Canada, that it is being constructed as economically as possible, and that their interests are safe in the hands of the Liberal party. The government, on its part, is prosecuting this undertaking to its ultimate conclusion so that the people may have the benefit, outlined by the Prime Minister, when he first introduced the resolution, and that is the solving of the transportation problem from east to west and from west to east. I submit therefore that the amendment to the resolution should not be carried, but that the motion of the Prime Minister should pass.

Mr. S. BARKER (East Hamilton). I rather congratulate my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the question he put a moment ago to the Minister of Railways because he drew from that hon. gentleman, in the last five minutes of his long speech, the only words he addressed to the subject matter of the resolution. For two hours we had the hon. minister addressing us upon every matter connected with the Transcontinental except the subject brought before the House by the Prime Minister. He discussed the contract, the specifications, the amended specifications, the arbitration, the correspondence of the arbitrators—everything which has no rela-

tion whatever to the resolution, and it was only during the last five minutes that he said anything about the resolution itself. With all respect to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) and without any desire to be in the least degree offensive, I would like to say that, in order to take up as little as possible of the time of the House unnecessarily. I shall not at all refer to the nineteen-twentieths of the speech he has just delivered.

The subject before us is a very simple one. It has nothing whatever to do with the arbitration. If the Grand Trunk railway had accepted every certificate, if they had agreed to every expenditure, if they made not the least objection to any expenditure by the commissioners, that would have nothing whatever to do with our objection to the narrow scope of the reference proposed by the Prime Minister. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has told us over and over again that the people of this country want this railway and mean to pay for it. I do not suppose that any one says the contrary. We want the railway and we intend to pay for it, and no doubt we shall be made to pay for it. But is that any reason why we should be swindled? Is that any reason why the country should be robbed? Is that any reason why there should be malversation, misconduct, incompetence or criminal negligence? Are we to be silent and make no inquiries when we are told time and again that there has been conduct in the management and construction of this railway amounting to fraud. Are we to be content with a long speech from the Minister of Railways about arbitration and specifications and not one word in reprobation—if the charges be true—of what Mr. Lumsden has alleged in his letter of June last. Surely whatever questions or disputes there may be between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the commissioners of the government, no one will pretend for a moment that the existence of such disputes can justify or exercise any neglect to investigate the misconduct charged by Mr. Lumsden. My whole object in rising is to add something to what has been said by the Prime Minister and my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) as to the gravity of this matter. The Prime Minister, in his resolution, says that the charges are grave and demand investigation. We agree with him, but we say that the charges are so serious that they demand investigation beyond the scope indicated in the resolution. That is the whole question. There is no other question between the two sides of this House. We are all agreed that there should be an investigation; but whether that investigation shall be confined to a few staff officers and a few engineers and to certain portions of certain districts, or whether it shall go to the bottom and find out whether such wrong doings as are complained of exist anywhere and who are responsible, is the question at issue. We on this side say that the investigation should not be confined to the question whether a few subordinate engineers have done wrong. The question is, has any wrong been done and who is responsible?

I listened with a good deal of attention to the Minister of Railways and Canals. I hoped he would, somehow or other, get to the question, but I failed to see that he has shown himself able to appreciate the position he occupied as Minister of Railways towards these commissioners. The hon. gentleman set out, at the very beginning, with a glorification of the position—there were contracts entered into between these contractors and the government; we had the commission there with its chief engineer, and the chief engineer had great and important duties to perform. We all know these things, but these are not matters in the question. It comes down to this—that since Mr. Hodgins made his charges there have been like complaints of improper conduct, yet no adequate investigation has been made on the part of the government. The hon. minister complimented my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) on the work he had done in going carefully through these contracts and the moneys that had been paid on them and on the ability he displayed in criticising the acts of those in authority. Sir, we know that if the Minister of Railways had been doing his duty, every figure that the hon. member for South Simcoe worked out today would have been in his department month by month since the time these contracts were entered into. There is not a railway company in the world that, entering into such contracts as these based on surveys and rough estimates—more or less precise—and finding as they would soon have found, that the outlay was more than they had anticipated, but would have checked these payments by the specifications and estimates laid before the contractor in order to learn the explanation of this enormous and unexpected increase. Where do we find the first attempt on the part of the minister, with his great staff of skilful and able officers, to check these estimates month by month as they came in. If that had been done, as it would have been done in any business office, the minister would have known that things were going wrong and would not have had to wait for two or three years and until millions had been squandered before he made an attempt at investigation.

I wish to point out as briefly as I can

a few things which will indicate how negligent the Railway Department has been, how little alive to what is going on, and how little careful to forestall any improper practices. To appreciate the gravity of this question, you have only to go over some of the figures back to the year 1907-8. It was in 1908 that Mr. Hodgins made his charges, almost identical even in wording with the later charges of Mr. Lumsden, and almost identical with the complaints made by Mr. Woods, of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The words are almost copied from each other—they refer to the same specifications—and you find, if you read the letter of Mr. Lumsden of June 25th last, that he declares to be going on at that time just what Mr. Hodgins said was going on in March, 1908.

Now, let us see how much has been expended on the construction of the two sections 'B' and 'F,' which are the two indicated by Mr. Hodgins, frequently referred to by Mr. Woods and more recently referred to by Mr. Lumsden. In the report of the Transcontinental Commissioners for 1908, page 41, you find that the commission expended for the year ending March 31, 1908, on section 'B,' $8,467,124. Then there is the 'contract reserve,' and I give this figure now because of the boastful language of the minister when he was speaking of the amount they had in hand. This reserve is shown by the Transcontinental Commission to be only $299,569. This leaves the cash paid out for one year on section 'B,' $8,167,554. In the same year, as stated at page 46, the amount paid out on district 'F' was $8,155,864. That is, on these two districts, which have been subject to such charges as compelled the Prime Minister to ask for a committee, they spent in one year—the year which was the period of Mr. Hodgins charges—$16,323,419. In the next year up to March 31, 1909, they expended on sections 'B' and 'F,' $17,920,992. For these two years there was spent on districts 'B' and 'F' the enormous sum of $34,244,411. Now, we are within two months of the completion of another year, on March 31. If you add another year at the same rate as these others, you find that in the years 1908, 1909 and 1910. we shall have spent about $51,000,000 on these two sections. That is, in these three years, taking no account of what was spent before 1908, or of what will be spent in the year that is soon to open, they have expended fully as much as the Minister of Finance said would build the whole railway from Moncton to Winnipeg.

I take those figures as showing in a manner that cannot be disputed, in clear and concise way, the enormous amount that is being expended beyond anybody's anticipation. Here we find that, in three years only of the five or six years it is going to take to build that road, we have spent on districts 'B' and 'F' where these charges apply, more than we were assured by the Finance Minister would build the whole eastern section of 1,800 miles. Now when you look at that, and when you consider that Mr. Hodgins made the specific charge in 1908, that the Grand Trunk Pacific engineer confirms that charge in letter after letter, and on that on June 25 of last year, Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, repeats the charge specifically, and rather than submit to the degradation and shame of assisting in such misconduct as he refers to that he throws up a valuable appointment and goes out of the service—surely you cannot imagine any stronger reason for an inquiry. There cannot be the slightest dispute on that point, it seems to me. I do not care to go into all these details. What the hon. member for North Simcoe has worked out so elaborately ought to be in the office of the minister; he ought to have had that information month by month since the work began. The engineers in his department could do that, and should have done it. They should have the records at hand, and ought to be able to confirm or dispute every word the hon. gentleman recited here.

Now where are we on this question? Are we to submit, because we are building a railway, to robbery? because it is robbery, and nothing short of robbery. When we take that letter of Mr. Lumsden where he says his orders have been disobeyed; where he charges specific improper acts, and that these have been going on, and that in consequence he has lost all confidence in the engineers on a certain portion of the railway, can we doubt that it is our duty to insist on a thorough and complete inquiry?

But the Prime Minister says: Oh, we will inquire into the conduct of these few men, these few officials, who are charged specifically by Mr. Lumsden. He assumes, apparently, that Mr. Lumsden having recently gone over 'B' and 'F' and seeing these things, and in his indignation, having resigned, that he forsooth acquits all others on the whole railway. What an absurdity. If a commission were investigating this matter, and they got up to a certain mile post and discovered such things as are here charged, would they stop and say: We assume the mischief didn't go beyond that mile post, or would they say: We will go on and see what has occurred beyond. Surely a business man would. Surely if this was the case of a great corporation, and they had found peculation and robbery, and shameful misconduct among their staff, they would not think of dismissing only two or three caught, as you may say, in the act,

no, they would order an investigation all along the line, they would investigate every portion of their business and see how far the dry rot had gone. That is what business men do, but that is not the way a Liberal government acts. The hon. gentleman says: A particular set of men are charged, the charges are grave and serious, and therefore we will appoint a commission to look into the case against those men, and go no further. Why, if Mr. Lumsden had only gone to 'B' and examined 'B', and then made his report, and indignantly resigned, the hon. gentleman with equal justice might say: We won't examine 'F' because he only mentions 'B'. Yet 'F' is just as bad as 'B'. Why should not 'A' be examined and 'C'? Why is it confined to the two places visited recently by Mr. Lumsden in connection with arbitration where he found such wrongdoing going on that he threw up his situation in disgust. Having found robberies going on in June, is it to be assumed that everything is right elsewhere? Surely not. Surely that would be a very bad certificate to give to any man that had not been specifically charged. Here is one section in Quebec and another near Winnipeg, both corrupt, if the statement is true. We will look into these and let all the others go; we will whitewash these and let them go scot free. I think that is a course that will not appeal to the common sense of business men; I hope that every business man in this House has better sense than to believe that is all we ought to do. Why should we confine it? Surely the men along the other districts who will feel that their characters have been besmirched by what has been discovered on 'B' and 'F' and will desire, if they are honest men, as I trust they are, that the inquiry should extend to their districts. Honest men will welcome an inquiry of that kind; the board of commissioners should welcome it. I should hope they would be glad to be given an opportunity to show that while this charge has been made against 'B' and 'F' they are willing to have the whole railway, the whole work of construction, inquired into, and that they would scorn to take advantage of any technicality to prevent an inquiry of that kind. I should expect also that the Minister of Railways would welcome a thorough inquiry. Surely the Minister of Railways should desire that everything connected with that line from end to end shall be examined most thoroughly and completely.

There is another feature. The minister has said that he is surprised that Mr. Lumsden did not dismiss these officers. He asks why did not Mr. Lumsden stay there and face the situation? Why did he not dismiss these men? Will the minister say that he had power to dismiss them? I noticed the minister using different language two or three times on that subject. One time he said he ought to have dismissed them; another moment, recommend them to be dismissed. I noticed the First Minister using similar language, when he was speaking about employing. First, he said they are employed by the chief engineer; a moment afterwards he said they were employed on his recommendation. That is all the difference in the world. I think, Sir, that when Mr. Lumsden goes into the box upon his oath, as I hope he will, he will tell why he resigned. I expect to hear Mr. Lumsden, who, I believe is an honourable gentleman, give his reasons for not taking the course that the minister hinted he ought to have taken. I think Mr. Lumsden is as capable of judging what is incumbent upon a gentleman as regards his own character as any man in this House. I think he will find that Mr. Lumsden will tell why it was that he did not dismiss the men, why it was that he did not recommend their dismissal, but that in disgust he threw up his commission and went out. We would be glad to hear Mr. Lumsden's explanation as against what the minister hinted he ought to have done. If Mr. Lumsden did not do what the minister hinted he should have done I firmly believe, from what I know of him, that he had sufficient reason for the course he took, and I am bound to say, if Mr. Lumsden took that course deliberately because he felt that it was useless for him to attempt to dismiss men or recommend their dismissal, this inquiry ought to go up higher than the chief engineer. I do not think it will be satisfactory to this country to have this inquiry going on at all, unless it is possible for the committee to inquire from top to bottom who is responsible, who is guilty of criminal negligence or incompetency.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, in all candour I think the House will agree after the statement of hon. members on the other side who addressed the House on this subject to-day that they never expected, never hoped and knew that they had no right to expect or to hope that the resolution which they have proposed would be adopted. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said that Mr. Lumsden went up, inspected sections 'B' and 'F,' got mad with some body and apparently mad with himself, went off in a pet and came home and resigned. Because Mr. Lumsden stated in his letter to the commission that he had lost confidence in some of the engineering staff, whom he had himself appointed, because they disobeyed his instructions, not on the whole line of the

Transcontinental, not on the whole line of the eastern division, not on the whole of sections 'B' and 'F,' but simply on a small portion of these sections, because he was in a pet according to the hon. member for Hamilton, as against some of his own engineers, therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite say that we must appoint a roving commission and investigate this whole Transcontinental railway from one end of it to the other. That is the logic and argument of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I think we ought to understand what may be called the fair ground for parliamentary investigation. I think it is not stating it improperly to say that if a prima facie case is shown parliament should investigate any wrong-doing or any abuse where such an investigation would result in any advantage or have any purpose. But parliament should not lend itself to purposeless or resultless investigation, or where matters are sub judice, or where an investigation is proposed without ground or warrant and solely for political purposes. I submit that that statement of the duty of parliament is absolutely correct, will be found to be based upon precedent, and is manifestly adaptable to the present occasion. This matter is now sub judice in the hands of the very tribunal to which parliament said it should go five years ago and to which my hon. friends sitting on the other side of the House—and I have read the debate upon this subject and they certainly discussed the Transcontinental Railway Bill at length enough—agreed. The hon. gentlemen who are to-day raising this issue agreed to the passage of this section 7 without any question whatever. That tribunal was created after all the deliberation and all the discussion that took place as to which was the best way to settle technical questions which might arise as to the correctness or incorrectness of engineering views and as to classification. That tribunal has been appointed, it is now dealing with the matter and although the question is sub judice my hon. friends ask this House—I say it not without the most absolute confidence—solely for political purposes to take the matter out of the hands of that tribunal which has been created for that purpose and to engage in a purposeless investigation. That is the situation as it exists to-day. What is the occasion for this debate? Mr. Lumsden, who was the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway company, in resigning his position, said that certain engineers, whom he himself had appointed, had disobeyed his instructions and acted in bad faith. My right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asks this House to investigate that statement and to ascertain whether it is a fact or not. That is how it has come here. If all this great necessity for an investigation with regard to the operation and construction of the Transcontinental railway existed that these hon. gentlemen have conjured up with solemn faces and deep intonations and which according to their story has existed for the past two years. We have been sitting for nearly two months and these gentlemen have sat inert and have not attempted before to save this country from the terrible catastrophe that they would like us to believe is threatening. This government come with this motion in the proper way, according to the rules of parliament and ask parliament to investigate a statement of the chief engineer to ascertain whether it was bad faith, whether there had been a breach of instructions to which these gentlemen, employing that large amplitude of adjectives which they always bring forward whenever they smell a scandal, propose an amendment. What do they say? They say:

> H. D. Lumsden, in tendering his resignation as chief engineer of the N. T. Ry., has made grave charges—

Grave charges, say they.

> —touching the expenditure of public moneys' in the construction of the said railway, which charges ought, in the public interest, to be thoroughly investigated.

Is there anything in that language or in that paragraph which involves a single thing in any degree greater or wider than the words stated in the government resolution? Not a single thing. We have a lot of superlatives there put in for effect in order that our Conservative friends may furnish material to their newspapers throughout the country, all those adjectives are supplied for that purpose, but when you come down to analyse it, when you come to the final analysis as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, you will find that this section of the resolution amounts to nothing more than the plain Anglo-Saxon which is adopted by the resolution in respect to the statement made by Mr. Lumsden.

Mr. FOSTER. May be the hon. member will tell us what it does mean?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My imagination is hardly vivid enough to cope with my hon. friend's or to enable me to say what is meant by this motion.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the Prime Minister's declaration that I am asking the hon. gentleman to cope with.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend is not obtuse. Whatever else he may be charged with, nobody has yet charged him with being obtuse and I do not intend to assume that he is guilty of any lack of

qualification that his friends have never suspected of, and even his enemies have never found him guilty of.

Mr. FOSTER. You never can be guilty of that which nature does not endow you with.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We are told that we must fear the Greeks even though they bring gifts and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is so lamb-like of late that I am disposed to regard him as a gentleman whom we need to watch. Now, the statement in the first part of this amendment is nothing but a reiteration in superlatives of the statement contained in the first part of the resolution of the Prime Minister, and that being so we may remove it from the controversy. But as to the second part there is a new element introduced. It says:

The cost of the eastern division of the said railway according to the latest estimates of the government will be so enormously in excess of the estimates submitted to parliament in 1904-5 as to arouse the most serious alarm.

That is a splendid phrase.

Mr. FOSTER. It is almost like the 1903 Liberal platform.

Mr. GRAHAM. It won't be nearly so successful.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friends opposite are getting in training to lay down their platform next June, and I suppose that some of those glittering phrases are being prepared by the lesser members of the opposition. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) goes on to propose in his motion that parliament should investigate 'said charges'. What charges?

To investigate the statement made by Mr. Lumsden in his letters and all other matters connected with or related to the construction of the eastern division of the said railway and the expenditure of public moneys thereon.

Just fancy imposing on this House the task of investigating every thing connected with the railway since its inception; every dollar that has been spent on it, not in connection with its construction or the classification or the payments to contractors, but every dollar expended on the railway from 1903 to the present. Is there any connection between that and the utterances made by Mr. Lumsden in his letters as to the engineers on sections 'B' and 'F'? Not at all, the two things are irrelevant one to the other. Let us see what Mr. Lumsden has said. His statement is that he was dissatisfied with the failure to carry out his instructions on the part of certain gentlemen who were connected with sections 'B' and 'F'—not the whole staff, for he took good care to correct any misapprehension on that point by writing the very day after he wrote that first letter that his statement did not refer to the whole staff on the system or to the whole staff on sections 'B' and 'F,' but only to a certain number of these gentlemen. Now, I find according to the estimate in the annual report of the commission for 1909, that the total mileage under construction is something like 1,800, and, giving the widest possible range to any complaint made by Mr. Lumsden it would only apply to about 500 miles. He acquits the engineering staff on the other 1,300 miles from any possible criticism; he stands by what they have done, he recommended the appointment of every one of them and he limits his criticism to the engineers working on less than one-third of the whole line. The government now propose to investigate his statements made with reference to these gentlemen. As to all other engineers Mr. Lumsden gives them a certificate of character.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman read the certificate of character which Mr. Lumsden gives to the other engineers?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I have read the statement of Mr. Lumsden that his complaint only applies to certain engineers who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B,' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F.'

Mr. MEIGHEN. Is that a certificate of character for the others.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If Mr. Lumsden had any complaint to make about the others he would have made it, but he expressly limited his complaint to the men on these sections he has described. Now, in order to consider whether the House should adopt the second portion of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) for that is the only point in controversy, let us look for a moment at a few general principles. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has not complained much about the government. In fact I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite who usually discuss the government with the most reckless disregard of facts are very careful to confine their complaints in this matter to the fact that the Minister of Railways did not have some one in his office to check off the statements that the commission sent over, but surely that is not a very grave thing. Under the statute the commissioners are responsible, and the Minister of Railways is simply the mouth piece in the House for the commission.

Mr. BARKER. So he thinks.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. So the statute says and the statute confirms his judgment in that regard. But, my hon. friends oppo-

site know very well that if there has been any error in regard to the question of cost the man solely responsible for that is Mr. Lumsden. My hon. friend from Hamilton is too old a railway man not to know that the Minister of Railways or the commission is no more responsible for an engineer who in the northern wilds classifies common excavation as solid rock than would Sir Thomas Shaughnessy be for a wrong classification made by an engineer in the far west. And yet every Conservative newspaper in the country will be talking about the government and its malversation in connection with the management of the construction of this railway and of the millions of dollars of the peoples money that have been thrown away. A government or a company finds the money with which a railway is built. The contractor builds it. the engineer inspects it and determines the amount of money the contractor receives. The government or the company pays that money when the engineer certifies it. If stone develops where the estimate indicated clay, are the government or the directors of the company to be blamed? If the engineer when he comes to decide what is to be paid to the contractor for an excavation, has allowed for loose rock or solid rock instead of common excavation, would you talk about the government or the directors of the company being turned out because the engineer has made a mistake? A company or a government is absolutely helpless if the engineers are dishonest in regard to their classification, all they can do is to dismiss the engineers. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) knows that the man who settles what a contractor is to receive is the engineer, not the directors of the company or the government or the commission.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The member for South Lanark does not know that. He always has heard, and especially from the other side of the House, of ministerial responsibility, that the party who is responsible to this House is the minister.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That is true. The minister is responsible for the acts of his immediate officials, upon whom he must depend, but my hon. friend has been a minister, and he would have thought it very hard if he had been constructing a railway as a government work and an engineer on the north shore of Lake Superior had classified wrongly for a contractor, if his opponents had asked that he be condemned because of that.

Mr. J. HAGGART. He has been in that position several times. Some of the engineers and contractors stole money and the opposition held the minister responsible.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. And you disclaimed responsibility, certainly.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Not at all. I did not disclaim the responsibility. I made the excuse that the minister could hardly be responsible for the act. But the principle laid down is that the minister is responsible for everything done in his department and he must show the reason why.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Perhaps my hon. friend will tell me whether or not he was right in his contention?

Mr. J. HAGGART. I knew the principle was a right one.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. But did you think you were right yourself?

Mr. J. HAGGART. I thought I should not be held responsible and it is the same in England. If the hon. gentleman will allow me a moment, if there is stealing in a department, say from the Navy Department, the minister who represents the government in the House is responsible. The excuse may be made that if the superintendence was as direct as the minister could possibly exercise, the party should be punished and the minister excused. Of the responsibility there is no doubt.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am at a loss to understand where my hon. friend stood as a minister, whether he assumed a certain position or whether he stood where he is now in opposition, taking any kind of position if it will hurt the government. If Mr. Lumsden had communicated to the commissioners the names of the men whom he said ought to be dismissed and had recommended their dismissal, and if the minister or commissioners, on investigation, had found the statement was correct, and did not dismiss them, then the minister or the commissioners, as the case might be, should be condemned, but as Mr. Lumsden has not indicated the names of the men in whom he has lost confidence, who the men were who disobeyed his instructions, the Prime Minister is proceeding by this inquiry to find out who these men are, and to deal with them when they are found out. My hon. friend will agree with me that even on his stand of strict ministerial responsibility the government are not and cannot be held responsible until they know the men who have done wrong, if there has been wrong.

The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Baker) himself discussed this question of responsibility in the House two years ago, in the debate on the report of the Hodgins Committee. He discussed these letters of Mr. Woods in the following language:

The hon. member also comments upon the fact that in putting in before the committee the various letters that have been referred

to to-day. I have said that those letters did not charge or prove fraud against the commissioners; I say so still. There is nothing in those letters that indicate any fraudulent conduct on the part of the commissioners That has never been pretended.

My hon. friend did not pretend then, he cannot pretend now, that these statements in regard to excessive classification in any way, if true, would reflect on the commission or the minister, and the result is that we get down to this question as to whether or not there have been mistakes in classification, whether or not Mr. Lumsden was correct in his statement that there was disobedience of instructions and failure to record what he had told these men should be done. These are proper subjects for the committee. The question as to whether there was proper classification is a matter entirely for the tribunal constituted by parliament in 1903. I need not read to the House again section 7 of the agreement, in which that matter was especially provided for. There is another section of the agreement, section 47, which expressly provides for another and final arbitration in the event of there being any further difference in regard to matters affecting the construction. So clear and definite was parliament in making this agreement in 1903, that they have declared in those two sections that all matters of difference in regard to construction shall be dealt with by arbitration boards.

I was surprised to hear my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) say to-day that if this matter was before the Exchequer Court, he would still have thought they should move for a committee. The statement of the member for East Hamilton in 1908 that this complaint in regard to classification did not reflect upon the commissioners and only dealt with questions as to whether the engineers did right or not, shows conclusively that it was a matter to be determined by a technical board, and if this had come before an Exchequer Court judge it is against every precedent here or in England for parliament to intervene and take out of the hands of a tribunal of the country and to itself determine a question that had been committed to a tribunal. My hon. friend will search in vain for such a precedent. The issue is surely one for engineers to determine. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways, in his admirable speech, pointed out section 15, which provides that the chief engineer shall be the sole judge of the work as regards quantity and quality. He is the man who has to certify for every dollar of money paid to any contractor. Neither the Transcontinental commission nor the government had anything to do with certifying to these payments. If there be anything wrong, if there be any unduly increased cost, Mr. Lumsden was the man responsible because he certified for every dollar of money paid anybody, and the other engineers had nothing to do but act under his direction. Where could you find a tribunal so well qualified to deal with the classification as that created by the agreement? The engineers who compose that tribunal are the best judges one could select. Does my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) or my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) think that any committee of this House, composed of men without any engineering training, would be able to form any better judgment on a question of classification than men specially trained to that work? Just imagine my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), with all his judicial knowledge, taken out into the wilds of Lake Superior and asked to decide whether or not certain material was loose rock or only common excavation. Yet that hon. gentleman would like to have himself and other members of this House, equally inexperienced, constituted a tribunal to determine whether or not the classifications arrived at were right, and actually would have us believe that a tribunal of that kind would be more competent than one composed of engineers of eminence such as Messrs. Schreiber, Grant and Kelliher. Yet that is the proposition embodied in the amendment of my hon. friend. Of course, we could subpoena the engineers who made the classification and who had seen the work done, and we could hear their testimony and weigh the balance of evidence pro and con. If there was more evidence on behalf of the Transcontinental engineers than on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the evidence of these gentlemen was not shaken in any way by cross examination—my hon. friends from Simcoe and Hamilton, if they were going to be absolutely judicial, would be bound to find in favour of the Transcontinental engineers. But what a practical tribunal that would be, and how much light would they not throw on the question? How convincing their judgment would be in contradistinction to that of a tribunal composed of men who have practical experience and who know all about classifying, who have had daily reports ever since the inception of the work and who have been over the road and have studied every aspect of the question. I think no one, who is not blinded by party, will fail to recognize that the latter tribunal is by far the more competent of the two. And the Minister of Railways has shown us how well the government are protected against any payments being made to the contractors which ought not to be made. Of course, our hon. friends opposite, despite their experience of two years ago, will continue to ring the changes on the cry of scandal, and will argue that the object of the government is to prevent investigation. But what

the government is doing is sending the question to the only tribunal whose verdict will be worth something as compared with that of a committee of this House. In the one case you have a body of men who can decide from practical knowledge and experience as well as from the evidence, and in the other you would simply have a committee which could only give a decision based on the evidence without having the competence or practical experience to estimate, as engineers would, the value of that evidence.

I pointed out some time ago that Mr. Lumsden had only complained with regard to two divisions. But even with regard to section 'F,' I have a letter in my hand which shows how all these imaginary charges disappear on investigation. There is a letter written by Mr. Woods, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, on the 21st of January:

January 21, 1910.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, N.T.R.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Referring to my letters of July 27 and October 12 last, re classification on O'Brien, Fowler and MacDougall contract, district 'F' to which our district engineer, Mr. Heman made objections, and particularly to my letter of October 12, wherein I specified many instances in which we objected to returns as made, I am pleased to say that since that time a further examination of the work has been made by your district and inspecting engineers, together with our district engineer, and an agreement made as to classification and other matters, satisfactory to both parties.

I am to-day in receipt of a letter from Mr. Heaman in which he states that he has written a letter to district engineer Poulin, approving the classification and other matters on the above work, as agreed by your inspecting engineer and himself, providing Mr. Balcom's assurances are carried out.

This being the case, please consider my letters referred to above, as being withdrawn.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

So that once these engineers, who thoroughly understand these matters, come to deal with them, they have no difficulty in reaching an adjustment; and I say that when you come to the genesis of this question, when you come to analyse the arguments of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and Hamilton (Mr. Barker), you find that because certain engineers on districts 'B' and 'F' may have made wrong classifications, the suggestion is made that they did so deliberately. That, Sir, is an unfair assumption. These men, who went into this engineering work, are not all Liberals. A great many of them are Conservatives. They belong to a profession just as honourable as that of the law and they realize that their great asset is their honourable name and the reputation that, in dealing with questions commited to their care, they will deal with them honestly. So that every presumption we can make that is at all reasonable would go against the theory that these engineers would deliberately make wrong classifications. To lay themselves open to such an imputation would be to destroy their prospects in their profession for all time. Instead of assuming that, because there were disputes and differences between engineers representing different interests in that northern country, there was wrong-doing on the part of either or both of them, it would have been only fair and reasonable to assume that these men, or some of them, might have come to wrong conclusions, but that, whether they did or not they acted honestly in regard to the matter and believed they were doing what was right. All this shows that the whole question is one that can only be dealt with by the tribunal which parliament constituted especially to deal with it. I was surprised when the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who had spent a great deal of time on this question, and had made an argument which might be dignified with the statement that he had made the best of a bad case, talked about this old story of the government having spoken about this railway being built at a cost to the country of $13,000,000. My hon. friend had delved in the figures a great deal, but had he made this further calculation, he would have seen that the conclusion was one that nobody would believe, for it would mean that the country was to get this road at a cost of $866 per mile. To say to me or to any man that any minister of the Crown said that it was possible to build a road through that country at a cost of $866 a mile shows that the proposition was merely a ludicrous one and one that will not appeal to anybody. I do not think that anybody believed it, the hon. member himself was candid enough to say that he did not believe it. But I thought that, in referring to it, the hon. gentleman used an argument not at all necessary in what was otherwise, as I have said, about the best argument that could be made for a bad case. Nor did I take it kindly that the hon. gentleman spoke of 'stifling the Hodgins charges.' He and I sat on that committee together, and he knows that we dealt with the question when it came before us fairly and honestly. The charges made by Mr. Hodgins were all abandoned, and the differences of opinion as to quantities were found to turn on the same question as in this case—the question whether there had been proper classification or not. And the position taken in that first case is the one to be taken now that the proper tribunal ought to deal with the sub-

ject. That was done with the Hodgins charges, and I feel sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) believes in his heart that, had we attempted to determine that question of classification, we would have realized that we were a poor body to engage in such a duty in comparison with the tribunal appointed by the government for that purpose.

I shall not speak at greater length. I do not think hon. members opposite are very serious about this matter. They realize that the question involved is the determination of the proper amount to be paid to the contractors, and that that question is in the hands of the proper tribunal. Parliament can deal with it when that tribunal makes its report. And, if contractors have received any money that they should not have received as the result of the determination of the engineers, there are ample funds in the hands of the government to guarantee the country against loss on this account. Every interest demands the consummation of this great enterprise in the way desired by the men on this side who have stood for it from its inception—as many men who vote Conservative stand for it to-day. There is a great revolution in public opinion on this subject since 1904. Many of those who opposed the Grand Trunk Pacific at that time are now standing for it as strongly as those who originally agitated it. The mistake hon. gentlemen opposite make is in fancying that they are going to gather strength by appealing to the Bourbons of their party, the men who never learn and never forget. They will do better by appealing to the patriotism of all Canada, whose people look upon this as a worthy enterprise to be undertaken by this country at the beginning of the twentieth century. If they would forget their carping criticism and realize that this enterprise is going along proper lines, it would be better for themselves and better for Canada.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. It is rather early. I think we might go on until midnight.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. A great number of those on this side were up until one o'clock this morning, and would appreciate it greatly if the adjournment were allowed.

Mr. FIELDING. I had a discussion with the Whip at an early stage and I thought that, while we could not conclude to-night, we might sit for a considerable time longer. I think we might, therefore, sit until midnight. Of course, if hon. members opposite will not address the House we cannot compel them to do so.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I shortened my remarks, thinking that we would go on.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As hon. members on this side were up so late last night——

Mr. FIELDING. This habit of sitting up late the night before is much to be regretted. But I have no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this debate go on to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is private members' day.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 26, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS presented the second report of the Committee on Debates as follows:

Your committee recommend that Mr. E. L. Desaulniers be appointed to fill the vacancy on the staff of translators of the official report of the debates caused by the death of R. Laferrière and that the said E. L. Desaulniers be paid the minimum salary of the first division, subdivision 'B.'

H. GERVAIS,
Chairman.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour) presented the second report of the committee to whom was referred Bill (No. 21) respecting the hours of labour on public works as follows:

Your committee recommend that leave be granted to them to employ the services of a specialist to assist the committee in its researches into legislation respecting hours of labour existing in other countries.

Mr. KING moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the report had better be read again; I could not get it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. KING. The suggestion is that the committee have power to obtain a specialist to assist it in its researches into the

legislation existing in other countries respecting hours of labour on public works. There is a great deal of legislation of a nature somewhat similar to that proposed in the eight hour Bill enacted in other countries and this is to enable the committee to retain some person to go through that legislation and report upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of a specialist would he be who would do that kind of work?

Mr. KING. The intention of the committee was to retain some gentleman associated with one of the universities. Professor Skelton of Queen's university is the person desired by the committee as he has given a good deal of attention to this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that this is rather unusual, and we have not heard anything so far to show us that it is necessary. What in the world do you want done? You want some man to go to work and look into this legislation as it exists in other countries as to hours of labour and make a precis of it. Why in the world do you need a high class specialist to do that? If, after you find out what other countries have done as to hours of labour and the trend of legislation, the committee wants somebody to advise it as to the results of such legislation then I could see where a specialist would come in. But we do not know that there is any disease, we do not know that at present any medicine is needed, we do not know anything about it, and all this specialist is supposed to do is to make a precis of the legislation in other countries on the subject of hours of labour. I think it is not necessary to have a specialist. It seems to me that any level headed clerk can do that sort of business and do it as well as any specialist can. The specialist's work comes in after you have a collation of what exists and when you want evidence as to the results of that. Then, a specialist, who has made a study of the question, has travelled and has the experience, would be a very great benefit to the committee. I would not be opposed to having the very best we can get in that respect but it does not seem to me that the time has arrived for a specialist.

Mr. KING. The committee has already gone over the preliminary ground mentioned by my hon. friend and it is precisely with the view of having the results of that legislation collated for the committee that the employment of this specialist is suggested.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). It seems to me that when we have a large labour bureau that is costing this country a great deal of money, and as my hon. friend the Minister of Labour himself has been devoting his time for some years to the condition of legislation in other countries with the view of perfecting the labour legislation of this country, the minister and the bureau should be in possession at this moment, without any extra expense to the country, of all the legislation that it would be possible for any expert, I do not care, who the gentleman may be, to procure and would also be able to give the results. It rather suggests that somebody wants a situation. I do not know who it may be, I have nobody in my mind at all, but I do not think it is in the interests of Canada that we should be farming out from time to time certain work that should be and is performed in the department at a very large cost to this country. I am quite willing that money should be reasonably expended in order that we may have the best information possible in the interests of the country but it seems to me that the effect of this report is to give to some outside person to do, what the department should do itself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is certainly a departure from the practice in the past, and no doubt the reasons may be quite sufficient, but in the meantime I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw the motion so that the House may have an opportunity to look into it.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

QUESTIONS.

BASS RIVER AND LITTLE DYKE LIGHTS.

Mr. STANFIELD:

What supplies, and cost of same, were furnished the pole lights at Bass river, Masstown and Little Dyke, Colchester county, for the years 1907, 1908 and 1909 respectively?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

The supplies furnished the three lights indicated included oil, lamp accessories, paint, cleaning material, &c. The agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Halifax, advises that the cost of such supplies furnished were as per following table:

	1907	1908	1909
Bass River	$34 09	$50 36	$47 29
Masstown	19 07	20 97	16 82
Little Dyke	18 74	20 99	28 83

The light at Bass river is a tower light, not a pole light.

GRENFELL WHEAT ELEVATOR.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN:

1. Has the subject of the accident at an elevator at Grenfell last fall, by which an operator fell into a bin and lost his life, been brought to the attention of the government? If so, to what department were the representations made, and by whom?

2. What was the substance of these representations, and what action did the government take?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes. Representations were made to the Department of Trade and Commerce by the Hon. Walter Scott, premier of Saskatchewan, and Charles C. Castle, warehouse commissioner, Winnipeg.

2. The department was requested to examine the existing statutes to ascertain whether any legislation was required to empower the warehouse commissioner to act in the matter; and further that the Dominion government enact the necessary legislation to require licensed elevators to take out accident insurance covering their employees. It was also stated that there was some doubt as to provincial or federal jurisdiction in the matter. The subject was referred to the Department of Justice, which department replied that the Minister of Justice was of opinion that such legislation should be left to the provincial legislators to enact.

PENDER ISLAND CANAL.

Mr. BARNARD:

1. What was the cost of the Pender Island Canal?

2. What was the depth of the canal when completed?

3. What is the present depth at low water?

4. What is the length of the canal?

5. What was the tonnage passing through the canal during the past year?

6. What saving of distance is effected by vessels using the canal in lieu of passing around South Pender island?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. $10,000.

2 and 3. Depth of channel when completed and present depth, 10 feet at low tide.

4. 1,000 feet.

5. No records are kept of the tonnage passing through the channel; the resident engineer reports that it was used by the mail boat in a tri-weekly delivery of mails, from Sidney to the islands, and also by small boats trading between Browning harbour and Sidney.

6. From Sidney to Browning harbour, five miles; from Bedwell bay to Browning harbour, seven miles.

LABOURERS ON LACHINE CANAL.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What are the names of the labourers who are employed and who will be paid out of the $3,100 mentioned in the answer of January 17, 1910?

2. On what kind of work will they be employed from now until the end of the fiscal year?

3. Who is the chief electrician on the Lachine canal, and what are his duties?

4. What are the duties of T. Evers, employed on the Lachine canal, and what is the form of expenses allowed to him?

Hon. GEO. GRAHAM:

1. The names of the labourers employed at the present time for urgent and necessary work, are as follows: (Conditions may arise that necessitate, in the interest of the department, the employing of a few more labourers on the roads):

Damase Gratton, road foreman western division; W. Bergevin; Ald. Filion; J. Forest; J. B. Sauriol; W. O'Leary.

J. P. Evers, foreman eastern division; E. Riley; J. Donaldson; J. McNamara; P. Murphy; J. Murphy; W. Gauthier; Geo. Yon; A. Larivèe; J. B. Tremblay.

Maintenance of government yards, M. Fitzpatrick; F. Riley; J. Harding.

2. Labourers will be employed along the entire line of the canal where required during the balance of fiscal year, repairing roads, removal of snow on and off bridges, opening ditches, cleaning sidewalks, spreading ashes, maintenance of government yards, shops and stores and other necessary works in connection with government reserve lands.

3. There are two electrical power houses on the Lachine canal, Mr. Julien Brunet, is chief electrician of the eastern division power house, Mill street, Montreal, and Mr. James Innes is chief electrician of the western division power house at Cote St. Paul, both Julien Brunet and James Innes have charge individually of their respective division and power house.

4. T. Evers is employed as clerk or secretary in the office of the superintendent and also as telephone electrician in charge of the repairs of the telephone instruments of the Lachine private telephone system. T. Evers has a monthly allowance of $15 for conveyance in connection with this work, the same as is allowed to electricians Brunet and Innes.

'WHIG' PUBLISHING COMPANY.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has the 'Whig' Publishing Company been paid any money for printing and advertising by or for any departments of this government other than Militia and Defence and Marine and Fisheries since 1896?

2. If so, what amount have been paid to the said 'Whig' Publishing Company in each year from 1896 to the present time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

This should be the subject of a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands as notice of motion for a return.

REPORT OF SWINE COMMISSION.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Has the Swine Commission made its report? If not, why not?
2. When did the commission return, what countries did they visit and make investigations in?
3. Why did the commission not investigate conditions in Canada before going abroad?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. The commission has made its report, which is now in type and has been once proof read by the secretary.
2. The commission returned at the end of August after having made investigations in Great Britain, Ireland, Denmark, and to a slight extent in Holland.
3. The commission, being composed of men actually engaged in the rearing and marketing of swine, were, from their own experience, sufficiently acquainted with conditions in Canada to enable them to examine intelligently conditions in other countries, having in view the lessons that would be useful to Canadian swine raisers.

CENSUS OF 1911.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. When does the government commence taking the census?
2. Will the work be carried on in a similar way to that adopted in 1900? If not, what is the nature of the improvement suggested?
3. What is the estimated cost of taking the census and the time required to complete same?

Mr. FISHER:

1. In June, 1911.
2. Yes.
3. Estimates not made yet.

QUARANTINE BOAT, HALIFAX.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. Has the government made any arrangements or let a contract for the construction of a boat for the quarantine service at Halifax?
2. If so, were tenders asked for, and how, from whom were tenders received, what are the names and amount of each tender, what is the amount of the tender accepted, and when will the boat be delivered at Halifax, ready for service?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes.
2. Tenders were asked for by public advertisement and were received from—

Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood, Ontario	$35,000
Toronto Ship Yards, Toronto, Ont.	39,850
Philip & Son, Ltd., Dartmouth, Eng.	22,600
Edward Norman, Toronto, Ont., (for Crabtree & Co., Ltd., Yarmouth, Eng.)	28,310
John Reid & Co., Montreal, P. Q., (representing British Builders)	28,500
Halifax Graving Dock Co., Ltd., Halifax, N. S.	37,362
Laurie & Lamb, Montreal, P. Q., (representing British Builders)	27,215
Polson Iron Works, Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	36,450
La Cie Pontbriand, Sorel, P. Q.	37,750
The New Burrell-Johnson Iron Co., Ltd., Yarmouth, N.S.	32,750
Mordey, Carney, Cardiff, Wales, (per Ed. Nonan, Toronto, Ont.)	27,143
P. J. Powers Co., Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.	38,500

The amount of the tender accepted is $22,600 The delivery of the boat is to be made by July, 1910.

HALIFAX HARBOUR MASTER.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received any official notice from Halifax of the death of the harbour master at that port?
2. If so, has any appointment been made to fill the vacancy?
3. Has the minister received any letter or recommendation from any person or persons or mercantile board or board of trade? If so, what is the nature of the recommendation or requests?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries was advised of the death of the harbour master at Halifax, on the 19th December last.
2. No appointment has been made. Captain Neil Hall, port warden of Halifax, is acting as harbour master temporarily.
3. The council of the Halifax Board of Trade recommended to the department that a man of thorough nautical experience should be appointed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. LAKE.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Before the notices of motion are called I desire to rise to a question of privilege. It has reference to an answer given on Monday by the Prime Minister to a question standing in my name. This is the first opportunity I have had of speaking to this question of privilege. The Prime Minister's answer was given at a moment when I was absent from the House. During the course of it he took occasion to say that the citation made by me of a report appearing in the 'Globe', of a speech the right hon. gentleman had made at Toronto, was not a correct reproduction of the 'Globe' report. He said further it was garbled and omitted an important part of a sentence, though he added that he was quite sure that the misquotation was unintentional on my part.

Let me say that the question as it ap-

peared in the orders of the day was not a correct reproduction of the question as I handed it in to the Clerk of the House. The Prime Minister is well aware that questions are not always printed exactly as they are handed in, and I should have thought it more consistent with his dignity that before casting such a reflection on an hon. member of this House, as that implied in his answer, he would either have refrained from dealing with the matter until the member was present and had had an opportunity of explaining any possible discrepancy, or would at least have looked at the question in its original form in the member's handwriting.

Had he done so he would have found that I had made two quotations of two separate and complete sentences exactly as they appeared in the 'Globe' and that I had made the necessary quotation marks to show that they were separate quotations.

The Prime Minister in his reply made a full statement of the 'Globe' report, which he says is substantially correct. According to that very statement it would appear that the Prime Minister has made a misstatement of fact in his answer and founded his whole argument upon it. He states that an important part of a sentence is omitted. That is not the case. No part of any sentence, whether important or unimportant was omitted. A whole sentence was omitted deliberately, because I had no fault to find with it and had no question to ask in respect of it. It stated in effect that the people of Canada are the loyal subjects of His Majesty. Surely the Prime Minister does not seriously suggest that it was necessary for me to ask whether the government held the same views as himself in that respect. I take it for granted and I would consider it a reflection to ask such a question.

The other two sentences which I quoted and which the Prime Minister now endorses and implies to be the views of his government in regard to our relations to the Throne contain views which I believe to be unconstitutional and contrary to the facts. It was in respect of these two statements, and of them alone, that I asked my question as I believed it to be of the highest importance that the country should understand the attitude of the government regarding them.

I have nothing further to say at present other that to express my astonishment and regret that the Prime Minister in an apparently carefully prepared statement should have made an incorrect statement of fact and founded upon it an argument that would reflect upon a member of this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. May I also be permitted as a question of privilege to answer my hon. friend just one word. If he has read my answer, and evidently he has, he knows that I acquitted him of any intention of misquoting. He now says that he put his question correctly and the only blame he puts on me is that I did not look at the question as he handed it to the clerk. I assumed that the clerk had put it on the notice paper correctly. The notice paper was before the House for three or four days and nobody took objection to it, not even my hon. friend (Mr. Lake). Therefore I took the question as it was printed in the Order Paper and I do not think any one will find fault with me for doing that. I have only to say that I think my hon. friend is hardly fair. I told him in the House that I knew he was incapable of making a garbled statement. What more could he expect from me?

Mr. LAKE. May I say that I have been very busy and had not seen the printed question. Had I been present in the House I would undoubtedly, as I have done on many occasions, corrected the question in putting it to the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the question was put in my hon. friend's absence he should not blame me, let him blame some of his friends who put this question for him.

PARTY PATRONAGE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the prevailing system of party patronage constitutes a menace to honest and efficient government, incites to great waste of resources and extravagance of expenditures, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals, and should forthwith be eliminated from our federal administration.

He said: I do not make any apology for introducing this resolution even though it may be said to be an academic one. I have not very much love for simply academic resolutions which have no practical relation to legislation or to our system of public life; but I do not think it would be an unmixed evil if in this parliament we were to devote a little more attention to the theory and give a little more time to the discussion of the principles involved in the administration of our public affairs. But the question I am bringing to the attention of the House is not a purely academic one, because it is intimately and practically connected with the government of the country that it has every day and every hour an influence, not only upon special lines of governmental administration, but upon the public life of the country. Fortunately during the last few years, this question has been attracting the attention of the more thoughtful people of Canada. We have seen and heard a great deal of discussion on the results that flow

from the adoption of a principle different from the one advocated in this resolution. This question has excited a great deal more attention in the country of late years than it did formerly. I do not wish to elaborate that statement but simply to give a few examples which prove it. I do not know that I could do better than give three examples, as specimens of others that might be cited in very large numbers. So far as my remarks this afternoon may go, I shall endeavour to confine myself strictly to principles, although the temptation is great to bring to the support of those principles the many examples which illustrate them. However, I shall leave that to be done by each individual member, if not openly and publicly in the House, at least in his own mind; and from his own observations, I am sure every hon. member can furnish examples illustrative of some of the facts I intend to present. The first statement I shall read will be the motion moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and on which a vote was taken in this House:

That in making appointments to public offices, and particularly to those of a representative nature, party services should not alone be considered, but selections should be made with regard to capacity and personal character.

Yeas, 43 (Cons.)
Nays, 70 (Libs.)

You will notice that this deals with but a fraction of the patronage system, and that it is a very reasonable and moderate presentation of theory as opposed to the present practice. I shall next read an opinion broadly distributed throughout this country. How much support it has in the party opposite, I am not going to say, but it is a statement of what is demanded from the present government:

THE LIBERAL DOCTRINE.

The rank and file of the Liberal party will acclaim a plain statement of the need for a closer loyalty of the department to this accepted principle of party government—all patronage should go to the friends of the party. Every departure from this is an act of disloyalty to the followers and supporters of the party.

No cabinet minister nor any supporter of the Liberal party can assault this position and be loyal to his party.

Every new appointment, every power of patronage, belongs by right of system and precedent to the members of the Liberal party.

To appease a political foe by gifts of patronage is a sign of cowardice, or even worse.

In the initial appointment or in the awarding of a government contract, it is expected that the party in power shall be loyal to its friends. Without such loyalty the party becomes disorganized.—Ottawa Free Press, Lib.

This is taken from the Ottawa 'Free Press.' This may be an extreme statement of the view of the writer of this article, and an extreme statement of the view taken by the party as a whole; but I read it because it shows very precisely the ultimate and extreme position that can be taken by the adherents and supporters of the party patronage system.

Then I take, as an example of the utterances of church conferences, the following:

That the sordid system of patronage unfortunately obtaining in this country is not only folly from the party point of view, with which as such this conference has nothing to do, but that it is contrary to public policy and an offence against the people inasmuch as it proceeds on the assumption that the party in power is justified in administering the affairs of the country to the advantage of that section of the electors who have assisted in returning it, whereas, according to any true view such party should regard itself as a trustee for the whole people.

That was a resolution unanimously adopted by the Methodist conference. As a fourth extract, I beg to leave to read the statement of a newspaper, which, according to the view one takes, may be independent or may be a strictly party paper, for, as one reads its pages, it is sometimes the one and some times the other. Probably on the whole the independent view is the one which obtains. I refer to the Montreal 'Witness.' In an article on the report of Mr. Justice Cassels dealing with the evils that flow from the patronage system, it has the following:

The saving of a million or so of the people's money in each of the departments would be the very least part of the public gain by a change which would eliminate these corrupt dealings. Far more important is the fearful demoralization of public servants that inevitably develops under it, and which those who seek dealings with the departments tell us, with what truth we do not know, is found throughout the service.

But even the demoralization of the public servants is not the worst. Worse far is the example set and the lesson taught to the whole nation, and the general contempt for government which the common knowledge of these things breeds. Judge Cassels did not advise an investigation similar to his own into the other departments. It was not his business to do so, and he had not any evidence on which to base such advice. But when, in advising an independent purchasing agency, he says: 'Are there no other departments of government which could be dealt with in the same manner?' he comes as near as he may to such a suggestion. Surely it is time for a clean sweep. That ministers are capable of making this sweep themselves is fully proved by the history of the department that has been the subject of the inquiry. That the system of judical inquiry should be made general, and probably in some shape permanent, is the natural deduction from all the conditions, and this last is practically advised.

These four statements show in brief the position which is taken by the large divi-

sions of those who express public opinion in this country. So I say that the question is attracting renewed and constantly increasing interest. It is no longer an academic question in this country, I hope it is eminently a practical question, and I hope the question will not get out of the sphere of discussion until this country, in the beginning of the twentieth century, of its twentieth century, shall purge its public life clean and clear from the patronage system and the evils that come therefrom.

This patronage system which has existed since confederation, and under all governments, and exists to-day, is the lineal and distinct descendant of the old kingly monopolies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. What the king did in farming out great monopolies, and taking revenues for himself, and gains therefrom, dividing them amongst favourites, who thereafter became beneficiaries, is being done under the patronage system. Now substitute for the king of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Prime Minister of the twentieth century; substitute for the immediate favourites to whom the king made these grants of monopolies, the ministers of the cabinet selected by the Prime Minister, and you will have the first two of the many links in a chain that binds the whole system together. The premier and his selected councillors make up the ministry, that is the first; after that comes the caucus and its elected components; after that comes the local candidate in his district, with his circle of party supporters; and lower down in the scale comes the district committee with their control of the petty patronage which has to be dispensed within the purview of their own jurisdiction. That makes a complete chain, extending from the representative of the king, under the old idea, and down to the base of the system. This is a wonderfully concentrated and correlated system. There is not a section of this country from one end to the other which is not under its influence, and which to-day is not throbbing and pulsating with the stimulus—whether it be good or bad, I am not saying just now, though I shall later—with the stimulus derived from the party patronage system. The old kingly monopolies and what was knit thereto, were powerful and strong; this is an infinitely more powerful one because of the wider distribution of the roots that it sends down in all directions and everywhere, and because of its numberless ramifications.

But it is more powerful from another consideration. The kingly monopoly was raised up before the people in lurid light, but had for its backing no such powerful association as the people behind it. But the patronage system, on the lines that I have tried to explain just now, becomes infinitely more powerful and dangerous, because it hides its enormities by the fiction that it is the adjunct of party government exercised by the people and for the people, and is one of the instrumentalities of a governmnt so organized and so conducted. That is what gives it its power and tends to its continuance, and that is one of the shields that must be stripped from it before eventually the people throw it off their shoulders. Hitherto we have looked upon the patronage evil in bits and shreds; we have seen a manifestation of it here and talked about, we have discovered a manifestation of it elsewhere and have discussed it; I think we would gain a new view perhaps if we attempted to put it in one great mass before our view, and the view of this House and the country. Let me try for a moment to do that. The soldier, as you will acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, though he is a picturesque object with his uniform, and his erect stature, and his military facings, is not impressive, that is, he is not so impressive as when all the soldiers of the army are gathered into regiments and battalions, and the mighty sweep and force of the united host is presented to the view. So with reference to this patronage. Take a feature of it in the city of St. John and elaborate it, Heaven knows it is bad enough; take a bit of it in Vancouver and elaborate it, and you will see some of it; but you have not yet got what we may only get when we hold the whole beastly system up to the inspection and reprobation of this country.

Let us look at the Civil Service of the country. I cannot say by the book, but I suppose there are probably between 8,000 and 10,000 members of the Civil Service, inside and outside. This Civil Service is constantly enlarging, its numbers are constantly growing. Every day, almost, some vacancy occurs, and every day, almost, some appointment to fill a vacancy is made. And so in new appointments, and in appointments to fill vacancies, you have a large and constantly increasing draft from the outside into the inside of the service. But that does not show the extent of it. Every civil servant has his family, has his relatives, has his friends outside his relatives; and whatever interest he may have in the patronage system, whatever it does or promises for him, it creates an interest which is distributed more or less over his family, his relatives and his friends, and binds them with him in the objects and for the purposes that he looks upon as being advantageous and useful, either actual or possible to himself.

Now, with reference to the Civil Service, until September, 1908, this was absolutely true, that no man entered it, no man got preferment in it, no man felt safe within it, unless he either got the entrance by virtue

of party influence, or looked after his preferment and his permanent position by keeping on good terms with the party influence as represented by the nearest access of that influence to himself. Since September, 1908, a measurable advance has been made, and a portion of the Civil Service has, to a certain extent, been cut loose and put into a more or less independent position in that respect. It still remains true that the vast mass of the Civil Service is in the position that I have just mentioned.

But the Civil Service is but a small portion of the entire service of the country. Outside of it you have great numbers of public employees. Take, for instance, the Intercolonial railway. The yearly pay-roll of that railway is about $500,000, and the number of persons employed and paid is now close up to 10,000 persons. When you take 10,000 persons with their families, their relatives, their connections and friends, you see what an element you have in the consideration of this question of the influence of party patronage. Then, there is the post office. You have scattered throughout this country 12,000 keepers of post offices of high and low degree—taking the degree to mean the salary and functions that they enjoy and perform. There is also a brigade of some 600 mail clerks, though railway mail clerks do form a portion of the service. Then you come to the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, and you find a widespread and heavily manned organization outside of those who form the regular Civil Service of these two departments. Take also the Department of Interior, with its immigration branch, its lands branch, its Indians branch, and you have a widely distributed force, large in numbers and great in influence, which is affected by and interested in this matter which I am discussing to-day. The Department of Marine and Fisheries is a widely extended one outside of its permanent Civil Service employees. There is an army of 800 employees at one place alone, Sorel. The department's dredging fleet is manned by 500 to 600 employees. Its steamers have an employment roll of 500 persons. And the fisheries inspectors, the marine agents, the lighthouse keepers, the buoy keepers, and all the dispensers and adherents of this immense service constitute an army the exact size of which I do not know, but which is very large, and, as I have said, widely extended. Then you come to the Department of Agriculture. Any one who compares the condition of this department ten or fifteen years ago with its condition to-day and sums up the result must see how this service has ramified in various directions in all parts of the country. To-day it has a very large number of employees, some permanent and some so called temporary. I do not know the number, nor can I give you a statement of the salaries paid. I am simply making the point now that these employees are numerous, and, of course, must be costly. The Department of Public Works, outside the ranks of its regular civil servants of inside and outside employees, has under its charge a large number of men. And even outside the men it employs and pays out of the public treasury, it is a vast dispensary of patronage. In the course of the year some $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 of public money is paid out by this department on the basis of tender and contract, or otherwise, and every one of these expenditures has to be supervised. There are foremen, there are inspectors, there are a multitude of persons engaged in one way or another; and, patronage having full force as it has in that department, shows up greatly and in wide extension. Without going further into detail, I may state in brief that all these together make up a multitude which no man on the spur of the moment can exactly number. I think it will be found that there are not much less than 30,000 employees of one kind or another in all these lines that I have enumerated. Add to these the regular service and you have a vast army of employees. And with reference to all of them, with the simple exception of the Civil Service at Ottawa, it is absolutely true that no man enters into that employment unless he utters the party shibboleth, and no man remains in that employment unless he either keeps a mighty quiet tongue—if he happened to go to work before the existing government took office, whatever that government may be—and no man gets along unless he continues to utter the party shibboleth and keep in touch and well within the good will of the party.

But even that is not all of it. We have in this country a number of commissions. And, of late years, commissions have enjoyed a growing era, so to speak. We heard yesterday how stones grow. Without going into the question as to how the growth takes place in such hard formations as that, there is not the least doubt that there is a vast growth in commissions—commissions permanent and commissions temporary, commissions stationary and commissions travelling, commissions made up of several and commissions made up of one; but commissions there are in plenty and constantly increasing. For example, you have the Transcontinental Railway Commission, made up, in the first place, of five—or is it six?—king pins. These are the main men. But when we look beyond these king pins and the salaries they get, we have only begun to size up this commission. See the

clerks they have; see the engineers they have; see the supervisors they have; see the inspectors they have. And follow it up: within the last four or five years of its existence, this commission has dispensed about $58,000,000 of the people's money. And all this organization is permeated from top to bottom with the idea of party patronage. On the basis of that idea they were created. The men who formed the commission took products of party patronage as their raw material. And, the commission being constituted of the dust of party patronage, well ribbed and fitted up, everything which emanates from that commission is of the same nature. Every clerk of high or low degree, every supervisor, every engineer,—every man who has anything to do in the mighty series of transactions carried on by the commission qualifies for his work upon the basis of party patronage. Every man must speak the party shibboleth, must do his duty to the party—as many of them know to their great cost—and they must all keep in touch and in hearty sympathy with the party. There is another commission—the Railway Commission. It is a commission of a different order, but the same principle holds good. By virtue of the party patronage principle the members of that commission were first appointed, and by virtue of that they hold their positions. Aside from whatever excellencies they may have—I am not discussing that question—they could not get there unless they had earned their spurs by services to the party, or unless the party believed that they would get an equivalent compensation by their appointment. And so with an army, small in this respect, of employees under them; all is based and carried out upon the same principle of party patronage.

Well, the matter does not end there. We have a judiciary in this country. We have benches and courts of law from the highest tribunal at Ottawa down to the county and district courts in the various provinces. Is it too much to say that within the lifetime of any party no single man gets a seat upon the bench who does not get it because he belongs to the party which has the appointment and because he has thus earned his spurs? That does not mean to say at all in no case do they ever have all the qualifications that a good judge ought to have, but it is undeniably true that many of them enter through the gate of party exigency rather than by reason of merit, experience and the degree in which they are versed in the law. Take a lawyer who goes up to a certain stage in his profession, not a very advanced one, jerk him out into political life, throw him about in political life for fifteen or twenty years, perhaps holding cabinet positions and otherwise, and all that time out of his office, away from the administration of the law and from the prosecution of the deep and grave studies of the law; do you in that way fit him to sit upon the bench? No one would argue that for an instant. It must be a disadvantage. But if you look over the list, if you scan the roster, you will find that very many who sit upon the bench to-day have come up through that school which nobody will for a moment assert is the best school through which they should come. To-day the judiciary is appointed on the line of party patronage and the inevitable tendency is some time, somewhere, to make mighty poor appointments because the exigencies of party demand that such and such a one be rewarded. If a man would stand up and controvert that opinion I will put up to him the other part of the question: Does it help to make a better judge that he should enter upon his duties through the party door? Nobody will attempt to assert the affirmative of that proposition.

Well, that does not end it. We have a Senate. As a boy at school and a student at the university and after I left the university—my experience compares with that of others who have gone through the same course—what a high and reverential ideal we had imbibed and possessed in our student days of the Senates of the olden times. The Senate! What was the ideal?—men of irreproachable life, men of wonderfully great experience, men of age, because of the idea that wisdom and experience and age naturally go together. Our ideas of the senates of the old world and our ideas of what ought to be the senates of the new world were projected upon a high and lofty plane. Alas, as we grew up, came out into the life of this practical world of ours and some day found ourselves up against a real senate in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth century, our ideals, I am afraid, received a very great setback.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. To-day I am afraid that even the Prime Minister has absolutely abandoned all that he worshipped in his younger days. To-day my hon. friend stands in the position of having confessed to this House, after having deplored the evil, that he has sought to find a remedy, but that it is not within his resources to find a remedy and that therefore no remedy is forthcoming.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Shall we hear the confession of my hon. friend now?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I to-day am not in the mood for making confessions. What I desire to do to-day is to make a plea for what I consider would be a better state of

things and my concluding plea would be that the Prime Minister, the powerful minister of a victorious party and of a powerful party, will join hands with the men on this side of the House and see if a better ideal cannot be reached. Our senate of the olden day did embody some of those ideals that I have spoken of. Sometimes we know that distance lends enchantment to the view, and one whom we see through the glass of history sometimes bulks larger than a man, may be equally strong, that we do not see through the glass of history but come face to face and eye to eye with. All the same, making that allowance. I think that our older senate did have more of the elements of the ideal senate than the senate of to-day. It is true, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that every appointment to the Senate is a creature of the Prime Minister? I mean the word 'creature' in its proper sense—the creation of the Prime Minister—and the matter would not be so deplorably bad if the Prime Minister, when he creates a senator, would sometimes use fresh material. The trouble with him is that he takes old and powdered and decayed material and makes his creations sometimes out of that. Is it too much to say that the Senate, as it is at present projected by the Prime Minister, is, to a very large extent, used as a hospital for the incapables and incurables of the party in power, fortunately, or unfortunately, I am not sure which—for the time being I shall say fortunately—relieved by some men of great power and of large representative interests. But am I quite right in saying that it is a fortunate thing? The other element so far predominates that may be it is unfortunate that there are examples such as I have alluded to which may be pointed to to make it possible to keep longer in this country a senate based upon the power of appointing as it has been exercised in the last ten or fifteen years. If there were no redeeming representatives in it to-day we might get into a better position and have a higher standard to place ourselves upon all the sooner. But I do say and I do not think that anyone in this House will contradict me that there is absolutely no doubt that the Senate is not what it ought to be and that it is not, is due to the system of patronage or party appointment that is in vogue.

That, I think, is a statement that we can all subscribe to. To-day, every man who goes into the Senate has to kiss the shoe of the Prime Minister—that much he has to do, what else he has to do deponent in this case saith not.

And now I come to the House of Commons, and for the moment address myself to my own colleagues, not with any desire of passing judgment on the House of Commons; each man here shall be his own judge. The only thing I venture to do is to ask the members of this House to do as I myself do, to ask themselves certain questions, to ponder over the answer and then conclude, each in his own mind, whether things might not be better than they are. How far is the representation in this House based upon the calm unbiased judgment of the electorate of the country, uninfluenced except by the unpurchasable views of the electors, uninfluenced except, in addition to that, by the relative wisdom and weight of the party policies and the party platforms? Or, how far has it been due to the spoils of office past, present and prospective? Now, that is a question that any man can ask himself, and I am not at all afraid to leave that question with every member of this House, and I am not afraid to venture the assertion that he can find an answer to that in no other way than one that is condemnatory of the patronage system and the patronage evil. How far that has been the case each member can answer for himself. How far each member is here solely for his country's good, to sacrifice, to labour that his views of citizenship and policy and good government shall prevail; how far he is here looking to prospective office and emolument it is not for me to judge—every man can go before his own conscience in that respect. It is a little significant, however, that in the last 10 or 12 years 100 appointments of various kinds have been made, either of members of parliament or of defeated candidates, which though on the same principle as has been carried out under all governments from confederation until to-day, is in degree very much larger and greater to-day. That statement I think no one will deny. Certain it is that the spoils play their part in tempting the legislator. He may prove superior to it, he often does; I wish I could say that he always does, and always will. I hold, and I think I have said it before, that the majority of the legislators of the country have done their duty in legislative halls, basing that view on an historical glance at the records they have left in the legislation of the country. To my mind they have done their duty well, remarkably well for a new and young country. But I again ask the assent of every man in the House to this general proposition: That they would have done their duty far better if there had been none of the virus and poison of the spoils and of the patronage system at work neutralizing their best efforts in many respects, and preventing them from doing their best work.

I do not want to be extreme in this, but that last proposition is one that I think can not be denied.

Now, we will go to another part of the organism of our country: the press. Its

members do not have seats on the floor of the House, but they have elevated seats just above us, and they overlook us, and down upon us. No man has a higher idea of the purpose and profession and work of the press than I have. In one respect I think it is true to say that the press is the eye, and the ear, and the voice of the nation. As the eye of this nation it should be eagle strong to descry in the distance any approaching danger, to penetrate the gloom of any present error, and to catch the vision of the future good and mirror it so that the people of this country may look upon it and come to love it. As the ear of this country it should be sentient to the lowest plaint of every wrong whether it is individual, or social, or national. It should be sensitive to the faintest whispers of hope and desire from every quarter; it should be sensitive to every cry for quick relief from existing abuses. As the voice of the nation it should be strong and unceasing to translate, from its elevated point of view, what it sees and what it hears, and to convey it to the nation; to sound the bugle call to arms, to denounce every evil thing, and to summon high hope and inspiration to the aid of the forces of right in the country. I am not going to say whether the press does this or does it not, but I am going to say that that is an ideal which the press cherishes, and it is not absolved from following that ideal by any remarks such as that made by the Prime Minister just now, that the press would have a mighty hard job catching up to it. Mr. Speaker, the man that has done anything worth a groat in his life has done it because he has been trying to catch up to his ideals. The man who has no ideals does nothing worthy of his country. The man who does well in ordinary lines of life is the man who has high ideals and who is everlastingly trying to embody them in his life's work. I would be very sorry, by a turn of the lip or by the utterance of one single light word to dim the ideal of any young man in this country coming up to the light of the 20th century; I would rather help him to pitch it higher and encourage him to embody it to the full. Now, Sir, it is for the press of the country to answer this question, not for me—to what extent does party patronage dim the vision of the press, dull its hearing, stifle its voice, or worse yet, bring its voice into the defence of what is bad and sometimes into the advocacy of what is bad. Does that ever happen—it is not for me to answer, it is for the press to answer for itself.

I believe that the great newspaper fraternity in this country has its high ideals, that it is striving, as far as possible, to reach them, and that it is gaining ground every day in the essential principle of a high and lofty and well-toned press, striking abuses because they are abuses and inciting to what is good and right because it is good and right. Certainly a press which is shackled is not freedom's friend, and no party does any good to the press of this country which ties it or influences it by patronage of any kind. In so far as patronage creeps into the work of the press, it vitiates that work and takes away from the people a guiding friend and a valuable adviser.

Then we have a country. Theoretically its domain, its franchises, are a sacred entail to the six and half or seven millions of people who inhabit this Dominion, and what is far more important, to the generations which will succeed them until far off time, how far none of us know, but that it shall be far distant all of us hope. These resources are to be husbanded for them and for their descendants to these latest generations. The revenues and taxes of a country which theoretically are properly to be expended with a sole regard for their good and that of their countless recurring generations, should be so gathered and so expended by sworn and high-minded trustees. And so they are by sworn trustees. Every man who enters a government takes an oath that he will, as a trustee for the people of Canada, so administer their affairs, and every man who takes up office under that government takes an oath or enters into an obligation binding him first of all to the service of his country, and last of all, it should be, to the service of his party or to the service of an individual. The government of a country in its ideal sense is to be based on the principles of aptness and fitness, of economy, of scrupulous integrity, and it is to be carried on with clearness of vision and with nobleness of motive. Under the best possible system this ideal is hard to realize. The cynical man says: Out with you, you are entirely impossible and inconsistent with the ways of a world which will never conform to your ideals. There, again, I take issue and plead for the ideal, and to my mind the statesman never gets so old that he ought not to renew his ideals from time to time and nerve himself to the better embodiment and the truer carrying out of those ideals. Does our patronage system help to make it easier to govern a country on these principles and to carry out those ideals? There is a constant temptation, there is a constant pressure, there is a constant relaxation of fibre, moral and mental. There is the inevitable giving way in part, in sections sometimes, with lamentable effects, and there is the consequent lowering tone of public life and of public administration in the country. Does this massed, constant, persistent degrading force tend to honesty of government, the purity of administration, the elevation of public

life in this young nation of ours, in this the most important era of its existence, in this its formative period? That is a question we may well ask and strive to answer.

Let me ask attention to another thought. To this vast and complicated mechanism there is added the money power. Some say that money is the root of all evil. Well, it is the root of a mighty lot of good, too, and comfort and the like of that, but I suppose the inordinate love of money may be the root of a great deal of evil. Into the mass of that complicated administrative system you inject the power of money. We spent last year $112,000,000. Of that, may be $30,000,000 went without the impulse and stimulus or the virus of the patronage system, went to pay the interest on our debt—and thank Heaven not much can creep into that—and for other statutory purposes that do not come within influence of the vicious evils of patronage. But it is safe to say that $80,000,000 of that were spent under the patronage system; $80,000,000 or $90,000,000 or $100,000,000 will be spent this year and as much or more next year. Mass it together and it is a tremendous expenditure. We are wise if we put such guards about that expenditure, even to the cutting off of our vices of government to the very root, as will direct that money properly and make its force felt upon the objective point without too much electricity being drawn off in the passage. That amount was expended. How are these expenditures managed? I ask the Prime Minister himself, who has arrived at the years of experience and has had a long career, who has met a vast number of men and has observed things in a vast variety of circumstances in this country, I ask him the one question: In the expenditure of that $80,000,000 do business methods control? That is a simple question. I do not think it answers that question to say that a government never can do what a man can do in his own business. That is true, but a government must carry out in the execution of its business every proper economy that an honest, straight and intelligent business man will carry out in his. There may be diversity in the employment of the money, but the principles of the conduct of business are immutably the same all the way through.

Do we have business principles applied to the expenditure of this $80,000,000, or do we not? I do not want to belabour that argument, what is the use of beating a corpse. We acknowledge it. Why then do we not change it? Take the whole system from the time that the tender is asked for until the work is completed, and everywhere it is hampered, it is checked, it is made extravagant, it is made costly, it is made often corrupt by the effect of the patronage which meets it at every turn and calls for its toll out of every part of the transaction, from the contractor down through all the multitudinous supervisors and foreman and supply givers. The patronage system is there and it performs its one function, which is to make all works more costly, which is often to cause the erection of unnecessary works at exaggerated cost, and which is always to vitiate in some form or another.

I do not need to carry out that argument any further. The Cassels' commission and the commission which preceded it show how the thing works. Our public accounts have shown it and so have our discussions in this House and so have the observations of every member of this House. I do not think there is a member of this House who, in unrestrained conversation, going over the matter, will not make this admission. So that when you add to this immense personal mechanism the money element, you have a thing of very great force which plagues the legislators and plunders the country. Does it not plague the legislator? The most anxious hours my right hon. friend has had, the majority of the anxieties he has had, have not arisen from great questions of state or public policy, but from the miserable attempt to serve both party and country at the same time and make the two if possible jibe together. It comes from the more paltry and miserable demands arising out of all these petty questions of patronage which come up every hour of the day. Am I right or wrong? Almost 99-100ths of the work of the cabinet council and ministers is work made for them, difficulties raised for them, knots to be untied which have been tied for them, by this patronage system in one or other of its details. I have been there and I know it and I am talking to men who are there now and who know it, and those men will not gainsay the statement I have made. They may take some exception as to the relative proportions, but as to the facts in the great mass they cannot take any exception.

I wish it did not go further than this, but it does. It beclouds the great issues. We have great questions to solve. Not only has the legislator his part to do—which he cannot do well because he has so much of this other business—but this country has its part to do, which it is precluded from doing well because paltry questions of patronage arise and cloud the issues and prevent the elector giving his mind to the great questions and deciding on them. If we could eliminate these questions of patronage, great good would be accomplished. Take the last election in Great Britain not yet ended. It is warmly contested, it is marked by fervour of declamation even by physical force, but in that election there has not been from top to bottom any thought or fight for a single office. The

question who is to be game warden or dock loader or lock-keeper has not intruded itself in one single instance. The electors have fought the contest out as intelligently as they could, but at least they have fought it out on a question of tariff and free trade, the budget and the lords, home rule, socialism, the navy and other questions of that kind. What would have been the state of things over there if, added to all that, they had all the petty patronage involved in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of pounds to fight out in the general elections? These things are mixed and mingled with our elections and they becloud and vitiate the results. The machinery by which the government is selected is to that degree vitiated and to that extent the administration is weakened. It is weakened by the fact that its attention is monopolized by these matters of patronage and the like to the detriment of important business. Here is where the vital weakness comes in and every government is an illustration of it. Inefficiency, extravagance and corruption creep in everywhere and in every instance the system is at the root of the evil. It is not always what is right, but what is expedient that is looked to, and the measure of expediency in the main is how shall it affect our party. The first thing should be what are the interests of the country, and then how can our party be put in line with the interests of the country. What is the position to-day. The question is: How much can we do for the country provided we first make the party solid? Not what is proper, but what is available, not what is economical, but what is as economical as it can be made, and at the same time always leave a little dripping for the men who put us where we are.

What defence is there for a system of this kind and why should it continue to exist? I have asked thousands of people and the only answer I ever got was this, that you could not keep the party organized and you could not keep the party joined together unless you had that cement. Well, let me state this, and I believe it to be true, that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the death of a political party takes place because of the party patronage and the corruption and entanglements that spring from it. Few are the instances where a great policy defeats a party. Numberless are the instances where weakness gradually increasing comes to sap and undermine the power of a party and the government and forces it to give place to another. The cement of patronage is not necessary to keep a party together. I have instanced the case of Great Britain. An old member of the British cabinet said to me that in his long experience in public life he had never yet been asked for an office. What a heaven it would be for

legislators in Canada—I have several of them in my eye now—if they could get into public life and remain in public life and never be pestered with such an adornment as the patronage system tacked on to their political career. In Great Britain to-day you have not the patronage system, but did you ever see a country in which the party organization was more virile, better cemented, more sturdily capable of standing on its own feet than is the case in Great Britain? What is happening in Great Britain to-day? The first elections came on and one side had an enormous advantage. Then came the time for other constituencies to vote. And the people of those constituencies said: Yes, the Liberals are in for another term; but it does not make a bit of difference to us whether we are marching up to defeat or whether we are going on to victory; we are fighting an issue and we fight it to the end. And they fought it, and gained, and gained under an averse majority of the earlier part of the contest, under the knowledge that they could not form a government. That is a splendid tribute to an electorate which fights issues and is not fighting for plunder. In Canada everybody knows that we could not stand that for a single moment. We could not allow a system which put on the elections in certain parts of the country and got their majority, and, through that majority, influence the great mass of the electors yet to be polled. We would say it was unfair, that it was impracticable because of the influence that the ins, when they wield the patronage system, exert upon the public fortunes of the country. So, I say, it is not necessary to have a patronage system in order to keep the party together. The atmosphere would be infinitely purer, the tone of public life would be infinitely better, if we had this thing purged entirely from the life of the country. We should then have better issues and fight them out on stronger grounds, and, I believe, come to better conclusions and make more progress.

The next question, and the last, is: Can it be removed? The easiest thing in the world. I have been surprised to find how easy it is, in theory. There are some considerations which make it easy. If my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would rise in his place to-day and say that he believes in the principles of the views I have stated and in the general application of the principles I have enunciated; if he would declare that it would be better if these principles prevailed in the administration of the country, and that he proposed, so far as his government was concerned, to apply these principles—if he should say that, who would oppose him? Would the ministers of the gospel and all the church

forces send deputations here to-morrow in feverish anxiety to say to him: 'For heaven's sake, don't abolish the patronage system; the cause of christianity could not flourish if the patronage system were abolished.' Would they do that, Mr. Prime Minister? No; but, from every church court in this country there would come up a cry of thankfulness and praise; there is no doubt about that. The bankers, the business men, the solid yeomanry of the country, would they send up deputations to-morrow and declare: 'We cannot get along nearly so well; we cannot exist; please do not do that, Prime Minister.' Not one of them. Then, who would do it? Out of seven millions of people in Canada, how many share in the rake-offs? You have one Merwin; and you have 6,999,999 who have to contribute to Merwin's rake-off. Bunch together all the men who get something out of the patronage system and you have only a little bit of a measly, mean section of the country. On the other side, you have nineteen-twentieths at least of the people who never wish for and never participate in any drippings or droppings of this kind. The amazing thing is, that when the disparity is so great the infinitesimally small number should still impose itself upon the mass. If to-morrow, the first minister would take his resolution and carry it into effect, I could pledge him that this side of the House would give him support, and we could make the state of things in Canada immeasurably superior to that which now exists.

Now, I have said all I had to say. I have talked of general principles; I have abstained from citing examples——

Mr. LOGGIE. How about Merwin?

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. member wants to know about Merwin——

Mr TALBOT. We know all about that now.

Mr. FOSTER. I think you do. We talked a moment about ideals; suppose we state something of what would be a fair ideal for a country and consider whether or not it is worth striving for, in this Canada's twentieth century, on the part of a country which has such a future before it and such immense resources on which to base its anticipations of that future: An ideal state of things when members will be elected on broad issues and personal merits; when the Senate vacancies will be filled on a basis of fitness and representative interest; when prospective judges will not have to earn their seats by party services; when civil servants will rely upon their merit and industry and character for their entrance into the service, for promotion in it and for permanency; when the public money will be spent by the government absolutely as trustees for the people on the basis of trusteeship and that alone; when the country will be clad in that dignity of public life, that soundness of public morals, that wise conduct of public resources which make for national character, national progress and national permanency. Such an ideal is surely well worth an honest and sturdy attempt at realization. To embody in our administration the principle I have tried to advocate would I believe tend greatly to that end.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with the very greatest attention to the remarks which the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has seen fit to address to you, in support of the resolution which he has submitted. The language which the hon. member has seen fit to use in framing his resolution has something of an old-time flavour and the remarks which he has seen fit to address to you in support of that resolution have something of the old-time ring. In this House this question, in one form or another, has become a sort of a hardy annual, or perhaps I should say a sort of hardy perennial, which the hon. member for North Toronto, by his eloquence, by his vivid imagination, can cause to blossom forth, either in the bleakest midwinter or in the mildest mid-summer, according to whether the session in the particular year be held early or late. Now, my hon. friend is always most pointed and most expressive in the language which he uses, whether that language be used in debate in this House, or be employed in framing a resolution, and in this respect the present resolution, I think, is no exception to the hon. member's usual custom. It comes before us as an ear-marked resolution, if I may use the expression; and I think the officer of this House who is charged with the preparation of the order paper, might safely have omitted all reference to the name of that hon. gentleman in connection with this resolution, for the very nature of the language used would indicate its parentage beyond peradventure. When we find such extravagant language in a resolution as is to be found in this one, such language as 'a menace to honest government,' 'great waste and extravagance,' 'inevitable corruption,' &c., &c., the authorship of such language is placed beyond doubt, beyond even reasonable conjecture. Now, Mr. Speaker, having regard to the semi-judicial manner in which my hon. friend has seen fit to discuss the resolution though drawn in somewhat extravagant language, in the first place, if I may offer my own opinion, I would say that in form the resolution is somewhat objectionable; perhaps I might also add, coming as it does from my hon. friend from North Toronto, that it is per-

haps a little lacking in good taste. While not desiring to occupy the House at any length upon a discussion of the mere question of form, I cannot refrain from pointing out, before discussing the substance of the resolution, that in form it is nothing short of a direct motion of censure upon the administration, notwithstanding how high and noble, how unpartisan may have been my hon. friend's motives in bringing the general question up for discussion in this House. In thus speaking, of course, I am giving only my own opinion of the matter. I do not know what view the government may take of the motion; but as a humble supporter of the government, I think it my duty to point out that the motion as now framed, the language employed in framing it, constitute a direct censure of the government, upon the business methods of the government employed in its various departments, charging as it does, alleging as it does, that the present patronage system constitutes a menace to honesty that the present system incites to great waste and extravagance, tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals. This motion premises, takes for granted, the existence of this deplorable condition of affairs in the public service of this country. I think the hon. member, by the language he has used, has invited the defeat of his own motion. No self respecting government could accept such a motion, notwithstanding my hon. friend's disclaimer of partisan motives in bringing it forward. I think two or three years ago, in this House, I had occasion to class myself as one of the admirers of my hon. friend who sits on your left hand in this House, Mr. Speaker, one of his few admirers it may be, and I have not yet quite lost admiration for him, notwithstanding that at times I have been somewhat wearied by his extravagant and reckless expressions, notwithstanding that at times I have been somewhat bewildered as to his attitude upon various matters which he brings up for discussion in this House. At the present moment I am in real doubt as to that hon. member's sincerity upon this very question. One is inclined sometimes to look beneath the finished and polished diction, to look under the surface, to search for an ulterior motive; and in the present instance I am in real doubt as to whether the hon. member's motives in bringing forward this resolution are in reality the betterment or improvement of the public service, or whether he was not actuated by the fact that such a resolution as this would give him an opportunity to launch one of those embittered, one of those partisan attacks upon the administration so well suited to my hon. friend's training, practice and temperament. If his motive was really the improvement of the public service, then I think I can safely inform him that he has gone a very bad way about it in placing on the order paper a motion couched in language which may be said to be highly insinuating, if not offensive, a motion which invites its own defeat. If, on the other hand, his object was merely to obtain an opportunity for the delivery of a mortal thrust, a solar plexus blow at the administration, then I think I can inform my hon. friend that he has equally failed in that object. His thrust has fallen far short, his blow has been misdirected, I think probably he has used, in delivering his blow, one of those weapons so well described a few days ago by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), as a weapon with a very blunt point and a very sharp handle. In the discussion of this question, I do not think the government need have any misgiving as to where the wound or injury will be found. Now, I do not desire to occupy the House any longer in pointing out what to my mind, is the utter impossibility of any government accepting this resolution without admitting its own incapacity, its own inability, its own unworthiness. I think I can assure my hon. friend that the government and every member of this House are at all times open to suggestions for the betterment or improvement of the public service, I think I could go further and assure him that any suggestion which he has seen fit to make during the course of his remarks of a practical nature for the improvement of the public service, will receive the most careful consideration of the government and of every member of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose briefly to justify the present or prevailing system for the transaction of public business in this country, and to justify to a very large extent, at all events, the present method and mode of appointments to public office. I say that the present or prevailing system, while it is certainly not perfect or infallible, while I would not suggest that it is a system which is not open to abuse, not open to irregularity, I say it is the best system which has existed in this country under any government, either before or since confederation. I desire to make plain the fact that in addressing myself to the present system—this motion is directed against the prevailing or present system, not against any past system—it is the present system that I propose to justify so far as I am able to do so, not as a perfect system, but as the best system which has yet been devised.

My hon. friend from North Toronto and myself have certain common grounds of agreement with regard to this question, and we have many grounds of disagreement, but there is one ground upon which, I think, we will both agree, and that is

since confederation, at all events up to the year 1896, when there was a change in the administration, there did exist in this country a patronage system, better known as the spoils system, a system founded on the principle that to the victors belong the spoils. Perhaps beyond the year 1896 my hon. friend and I cannot agree. He certainly has spoken to-day under the impression that that system has been continued in full force, vigour and effect to the present time. I take issue with him in that respect. But we are at one in our ideas with regard to the existence of that system from the time of confederation down until the year 1896, and I do not know any hon. member sitting in this House at the present time who would be better able to give to the House a clear idea of what that system really was, how baneful and iniquitous it was and how disastrous it was in its operation as regards the welfare of this country, than the hon. member for North Toronto, who has just addressed the House. That system, which was introduced at confederation, or perhaps before confederation, was, as I have said, purely and simply the spoils system as it had existed in the United States, a system based on the principle that all government favour, all government office, must go to the political friend and political supporter, a system which, in so far as one's political friends were concerned, was an inclusive system and in so far as the public and political opponents were concerned, an exclusive system. I do not know that in its inception away back in the year 1867 it did have such a baneful effect as it had in later years. That was only during the formative period, one might say. At confederation, I think I am correct in saying, we started out perhaps with the idea that we would not have a political patronage system at all, but in two or three years the government, under the leadership of Sir John Macdonald, abandoned these early ideals and adopted a patronage system applicable both to government contracts and supplies of goods to the government and to appointments to public office. That system was certainly continued by the Mackenzie administration. They went out of power in 1878, but if I remember correctly, or if my information is correct, during the last years of the Mackenzie administration a number of appointments were made, some before the government retired and some shortly after it had retired which were promptly annulled, promptly set aside, when the Conservative administration took power. There was a great outcry in the country, there was a good deal of indignation at what was regarded as the rather high handed procedure of the late Sir John Macdonald, and I suppose that in order to appease public sentiment the government of that day appointed a Civil Service Commission to inquire into the whole system and formulate some rules, some policy which should in future be adopted with regard to the appointments of officials, with the view, I submit, of endeavouring to do away with the so-called party patronage system. Well that commission met. That commission made a report in the year 1882 in favour of the appointment of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners for the purpose of taking the appointment of public officials out of the hands of the government, or, at all events, of taking it away from party influence. That commission reported in favour of a system of competitive examination. It made several other useful suggestions and among other things it framed a Civil Service Act. Now, the Conservative government was in power from 1878 to 1896. I hope I am well within the mark when I say that they entirely disregarded the suggestions or recommendations which their own commission had made in their report in the year 1882. I judge from the finding of the Civil Service Commission which was appointed in 1892 that while a Civil Service Act was passed in 1882 the amendments which were enacted from year to year were so enacted with the object of doing away with any restrictions which were in the original Act of 1882 as recommended by the commission which Sir John Macdonald's government had appointed. The commission of 1892 found as follows:

> This Act, although not going so far in its provisions as was recommended by the commission, has been amended from year to year, with one exception from the time of its being placed on the statute-book until the year 1899, and so far as the commissioners have been able to observe, the amendments in general have trended in the direction of the relaxation of the provisions of the original Act, and the consequent prevention of its intention from being carried out.

So that after appointing their commission, after receiving its report containing its recommendations, they deliberately set about year after year, until the year 1889, to relax all the restrictions which their own commission had seen fit to impose. Following that came another commission in the year 1892. That commission was granted full powers of inquiry—just as full, complete and ample powers of inquiry as were granted to the commission appointed by the present government in the year 1907. That commission of 1892 took a great deal of evidence, made a very prolonged investigation and subsequently made a report, and in that report they made a number of excellent suggestions, such as a permanent civil service, removing the Civil Service from political influences, taking from it political appointments, competitive examination, a Board of Civil Service Commissioners, and the like. The year 1892 passed and the Con-

servative administration did nothing, 1893 passed and nothing was done, 1894, 1895, and half of 1896 passed and nothing was done, not a single action taken—only a few unimportant amendments proposed by the present Senator Costigan which, I believe, never went into effect and were never passed by the House.

Now, the hon. member for North Toronto was a prominent member of the Conservative administration during a large portion of the time to which I have alluded. I am unable to find in the public records, I am unable to find in any records to which I have had access, that on any occasion my hon. friend from North Toronto, sitting as minister presiding over the departments over which at various times he did preside, at any time took any steps or any action to consolidate or put into legislation those ideals which he has expressed in the House to-day with regard to the question of political appointment to the public service. But political appointment is only one branch of the spoils system as introduced at confederation and as pursued, managed and brought to perfection during the eighteen years of Conservative rule between 1878 and 1896. Perhaps it was one of the least of the features of the spoils system as it then existed. The spoils system under the Conservatives had as its cardinal principle that where public money was to be spent it must be spent among political supporters. There existed in every department of the Conservative administration what was known as a patronage list, kept under lock and key, and upon it was the name of each government supporter, each true Conservative, with whom the government desired to deal in order that when public money was expended it should reach the pocket of the government supporters to the exclusion of others. In addition to that, they had their middlemen and their commissions and their paid agents. They had all these things during these eighteen years of Conservative rule, all these things which have been so elaborately condemned to-day by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). Now, was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) a party to that? Did he go through the whole course of this patronage system from the time he became minister in 1885 until the resignation of the Conservative government in 1896? I say he did. I say he knew of that unjust and iniquitous system being in full operation in the very department over which he presided, and it was a more iniquitous and a more unfair system than has ever existed in Canada since. The tender system in these Conservative days was a perfect farce; it was the semblance of a tender system without the substance. I believe I can prove from documents which I have before me that while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Marine he knew, he ought to have known anyway, what was going on in his own department. I believe I can show that notwithstanding warnings to my hon. friend from the Auditor General, from his own deputy minister, from his own purchasing agents, he persisted in the course of party patronage which gave all the public money spent in his department to his own political friends and supporters. It is a curious thing to listen at this late date to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) delivering a very able speech from the ideal standpoint as to what this administration should do and as to the form of business administration which Canada should enjoy. I ask my hon. friend the question: Has he any wonder that I, publicly calling myself one of his political admirers, should be somewhat bewildered at the devious course he has seen fit to take during his long experience in public life? I propose to place before the House in concrete form some evidence to support my contention as to the mode of tendering which was in vogue under the Conservative administration. I have only a few of the records, which I take from a return brought down to the House two years ago, and there are only a few because as is well known the records of the Marine and Fisheries Department prior to 1887 were destroyed in the western block fire. The records are, therefore, not nearly as complete as I would like, but such as they are, I propose to read a few of them. Here is a letter dated the 23rd of April, 1891—that was after my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ceased to be minister and when Sir Charles H. Tupper was minister, addressed to Mr. J. U. Gregory, purchasing agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Quebec, and signed by the deputy minister of the department:

'I have to request you to invite tenders from a number of friends of the government in the trade for the provisions required during the coming season. Ask them their prices of provisions for the season, and send their tenders here, mentioning all the different articles you require in the different branches of provisions.

(Signed) WM. SMITH.

I read the following dated 24th of April, 1891, addressed to J. H. Harding, Esq., agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department, St. John, New Brunswick, and signed by Wm. Smith, deputy minister:

'Referring to the matter of provisions required the coming season, I have to request you to invite tenders from a number of friends of the government in this trade, and ask them for prices for provisions and send their tenders here, mentioning all the different articles you require in the different branches of provisions.

(Signed) WM. SMITH.

Then on the 4th of May of the same year, 1891, the following letter appears addressed

to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa, from Mr. Gregory, the agent at Quebec:

Sir,—In conformity with your instructions of the 23rd ult., I have the honour to report that I called upon all the friends of the government in the trade to send in tenders for the provisions required during the coming season, and to better carry out your orders, I consulted the Hon. Thomas McGreevy and Mr. Chateauvert that I might not commit any error in calling upon the tradesmen in question.'

I merely read that to show how hidebound was the system. The agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department was not allowed to use his own discretion as to those who he imagined were Conservative supporters, but to protect himself he called upon two of the sitting members from the province of Quebec to verify his list. The next letter is dated Quebec, the 30th of May, 1891, and it is also from Mr. Gregory, addressed to the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

'Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 27th inst., I have the honour to request that you will please return me the tenders I sent you that I may arrange them in the tabulated form you require. Regarding there being but two grocers, that is due to the fact that there being so few of them friends of the administration. The same can also be said of dry goods merchants. Besides Lucas and Dion, I called upon A. Grenier and A. Carvey. Both refused to tender, giving for reasons that they sold at cheap rates and would not make any reduction in their prices nor fix any rates. I will try to get one of them to do so if possible.'

What a farce. Does any one suppose these two men, both no doubt leading Conservatives in the city, did not know who were asked to tender? Why, it was a wide open door for any kind of collusion and dishonesty that any one had any desire to perpetrate on the government. The next letter is of date March 21, 1894, which brings it down near to the date of the general election, and it is addressed to J. U. Gregory, Quebec, and is from the Department of Marine and Fisheries:

'In reply to your letter of the 27th inst., relating to supplies for steamers, I have to inform you that so far as you have gone your action in inviting tenders for heavier staple supplies is approved. You should, however, consult with Mr. Hearn, M.P., as to who should be asked to tender and also inquire of him who he recommends for light supplies that may be ordered from time to time and that are not of sufficient importance to invite tenders for.'

I point out that there is a distinction in these letters, one formula was prescribed for the heavier purchases and the other for the light purchases, and there is good reason for this. The light purchases may be termed emergency purchases; nobody knows when they will be required, or the quantities in which they will be required, but for the heavy staple purchases which recur annually the system adopted by the old Conservative administration was: We will not trust the agent to do that, but we ourselves will prepare the list of the persons from whom tenders will be asked. And the list is a very circumscribed one, the number is very limited, as I propose to show. In the case of grocery supplies in Quebec I think only two Conservatives were asked to tender for the annual supplies. That was the system of tender which was adopted not only in this department but, I am satisfied, in every other department of the Conservative administration which was a purchaser of goods in any quantity or to any extent. Was my hon. friend a party to it? Did he know about it? Did he administer that pernicious system? I have some public records which I shall lay before the House, in that respect, not all the records I would like to lay before the House, because, as I intimated, the great fire in the western block wiped the slate clear prior to 1887. The first document I submit in order to show the connection of my hon. friend with this iniquitous, this atrocious patronage system which the Conservatives operated in this country for eighteen years, is an extract from the evidence of Mr. Gregory, to be found in volume 8, page 3275, of the evidence taken by Mr. Justice Cassels when conducting his commission of inquiry. It is there stated:

I will produce you letters from the different ministers thanking me for the aid I gave them in carrying on the business, from the very first minister of the Marine and Fisheries Department, a Conservative; from the next minister, a Liberal; Mr. Albert Smith, Mr. McClennan, Mr. Pope, and even one from Foster—to the best of my knowledge, the celebrated Foster.

That is the evidence of Mr. Gregory taken from the official report. I have stated and I desire to state it again that my hon. friend while he did preside over the Department of Marine and Fisheries, was warned by the Auditor General that the system of purchasing supplies in that department was not a proper one. He was warned by his deputy minister that it was an improper system, and by Mr. Gregory, his purchasing agent. I refer to the report of the Auditor General for 1886, and to a communication dated August 31, of that year, as follows:

Sir,—I was recently at Quebec and visited the office of your agent there. I find that the supplies purchased by Mr. Gregory are not obtained under contract, and the prices paid are apparently higher than those which are paid for the same kind of goods purchased for the marine hospital under contract. The difference probably arises from tenders be-

ing called for in the latter case and not in the former.

I beg to request that Mr. Gregory be instructed to call for tenders for all the principal supplies required by him.

That letter must have come in some way or other to the attention of my hon. friend while he was minister in control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Did he regard it? Did he carry out the suggestion? I may say not, as later documents will show.

I shall refer again to the report of the Cassels' Commission at volume 5, page 1394: This language, which I now quote, is the language of Mr. Watson, who was the counsel before the commission, and I do not submit it as evidence, but the documents to which he alludes I do submit. Mr. Watson says:

And the correspondence prior to that in the department, your lordship will recollect as a matter of history, was all destroyed in the fire that took place, so that there is really nothing beyond 1887 that is of record. I find they are all of this nature, and just as an illustration I run over a few of these to show your lordship the character of it.

On May 13, 1887, a letter was directed to the Hon. G. E. Foster, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department, saying:

My Dear Mr. Foster,—I beg to recommend that the firm of Powers & Co., machinists, Halifax, should be put on the list.

It did not say what list, just should be put on the list.

——and receive a share of the work to be done on all kinds of sheet metal work for steamships, lighthouses, etc.

Yours faithfully

(Signed) T. E. KENNY.

I believe at that time he was the sitting member for Halifax. The note on the foot says:

'Put this on the list.'

(Signed) G. E. FOSTER.

Another note—

Done, and letter written to Mr. Kenny.

That letter was written in 1887, a long time ago, my hon. friends may say, but I am only citing it to show that the system was a complete one, a hard and fast system. Conservatives only could supply goods, but in the first place they must be put on a preferred list at the recommendation of a leading Conservative. When they were placed on that list they were entitled to receive tender papers, to go through the form at least of tendering, and in the end to secure, no doubt, a large share of government money.

There is another letter from Charlottetown, P.E.I., on January 6, 1887, directed again to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). This letter says:

I have to acknowledge your kind note of the 15th ult., and beg to say Mr. Lord has not carried out your instuctions, nor for some reason best known to himself will he do so without a peremptory order. As you will see by reference to the December invoices for supplies to the department here which, I have reason to believe, are very large. I regret to take up one moment of your valuable time, knowing it is occupied with much more momentous matters looking towards Washington, but to the party interests here it is of some little importance.

I am, sir,

Yours respectfully,

W. E. DAWSON.

The note on that letter addressed to my hon. friend is:

Ask Mr. Lord if he has followed out the minister's instructions as to patronage, and why Mr. Dawson has not yet received any order.

This shows that according to the minister's view of the system which then existed, the order should go to Mr. Lord, although the amount spoken of was a large amount, or the order to be given was a large order.

I turn now to a letter written by Mr. Gregory in 1887. I am not very positive at what time my hon. friend was transferred from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to some other department, but I think he was there when this letter was written. It is a letter from Mr. Gregory to the deputy minister, as follows:

October 13, 1887.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 11th inst., calling my attention and asking explanation about prices of hay, etc., I have to call your attention to my letter of the 15th February, 1887, and several others on the same subject, supplies. It has long been my humble opinion, and I have no reason yet to change it, that all supplies, of whatsoever nature or kind, should be thrown freely open to public competition and given to the party whose tender would prove most advantageous at fixed prices for one or more years. As the matter has heretofore stood I am ordered to purchase from certain parties who owe this fact entirely to powerful influence; prices, it is true, are fixed for most articles, but it has become the opinion of traders that none but certain friends can get the patronage, whatever political party is in power, Liberal or Conservative. The result is very little competition.

This letter was signed by Mr. Gregory and was evidently laid before the deputy minister. The deputy minister also made a similar recommendation to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who was in charge of that department at that date and who disregarded that, as he had disregarded the intimation from the Auditor General.

On January 31, 1887, a telegram was sent addressed to Wm. Smith, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I wish that as usual, paint, powder, oils, drugs, common stationery for lighthouses, groceries, hardware and dry goods be purchased in Quebec, also provisions at once.

(Sgd.) HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

On the 5th of February, 1887, a somewhat guarded letter was written by Mr. Foster, to the deputy minister at St. John. He says:

In the matter of Sir Hector's telegram, saying to continue purchase of material for lighthouses as usual in Quebec, keeping the amount purchased small. It is not necessary now to lay in a heavy stock. Stationery must be got at the stationery office. Not necessary to buy paints and oils for lighthouses at present.

This was followed by a telegram from Rothesay, dated February 10, 1887, addressed to Mr. W. Smith:

Continue usual patronage, Baudet and Chinic, Quebec, with conditions as per letter sent concerning Sir Hector's request. Inform Caron.

(Sgd.) G. E. FOSTER.

These letters show that the whole system was one recognized by every branch of the government. We have here recommendations by the then Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin. We have also a former minister, Sir Adolphe Caron, associated with the system. I think, therefore, I may fairly say that the system, in all its heinousness and iniquity, was recognized as the basic principle for the transaction of general business by the Conservative administration of those days. I submit another note dated 21st April, 1887, a memo marked 'pressing for the minister':

Please inform me what plan you decide upon Gregory, purchasing supplies as he does not like to purchase now without authority. The best plan in the public interest is to advertise openly for tenders and let all get a chance to state prices for the principal articles.

(Sgd.) WILLIAM SMITH.

The next is a memo for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries relating to the purchase of supplies at Quebec:

Mr. McGreevy has handed in the accompanying list of names, whom he recommends should receive patronage at Quebec in the purchase of supplies. With reference to the first list marked for tenders he recommends that tenders should be asked from the different parties mentioned therein when any articles are required.

With reference to the second list he recommends that these persons should be employed if their services are required or that supplies should be purchased from them without tender, as it would be difficult to make contracts for these articles mentioned in the second list.

(Sgd.) WILLIAM SMITH.

April 22, 1887.

This is marked 'minister approves' and signed W. S. 20th April, 1887.

That approval was given to Mr. McGreevy's list after the Auditor General's letter had been sent the minister and after the agent at Quebec and the deputy minister had reported against the system. Mr. Thomas McGreevy simply sent to the department a list of Conservative supporters and said: Here is the list of those who are to be asked to tender for the larger contracts, and here is a list of those from whom you are to buy the smaller amounts; and the minister marked on that list 'approved' and that minister is my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. THOBURN. Might I put a question on behalf of the new members of this House? Are we to take it for granted that the reading of these letters, written by men who are dead and gone years ago, justifies the deplorable patronage system of the present day?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I trust my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Thoburn) will remain and listen to the balance of my remarks because I think he will very fairly get from them justification for any system which exists to-day.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the hon. gentleman cite any case from the records showing that the Conservative government was buying thousands of dollars of hardware from dentists or letting contracts for masonry work and carpentering to managers of railways?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know that I can find any cases precisely similar to the ones mentioned by my hon. friend, but I have some that come so near them that I think he will admit the principle is the same. The system was by no means discontinued when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) went into another department—I think the Department of Finance. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries he was succeeded by Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, and there can be no doubt that while the iniquitous system flourished to the fullest extent, under the administration of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), it still continued to flourish to the same extent under his successor. Let me quote another instance from page 1295 of Vol. V of the reports of the Cassels Commission. There I find a letter dated 17th March, 1892, saying:

Sir Adolphe Caron recommends the name of Mr. Samuel J. Shaw, hardware merchant,

Quebec, to be placed on the patronage list of the department.

This is signed by C. H. Tupper, who was then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and underneath his signature are the words 'inform agent', signed by the deputy minister.

On the 8th of March, 1892, there is a letter to Mr. Gregory:

I have to instruct you to place the name of Mr. S. J. Shaw, hardware merchant of Quebec, on the list of those entitled to receive the patronage of the department.

That is signed Wm. Smith, deputy minister. Here is a letter written in May, 1892:

Mr. H. F. McDougall, M.P., recommends that the North Sydney 'Herald' receive such advertisements of the department as concern Cape Breton Island, Antigonish and Guysborough.

(Sgd.) C. H. TUPPER.

The note to that is:

Mr. Alexander keep this in mind.

(Sgd.) WM. SMITH,
Deputy Minister.

I find another letter dated 26th January, 1895, coming to the close of the Conservative regime, addressed to the Hon. John Costigan, then the minister of that department:

My Dear Colleague,—I beg to recommend Mr. Octave Plant, tinsmith, 160 St. Johns street, Quebec, as worthy of getting a portion of the patronage of the Marine Department at Quebec. He has always been an ardent supporter of the party.

There is a note at the end of the letter saying: 'That shall be done.'

I submit another document taken from the file, included in the returns to the House, marked, 'provision for steamers.' I submit this to show that right until the eve of the general elections of 1896, this system continued in full force. A few weeks before that general election I find the following memorandum marked 'provisions for steamers:

Last year tenders were initiated by letter for fresh and salt meat, fresh and salt fish, flour, barley, rice, apples and vegetables. Smaller articles than groceries were obtained without tender at the lowest possible prices. This plan worked well.

Mr. Turcotte, M.P., has recommended Napoleon Moffet at Quebec for supplying groceries. Mr. Moffet can have an opportunity of tendering for provisions and staple or heavy articles.

As to small supplies, Mr. Gregory can order a share from Mr. Moffet, if approved.

(Sgd.) WM. SMITH.

In the margin there is the following note:

Carry this out again. Explain to Mr. Turcotte.

(Sgd.) C. H. T.

And in the margin beneath there is still another note:

Yes, but ask Mr. Gregory to consult Mr. Hearne, M.P., as well.

(Sgd.) C. H. T

This last letter regarding Sir Hibbert Tupper's administration, is the one I referred to a moment ago, dated 20th, 1896, when he was Solicitor General:

Liberal-Conservative Committee Rooms,
Pictou, April 28, 1896.

My Dear Sir Hibbert,—The central committee would direct your attention to the rumour that the steamship 'Stanley' may go again this year to Charlottetown to be fitted out, and would ask you to use your influence to hold her at Pictou and have her fitted out here this year.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) J. A. GORDON,
Secretary.

Then there is beneath that letter this note:

Please prevent this. In my day this work was done at Pictou. It should not go to a Grit county now.

(Sgd.) C. H. T.

That is the principle upon which the business of the administration was carried on. And what did it lead to? I have here such a cumbrous file of documents relating to this matter that I cannot hope to place all before the House. Perhaps if I quote a few that will be sufficient. For instance, I submit a letter dated 6th April, 1896—almost at the time of the change of government. This is addressed to Hon. John Costigan, now senator, who at that time presided over the department.

My Dear Costigan,—I troubled you last year about a small contract for paints in favour of J. P. Dodds & Co. They received a small share of your department's patronage. It is but natural that they look for an increase of business with you as they lead the trade here. As I told you last year, Mr. Taylor, who is actually in possession of the whole concern, is one of us in the most intimate sense of the words good, donator, sterling and honest. He will never deceive your department. I am invited every week, I may say, to send recommendations to you for friends. The present is, as you know, the sole exception to my uniform answer of refusal, because I attach a great importance to it.

Yours truly,
ARTHUR GAUVREAU.

Further on in the documents you find that contracts for paints and oils were awarded and went to J. P. Dodds & Company, just as requested by Mr. Gauvreau. I find a striking instance of the employment of the middle-man and a man who, I think, was not in the trade. I refer to this because of the question asked me by my hon. friend from York, New Brunswick,

(Mr. Crocket). It is a long story, but there are parts which, at all events, I can lay before the House to some advantage. It is in connection with a man, probably well known to my hon. friend, Mr. J. H. Hamilton. Mr. Hamilton lived, I think, at St. John. He was at one time in the dry goods business, but quit the firm of which he had been a member and subsequently became a middle-man as between the government and another firm. Positive instructions were given time and again, by a very prominent man in New Brunswick—none other than Mr. J. Douglas Hazen—to send orders through Mr. Hamilton. I will talk about this Hamilton transaction just for a few moments. The first document I submit is the following:

Ottawa, March 8, 1892.

Hon. C. H. Tupper,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,

In case your department at St. John find it necessary to purchase any dry goods there, I beg to recommend that a fair share be given to Messrs. Welsh, Hunter & Hamilton, who are staunch and loyal friends of yours.

Yours faithfully,
J. DOUGLAS HAZEN.

The next document is as follows:

March 18, 1892.

J. H. Harding, Esq.,
Agent of Marine, St. John, N.B.

Sir,—I have to inform you that Mr. J. D. Hazen, M.P., has recommended that a fair share of the patronage of the department in the purchase of dry goods required by your agency be given to Messrs. Welsh, Hunter & Hamilton. of St. John, N.B.

I am sir, your obedient servant,
WILLIAM SMITH.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. member say that this firm were not in the trade?

Mr. GUTHRIE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) will allow me, he will see what I am coming to. I say he was not in the trade when he got the order.

Mr. CROCKET. That firm was in the trade.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The hon. member will see from the letters I shall quote that what I say is accurate. The next letter is one from Mr. J. Douglas Hazen addressed to Hon. C. H. Tupper, and dated January 3, 1893:

Yours of 31st ulto., with memo concerning the purchase of dry goods in St. John duly received. It says that Mr. Harding has been directed to purchase supplies in St. John for the North Shore of N.B. when required instead of buying them in Newcastle and some of them might be purchased from Welsh, Hunter & Hamilton, before any tenders are invited. Is it asking too much to request you to instruct your officer in St. John to purchase all of those supplies from Welsh, Hunter & Hamilton; provided they will supply them at reasonable prices. I am satisfied they will do so. I would suggest in the future that you decide upon what is a fair price to pay for cottons, flannels, towelling and duck required at the lighthouses—

That becomes important in view of further correspondence.

—and divides the purchases at the price you determine upon between Macaulay Brothers & Company, and Welsh, Hunter and Hamilton, This arrangement will be very satisfactory, and I am satisfied the interests of the department will not suffer.

Yours faithfully,
J. D. HAZEN.

The next letter is dated February 14th, 1893, and is addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

You wrote me on the 20th instant that, acting upon my recommendation, you had instructed your agent at St. John to purchase drygoods, supplies, to as great an extent as possible from Welsh, Hunter and Hamilton at St. John. Since then a change has taken place in the firm, and I now request that you wire direct your agent to purchase from Geo. H. McKay, giving the order to James H. Hamilton, who is now associated with him.

Yours faithfully,
J. D. HAZEN.

The following letter dated 17th February, 1893, from William Smith to J. H. Harding also appears:

You are now instructed to purchase the supplies from Mr. Geo. H. McKay, giving the order to James H. Hamilton, who is associated with Mr. McKay.

Now, how did this employment of Mr. Hamilton work out? I am not going to read all the intervening letters between 1893 and 1895; there are many of them but they are all pretty much to the same effect. But in 1895, Mr. P. Harty, inspector of the Marine and Fisheries Department made an inspection, and in his report he said:

While on this inspection tour I obtained samples of grey cotton, cotton ticking, grey flannel and linen towelling purchased for the season's supplies, which samples are hereto attached. The prices charged are excessive and the quality of goods obtained are not of the best kind. The goods were supplied by Mr. J. H. Hamilton, St. John, I believe he is not in the business but procures the goods from wholesale houses, I presume, in the city.

And in the same report very unfavourable comment is made concerning another firm, Messrs. J. A. Estey & Company, who had been placed upon the patronage list also at the request of Mr. J. Douglas Hazen for the supply of soaps to the department. And, notwithstanding the adverse report of their own inspectors in May, 1895, in subsequent years further orders were as regularly sent as before to Mr. Hamilton and to Messrs. Estey & Company at the

request of Mr. Hazen. I have here about a hundred letters relating to these matters, but it is not necessary to place more of them on the records of the House. But here is a letter with regard to the meat supply in New Brunswick. I read this because there seems to have been a real kick by some Conservatives in regard to the supply of meat. First there is a letter addressed by Hon. Charles Hibbert Tupper to J. Douglas Hazen, dated 28th December, 1892, stating that at his request, Mr. McGonnigle had been placed on the patronage list. Then there is a long letter addressed to Mr. Costigan, dated May 14th, 1892, which I will read. The letter is addressed to the Hon. John Costigan, acting Minister of Marine, Ottawa, and is dated May 12th, 1893:

I wish to say that I have been engaged in the fresh meat and grocery business for over twenty years, I have had the honour of meeting you on two occasions, though perhaps you cannot recall me now. I have supported the Liberal-Conservative party since 1878, from conviction. Immediately after that election, Sir Leonard Tilley instructed the Department of Public Works and the Fisheries to give me a proportional share of the supplies required for government vessels.

Later on I was recommended by C. E. Everett and Hon. Geo. E. Foster. I have got very little in the past, in proportion to what others got, through the efforts of the wire pulling here, and there are none among them more deserving than myself from a party standpoint. I wish to inform your honour that the Marine Department has asked the friends of the party in the meat business to tender for the supplies. Messrs. Dean & O'Neal, two very selfish gentlemen, cut the price down, so that there is nothing in it, and there they have recourse to furnishing an inferior article. I was side-tracked last year on one-half cent per pound, and I have put in a tender this year for 8 cents for beef, which is a very moderate price. I have not heard whether my tender was lowest or not. If those men go below that, they will resort to boodling, as they have done in the past, by cutting the better portions of the beef off and sending the inferior. I did not anticipate anything like that when I tendered, though it was done to my own knowledge.

My main object in troubling you with this communication is to inform you how the matter of supply is regarded by those who tender, including myself, that is that the meat supply should be equally divided amongst us, by the department here. It would be better for all concerned to give more general satisfaction. I cherish the hope that your honour will favourably consider that view.

I am your obedient servant,
(Signed) TIMOTHY DONOVAN.

So the matter went on in St. John in regard to the meat supply. But Mr. Donovan was a hard man evidently to satisfy.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

On June 9, 1903, another letter is addressed to the Hon. Mr. Costigan:

I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your kind favour of May 29th in reply to mine with reference to supplying the steamer 'Lansdowne' with fresh meat and provisions. At the time I wrote you the tenders for the supply were not received, but have been since, and the tender of Thomas Dean, for six and a half cents per pound for beef has been accepted. Mr. Dean's acquisition to the party is of very recent date. He and all belonging to him were Liberals. He has a brother-in-law in King's county who votes for Mr. Foster, and by that means he was asked to tender for the supply. The first year his figure was 10 cents per lb. and he said he could not do it less. Mr. Godsoe and myself got it that year, our figures were 9 cents. He dropped six and a half cents per pound and yet no change in the price of beef. The others and myself are put out at that price, for beef fit to be furnished to that vessel rates here from 7 cents to 8¼ cents. About half the beef that Mr. Dean furnished on her first trip was returned by the captain. I saw it, and it was the class of meat that would be furnished to the almshouse or to the Kingston penitentiary under contract.

Mr. HUGHES. He is a Liberal.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Not according to Mr. Hazen, he was put on at Mr. Hazen's request. Further, he says:

This spring I furnished a small portion of supplies to the 'Curlew' while she was being repaired, but when she was going away Mr. Dean got the supply of it. I have spoken to the city members, Messrs. Hazen and McLeod. Mr. Hazen asked me what would be done in the matter, and I said to divide the supply equally between us at 8 cents. Mr. Hazen said that would be his view and would write you with a view to having it done.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) TIMOTHY DONOVAN.

That letter is addressed to the Hon. John Costigan, at that time Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Conservative administration. I do not know the politics of any of these men, I assume they were at that time pretty straight.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say to the hon. gentleman that several of the names he has mentioned as seeking patronage at that time from the Conservative government are now obtaining the same patronage from the Liberal party, and are Liberals.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If they are, they are obtaining it by fairer means. Then Mr. Dean must have been asked to explain, and his explanation is as follows:

St. John, June 24, 1893.

Sir,—Yours of the 22nd to hand regarding meat supplied by me on June 3. My man sent some beef through mistake that did not belong to me. When I found the mistake I

had it corrected. About meat, on the 15th the carcass of beef weighed 600 lbs., so you see it could not be so thin as represented. There are many of my friends who like a larger margin on their goods than I do, and I think in all probability through them the complaints are raised. About the cut meat the day I sent it was a day when fresh quarters of beef are not to be had. Some of our lukewarm Conservatives who modestly sold themselves for a part of the steamers supplies feel quite sore.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) T. DEAN.

Then comes a further letter to Mr. Donovan, after a great many letters seem to have passed between Mr .Costigan and Mr. Hazen. Here is a letter addressed to Mr. Hazen, I do not know how it got on the files. It is dated St. John, West End, March 2, 1896, and is signed by Timothy Donovan:

Dear Friend,—I received a note from the agent of the minister of marine here stating that the department had agreed to allow 7 cents per lb. for all kinds of fresh meat furnished to government steamers. I wish to say that is a starvation price, no good meat can be furnished at that price.

Later on:

I asked that the department allow 9 cents for all meats which is a fair price, $1.50 per barrel for potatoes, and 60 cents a bushel for all other vegetables, price paid last year, and to divide the trips equally among the friends by giving to each one what the boat would want for the trip. That will give satisfaction all round. If you will please suggest to the minister the advisability of carrying out the above you will please all the friends here, and I will bless you with the only blessing I can give, the full power of my larynx and energetic hustling at the polls.

Faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) TIMOTHY DONOVAN

And so the letters go, fifty or a hundred more, which I do not need to read to the House. My only object is to show to what extent the evil of patronage had permeated the whole business system of the late Conservative administration, and how that evil patronage system existed under the very eye, and management, and control of my hon. friend from North Toronto, and he never raised his voice in protest. Now, Sir, it is well known that when the change of government took place in 1896, there were conditions existing in Canada which called for treatment at the hands of the in-coming administration. I do not say that the government may not be open to some criticism for having neglected, during a number of years, the question of patronage, and the mode in which goods were supplied to the government. They carried out the old Conservative system far too long, in my estimation. But this may be offered, I take it, by way of excuse, by way of palliation, that the system was inherited by them, they did not make it, they did not inaugurate it, it was there, operated by the Conservatives. They had before them the report of the Civil Service Commission of 1892 saying that, so far as the commissioners were able to find, the business was being fairly well conducted, the officials were performing their duties; and two departments in particular, the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Militia Department, which subsequently came in for some vigorous treatment, were specially mentioned by the commissioners in 1892 as being well conducted. The government, having a great many very important measures to deal with, might well overlook the question of patronage, for a few years, at all events. The government had, in the first place, to look after the condition of the country—trade stagnant and declining, markets cut off and new markets to be sought, tariffs to be revised, the gold excitement in the west to be provided for, the South African war, the construction of the Transcontinental railway, the establishment of the two new provinces—these were works of great magnitude which the government had to undertake, and for some years no doubt the government did allow the old Conservative system to remain in the various departments in connection with the transaction of public business. There is this also to be said, that the government, by its own motion, unasked by any one, undertook to remedy the defect, and after having found a remedy, has been the first government, so far as I have been able to find, in Canada that ever applied a remedy with any idea of effecting a cure.

In the spring of 1907 the government certainly became aware there were irregularities, that there was wrong-doing in connection with some of the departments. Whether that knowledge was gained by the government on account of disclosures in the Public Accounts Committee or not I cannot say, but certainly it is that in the month of May, 1907, the government, of its own motion, appointed a commission of investigation, not only into the circumstances of the Civil Service, but also to look into the methods adopted by the various departments. The powers given to the commissioners were of the widest, just as full and wide as were the powers given to the commission of 1892, but there is this difference between the two commissions. The commission of 1892 deliberately refused to examine into the business transactions of the various departments, stating in the first page of their report that they refused to do so, while the commission of 1907 deliberately set about such an examination, and I think it is well that they did set about it. During the following year the commission reported that certain abuses existed. I need not go over them; they

are all familiar to the hon. members of this House. That commission made certain specific recommendations, many of which recommendations have since been carried into effect. Some of the recommendations it made I may refer to briefly. In the first place, it made suggestions as to the mode of dealing with estimates by committees of the House of Commons, proposing that the English system be adopted. I believe that that question is one which in all probability will come up at a very early date. It is a question which should come up because I am satisfied that a better system could be adopted with regard to estimates and the expenditure of money, not in the departments, but in this House and in the committees of this House. A second recommendation was that stringent measures should be taken to suppress those abuses which they found existed in one or two of the departments and to punish the offenders. The government has taken action in that regard. It introduced an amendment to the Criminal Code to meet the views of the commissioners, amendments similar to those to be found in the English Act called 'An Act for the prevention of corruption' passed in 1906 by the imperial House. The next recommendation of the commissioners was for the removal of the Civil Service from political influences. The first step ever taken in this country in this regard was taken by this government within the last year or eighteen months. The commission recommended the appointment of a Civil Service Board. That has been established, the inside service has been placed under that board and I for one look forward to the day, and at no distant time, when, I believe, that Act will be made applicable to the major portion of the outside service. That commission further recommended the abolition of the patronage lists in the various departments.

Mr. CROCKET. Has that been carried out?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes. I am going to say that in so far as it is possible to carry out the recommendation in that respect it has been carried out and there is no patronage list, either under the name of a patronage list or under any other name, existing today in any department of the present government.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to hear a minister say that.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Perhaps you will hear that too. All the recommendations of a practical kind that could be carried out have been carried out by the government. We have now just such a service, just such a business administration as this commission suggested. But, further than that, we had the report of Mr. Justice Cassels. His recommendations were largely a reiteration of the suggestions of the previous commission with one addition. Mr. Justice Cassels suggested that in addition to the other recommendations the government should establish a purchasing board which should purchase all the supplies of the different departments of the government. That board has not been constituted. That recommendation has not been carried out. It may be in the future, but another system has been instituted, and one which I think is giving entire satisfaction, or has, at all events, given entire satisfaction up to the present time. That is the appointment of responsible persons to act as purchasing agents in each of the great purchasing or spending departments. Whether a board of three, or four, or five individuals with authority to make all the purchases would be better than one, two or three individual purchasing agents for the various departments is a matter upon which there may be two opinions. Personally I prefer the form adopted by the government and to-day in the Department of Railways and Canals you will find that every five cents worth of goods purchased in that department, the largest spending department in the administration, is purchased through a single man, Mr. Lavoie, the purchasing agent. What is the principle adopted? Let me say, in the first place, that about a year ago positive instructions were given for the abolition of the patronage list. I can only take the word of Mr. Lavoie, who appears to be a most upright and intelligent man and he assures me, and other officials assure me on their honour, that no such thing exists in that department to-day, and that no favour is shown to Liberal or Conservative with respect to any purchase that may be made. That is the principle upon which purchases are made and the only purchases which are not made in that way in the great department of Railways and Canals are what might be termed emergency purchases, because you cannot devise a system which can provide, in the case of a broken lock or a broken pane of glass, that you shall go out and get competitive prices.

Mr. DANIEL. How about advertising in the newspapers?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am coming to that, too, and I think I will be able to satisfy my hon. friend upon that. But, in so far as the supplies required in that department are concerned, the money expended for supplies is all expended under a system of public tender. There was a recommendation which I am going to place before the House which has been fully carried out, except in one particular, a recommendation by Mr. Butler, who until recently was a very able officer of the present government. He stated on the 27th Novem-

ber, 1908, about eighteen months ago, in a letter addressed to Mr. Pottinger, the general manager of the Intercolonial railway:

Ottawa, Ont., November 27, 1908.

Sir,—The question of purchasing supplies for the works under your control has been receiving the careful attention of the honourable the minister, and he has decided that the so-called patronage list, which, so far as this department is concerned, has hitherto embraced a large list of responsible firms that have been recommended to the government, should be revised to the end that the officers in charge shall have in their possession a full list of reputable manufacturers, wholesale merchants and representatives of foreign houses, from whom quotations may be secured on any supplies required for the public service.

You will be good enough to make up a list of firms from the list you now have, and that of any other firms of good standing, irrespective of politics, who will hereafter be asked for bids on any material that may be needed for each kind or class of supplies you have been in the habit of buying, to cover all the requirements of the several departments.

All large contracts will, as heretofore, be dealt with by public tender and advertisement, either through certain newspapers, by poster, or by circular letter, as may be found most suitable, having regard to the cost of the work and expense of advertising.

This is a portion that I ask the House to note:

In dealing with large quantities of supplies such as are involved in the store tenders of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways, I am inclined to think it is desirable that tenders should be called for by public advertisement in such newspapers as will likely reach the parties interested, or in the Official Gazette, so as to get the greatest competition possible.

If you have a limited patronage list in existence, anywhere in your service, it is to be done away with, and supplies of a suitable quality are to be secured at the best prices possible, irrespective of any political consideration.

I am, yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) M. J. BUTLER.
Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the date of that?

Mr. GUTHRIE. November 27, 1908. That is the system that has been utilized since these instructions were issued by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways and Canals. I have a few samples of the manner of proceeding. One of the largest purchases by the department is certainly in the matter of hardware. How is that gone about? In the first place, the hardware requisition is not made out in Ottawa, but it comes from Moncton, stating what hardware will be required——

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. gentleman has made great assertions here, and I would ask him can he give us some case where the government or the country has suffered on account of the patronage system under the Conservatives. He has shown that the patronage system existed, but I want him to show me a case which will show that the government suffered by paying a high price for any article.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Does the hon. member mean in recent years.

Mr. CROSBY. I don't mean recent years. I know about that myself.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then I would refer the hon. member to the debates of the session of 1891, and the proceedings before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. CROSBY. If the hon. gentleman has the evidence before him I would ask him to name one single instance.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I could, for example, mention the Langevin Block and the Curran Bridge.

Mr. CROSBY. That was tender and contract and not patronage.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have only a short while more to speak before six o'clock, and I cannot go into every instance of this kind that happened under the Conservative government. I have mentioned one or two cases to the hon. member and I have referred him to the documents where he can get further information if he wants to. In calling for tenders for hardware the requisition comes from Moncton, where the list is made, it is revised there, it is again revised in Ottawa by the deputy minister, and it then goes to the purchasing agent, who has a general knowledge of the requirements of the department, and of the prices of the various articles. The call for tenders is not published in the newspapers. It has been thought by the various officers of the department that a better system than newspaper publication is to ask for tenders, send the specifications to every reputable dealer whose name appears in the directories, and that includes practically every man in the trade from western Ontario to the sea. I believe dealers living west of Ontario are not notified because probably freight rates would prohibit them from competing. The order for hardware is a very large one and there are a great many people in Canada engaged in manufacturing and wholesaling and retailing the different articles required. The hardware specification was directed last year to about 360 prominent firms. I have a list here which I have not time to read, but it can be analysed by any one who wishes to. I notice that there are on the list about 60 firms in the city of Montreal, nine or ten in Halifax, 20 or 25 in St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Please read these for St. John?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The St. John list includes: J. & D. R. Burpee, T, McAvity & Sons, The James Robertson Co., Robertson, Foster, & Smith, Estey & Co., James Pender & Co., the Josiah Fowler Co., the Barrie Supply Co., the Maritime Art Glass Co., Campbell Brothers, the Portland Rolling Mills Co., Linton & Sinclair Co., the Imperial Oil Co., the Canadian Oil Co., Ltd., Gandy & Allison, the Maritime Nail Co., the Canadian Fairbanks Co., the McClary Manufacturing Co., D. Campbell & Co. Scattered through the list there are one or two more but the names are not collected under the heads of cities, and so I cannot give them.

Mr. DANIEL. Then I may inform the hon. gentleman that the largest hardware firm in the city of St. John is not mentioned.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Perhaps it is mentioned in some other part of the list.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. W. H. Thorne & Co.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think I have come across the name of W. H. Thorne & Co., whether in the hardware schedule or in some of the others. But at all events when you take about 360 representative hardware firms from western Ontario to Halifax you have about covered the whole ground, and every one of these firms is sent a printed specification and a form of tender and notification is given them that they are entitled to tender for the whole or any part of the list.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the paper which the hon. gentleman has in his hands a return brought down to parliament?

Mr. GUTHRIE. No. It is the result of an inquiry of mine to the purchasing agent asking for the names of the firms who were asked to tender for the goods last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will have no objection to place it on the table of the House?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Not the slightest.

Mr. CROCKET. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say this list was furnished to the purchasing agent or to Mr. Pottinger from Ottawa?

Mr. GUTHRIE. As I understand it the purchasing agent at Ottawa goes to the directories and compiles a list of all the leading firms in these particular trades, irrespective entirely of politics or the dictation of any individual.

Mr. CROCKET. I thought I heard the hon. gentleman say that the list which was formerly in vogue at Ottawa had been passed down to Mr. Pottinger with instructions to add to it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. No. I think my hon. friend has reference to the letter of Mr. Butler to Mr. Pottinger saying that if he had such a list he was to add to it the names of all reputable firms. I submit that this list brings into full force and effect all the advantageous points in connection with the tender system. It may be argued that the tenders should be advertised in the public press and Mr. Butler has suggested in his letter to Mr. Pottinger that they might as an alternative be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' but the people do not look for such advertisements in the 'Canada Gazette,' at the present time, and I do not think that course would be of much use. But if it became known throughout Canada that such advertisements would appear in the 'Canada Gazette,' then I suppose prominent business men and contractors might search its columns. Now, I take the next item, the item of lumber.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. gentleman know if any tenders have been called for under the new system he has referred to?

Mr. GUTHRIE. After the abolition of the patronage list I understand that specifications were forwarded to all the names on this list. I am informed by Mr. Lavoie, and I believe what he says, that in every case the lowest tender was accepted irrespective altogether of the political leanings of the tenderer.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think there is a Conservative amongst the whole lot of the names the hon. gentleman read from the city of St. John.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I am assured by a friend from the province of New Brunswick that this is a thoroughly representative list of the hardware and oil men of the city, and so in regard to Montreal, and so in regard to Toronto. I know more about Toronto than I do about St. John, and I know that on this Toronto list there appear the names of Rice, Lewis & Co., Samuel Benjamin & Co., Howland & Sons, and others, many of whom are Conservatives.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. member read the names on that list from Halifax?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The names from Halifax are: A. N. Bell & Co., Austin Brothers, Wm. Robertson & Son, Cragg Brothers & Co., Kelly's Ltd., J. E. Albro, W. B. Arthur. These are all that are grouped together in the list but there may be others here and there. At all events I will lay the list on the table and my hon. friend can see.

Mr. CROSBY. Is that the new list you are reading from?

Mr. GUTHRIE. This is the last list upon which tenders were asked as I understand.

Mr. CROSBY. Will you read the list before that?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I have not got it.

Mr. CROSBY. I wish you would read it.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Well, if I have not got it I cannot read it, and I have had enough papers to bring here without thinking of bringing every paper which the hon gentleman might think of asking for. At any rate, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) should not suggest wrong-doing; if he has anything to say let him say it.

Mr. CROSBY. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie)—

Mr. GUTHRIE. I must appeal for order. I want to get through and I have been delayed.

Mr. CROSBY. If my hon. friend cannot answer the question he may go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I now take up the question of lumber. This is also a very large item in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals. The advertisements for lumber supplies are given in the following way: Half sheet posters calling for tenders accompanied by specifications are conspicuously posted at every station on the Intercolonial railway between Montreal and Halifax, and at every station in Prince Edward Island. In the province of Quebec, whole sheet posters printed in English and French, are posted and also the specifications.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that done in the case of hardware?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think not. That specification and notice is likewise mailed to over 200 prominent lumber dealers throughout eastern Canada. The list of lumber dealers who were asked to tender in regard to the last purchases of lumber embraced something over 200 names. I am not familiar with the names or political leanings of the firms who were asked to tender, but I shall lay the list on the table. This list, I believe, has been prepared likewise directly on the instructions of Mr. Lavoie without any dictation from anybody, without any patronage list and without the slightest reference to the political leanings of the parties to whom invitations to tender have been sent. When these tenders are received they are kept sealed in accordance with the order in council passed a year ago last December. They are opened in the presence of the minister and one other chief official, or, in the absence of the minister, in the presence of two chief officials of the department in accordance with order in council. In every instance the lowest tender has been accepted, irrespective of what the politics of the tenderer might be. But there is this to be said, that the quality and quantity must be up to standard in every instance. This lumber, as received, is all inspected before it goes into stock. That inspector's report goes to Mr. Lavoie, the purchasing agent, and it is checked over with his list. The result is that the purchasing agent in Ottawa can tell you precisely the condition of stores as regards hardware, lumber, ties, or any other commodity in which the railway deals at his office in Ottawa up to two or three days before the time when he is asked for the information. In the case of lumber, the inspector is Mr. Wm. Powell, a brother of Mr. H. M. Powell, formerly a Conservative member of this House. He has seen this list, but I do not know whether or not he has taken any exception to it. That is the mode in which every dollar's worth of lumber used by the department was purchased last year.

In regard to the purchase of ties, the purchasing agent is in sole control of the situation. He receives his requisition as in the former case, he goes over his requisitions carefully, draws his advertisements and specification and the advertisement for ties is posted in every railway station on the Intercolonial railway, just as in the case of lumber. I do not think it appears in any newspaper. Again, it is sent to a large number of individual lumbermen and contractors, accompanied of course by the specification. When the ties are received, they are all inspected as to quality and quantity before they are accepted. In each instance the lowest tender is accepted, and perhaps as one evidence of the way the system is working out, I may say that, out of a large number of tenders received and accepted last year, 41,000 ties were supplied by tender by Mr. F. W. Sumner, at Moncton, the Conservative candidate at the last general election, he being the lowest tenderer. I merely state that to show that the system now in force is to ask all parties to tender if they desire.

A somewhat different course is pursued with regard to the purchase of machinery. That is rendered necessary on account of the quality of goods required. Some machinery can only be purchased from single firms, some is covered by patent and can only be made by certain firms; but any ordinary machinery is purchased by direct appeal to the manufacturer. No middleman is employed. Manufacturers' agents are consulted, of course, that is done in regard to every trade, but the appeal or invitation to tender is sent direct to the firm. The specification accompanies the invitation, and I have here a list of machinery manufacturers who were asked to tender for the machinery purchased last year. That list embraces from 75 to 100 names.

covering practically the continent of America, not being confined to the Dominion of Canada.

Tenders for bar iron and steel are treated a little differently again, the specification being made out according to requisition received in Moncton and the leading firms in the production of bar iron all being asked to tender. There are nine on the list, I do not know their political leanings. These nine firms were all asked for prices on bar iron and the lowest tender was accepted. So with the tenders for paints and colours, brushes and brooms and rubber goods, all of which I shall lay on the table.

My hon. friend from New Brunswick asked whether some professional man in Moncton was supplying hardware to the government. I think he has reference to supplies of the Canadian Gutta Percha Company.

Mr. CROCKET. I refer to Dr. Murray.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Supplied by Dr. Murray. Last year the purchases ran something like $12,000. If the hon. member will turn up the Auditor General's Report, he will find in the items included in the list of purchases that the purchases from Dr. Murray consisted of the manufacture of rubber and gutta percha and the largest amount of them were hose. It happens that Dr. Murray is the agent for the Canadian Gutta Percha Company for the province of New Brunswick. The tender was received direct from Dr. Murray. His was the lowest tender received and he obtained the order. He advertises himself and states he is the agent of the Canadian Gutta Percha Company for New Brunswick, and I believe that in all its parts that is a thoroughly Conservative company. That is the explanation I have received in regard to these purchases, and I may tell my hon. friend, although he is a member of the legal profession, that if he wishes to tender for hardware or oil and is the lowest tenderer he will undoubtedly receive the order, just as Mr. Murray did.

Mr. CROCKET. You can count me out.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I submit also the list of those who were asked to tender for cement, including, I think, all the cement firms in Canada. So for fencing, including, I fancy, all the manufacturers in Canada, so for tinware, so for passenger coach wheels, so for axles, fire brick, oak lumber, hard pine lumber and electric wiring. The supply of coal, I think, is about the only other large order for goods which the Department of Railways and Canals give. That supply is dealt with on a different principle. I do not know that it is altogether a correct one but it is a fair one. Coal mining is one of the native industries of the maritime provinces, and it is the desire of the government to give all a fair share of the patronage. Instead of calling for tenders the government arbitrarily fixes the price of coal at so much per ton and divides its orders among the different companies, and those companies which will not contract at that fixed price do not receive the order. As a rule, however, the orders are distributed among all the collieries in the maritime provinces. But leaving out coal and taking all the other large purchases of that department, they are all controlled by a single man. If there be any wrong-doing or abuse or irregularity, you can put your finger on the responsible party, Mr. Lavoie, the purchasing agent.

Mr. CROCKET. I thought the hon. gentleman said the government fixed the price. Does he mean the government or the Intercolonial Railway Commission?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I fancy the department fixes it.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the price?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not know the prices down there, but with the exception of coal everything is bought on a system of fair and open competiton. There is no patronage list, no spoils system. The virus condemned by my hon. friend from North Toronto has not entered into that department at all events. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they can suggest any improved system. Any improvement which they can offer will be warmly welcomed, I am sure, by the government, and my hon. friend who presides over the Department of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham).

Mr. CROCKET. Does that system apply to any other department?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes. It is argued that a purchasing board can do better than a purchasing agent. In England they have a purchasing board. The system is a good one, but it is the most expensive in any part of the world. It may be fairly argued that an individual, trained in a department, knowing its requirements, year by year becoming more familiar with the amounts required and the prices—it may be fairly argued that such an individual can do better in the interests of the department, can judge better what is required, and what prices should be paid, than any three or four gentlemen constituting a board. I think that is the view the government takes because the various departments are having each its own purchasing agent. Under the British system there is tremendous waste. There is an annual sale of the government surplus goods—goods purchased far in excess of the requirements. And I am not now talking of war or naval supplies,

which are always purchased in excess of requirements, but of general supplies. The British government has each year a large supply of excess stores which will not keep and has to auction these off, and goods which cost $2 or $3 a pound have been actually sold at three pence a pound. That is a statement which has been made to me by an English official. It may be that a better system can be devised than the one we are following. If so let us have it. Let me turn to the Marine and Fisheries Department, which came so much under fire. In that department there is no patronage list whatever. That list was abolished, as Mr. Justice Cassels mentions in his report, about October, 1908. Furthermore, the instructions of the minister are that no patronage list shall be permitted to exist; that all goods shall be bought in the open market. The department advertises in the newspapers, except in the case of small supplies which cannot be bought by tender. These small supplies, which are called emergency supplies, are purchased by the agent in the open market, at what he considers a fair price; and if he be an honest man, he will get the lowest price. You have to trust some one. All the lighthouse supplies, fog signal service and ship supplies are now purchased after advertising for tenders in the newspapers, and the contracts given to the lowest tenderers.

Mr. LALOR. Is that advertising done in the same way?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I intend touching upon that if I can get time. If anything goes wrong in the present system, who is responsible? Mr. Doutre, the purchasing agent, says that he is, and I certainly think he would be. A more intelligent, capable officer it would be hard to find. He has been a long time in the department, he knows offhand the market prices of the goods he has to deal with and he cannot be fooled, though of course he might be particeps criminis, but nothing short of actual dishonesty can cause loss to the department as at present managed.

The Department of Justice controls all the supplies for the various penitentiaries of Canada. The patronage list in that department, if it ever existed, has been abolished, and it has its purchasing agent. This is the first year that system has been put in force, and we do not know what the result will be, but the department has done away with the political pull and is making its purchases in the open market. The same can be said of the Department of the Interior. That is not a large purchasing department, but the Indian branch of it does make considerable purchases. Every dollar's worth purchased by that branch, except in the case of the very distant reserves, is purchased after advertising in the newspaper for tenders. The goods purchased are principally agricultural implements, provisions, clothing and cattle. In the case of some of the reserves, which are very distant there are but two companies which can tender—Revillon Bros., and the Hudson Bay Company, and one or the other gets the contract. But in the case of the nearer reserves there are public advertisements and there is no patronage list, and the lowest tenderer gets the order. If hon. members opposite can suggest a better system, let them do so. I was greatly disappointed when I found that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) after condemning the system as vigorously as he did, after showing what evil results might follow, suggested no improvement, no way out of the difficulty. The right hon. the Prime Minister asked him what he would do but he made no suggestion. I think that the government may well be congratulated on the advance they have made in the past two or three years and the alacrity and courage they have shown in acting on the recommendations of the two commissions. Other commissions were issued from time to time—one in 1880, one, a commission of ministers of the Crown, in 1889 or 1890, and another in 1892. All these commissions made their recommendations and suggestions; and, no doubt, had these been carried out at the time it would have done immeasurable good. But every one of them was neglected, the abuses were allowed to continue until they culminated in the revelations in the Public Accounts Committee of this House in 1891. This government has been, at all events courageous it may be at the price of political support and in the face of political friends. It has adopted a new system, as I have shown; and the patronage system as it existed until two years ago exist no longer in the various departments of this government. We all know that difficulties exist—and how to remedy them I do not know—in the outside service in regard to political appointments. How can these be remedied? I trust that the Civil Service Act will be extended in the near future to the outside service. But even then, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, there will still be some 15,000 to 20,000 people to whom it will not apply—the day labourer, the casual employee, and all these men may well be classed as belonging to a patronage system. But how are you going to overcome that? I do not know the remedy, and the hon. member for North Toronto has not suggested it. But what the House should do under present circumstances is not to condemn the course adopted by the government as this motion proposes; not to say that the present system 'constitutes a menace to honest

and efficient government', as the resolution says; not to say that the present system 'incites too great waste of the resources and extravagance of expenditures', as the resolution says; or that it 'tends inevitably to corrupt and lower the tone of public morals', as the resolution says. Every step the government has taken has been taken in the direction of improving the service, of stopping the waste where there was waste, and of raising, not lowering, public morals. And I trust that in their future efforts—and their efforts will continue no doubt—they will have the support from my hon. friend from North Toronto and other hon. members on that side of the House which they are entitled to expect. We have not a perfect system—no one says we have. There are a great many points yet to be covered. There is, for instance, the question of newspaper advertising. And let me tell you that it is not correct to say that the advertisements of this government appear only in the Liberal press. For instance, take the advertisements for contracts on the Intercolonial. How does the government proceed? At Moncton, there was a twelve-engine house to be built. Advertisements were posted, at every station, of course, but advertisements also were put in nine or ten newspapers, and at the very top of the list, and receiving the highest price is the Halifax 'Herald'. That cannot be classed as a government supporter. I have seen government advertisements again and again in other Conservative newspapers. At the same time I admit that the rule is very largely to give the printing patronage to the newspapers supporting the government. I do not know how long that will continue, but there is more justification for this than for buying goods at fictitious prices or under fictitious tenders from your friends, which was the system up to 1896. It is but natural to dislike giving favours to a press that, day after day, misrepresents your public accounts and makes charges against your government, many of them unfounded. It is human nature—you do not like to pamper such a press. There may be some sort of justification for having a patronage list so far as this matter is concerned. So long as publicity can be sufficiently obtained through the Liberal newspapers, I would say let the advertising be given to the Liberal newspapers. But when publicity cannot be gained in this way, then resort to the Conservative newspapers or to the 'Canada Gazette' which ever you like. But the resolution submitted by the hon. member for North Toronto condemns the present government and the prevailing system, and I submit this should not be done. Instead of condemning we should commend the government for what they have been able to do; instead of denouncing the system we should congratulate the government for having made advance, distinct and I trust permanent advance, in improving the whole business administration of the various departments. And, with that view, I conclude my remarks by apologizing for the great length of time I have occupied, and by moving, seconded by Mr. Tolmie:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the said resolution be struck out, and the following substituted in place thereof:—This House approves the rapid advance made by the government toward the elimination of the system of party patronage which has been in operation under every administration since confederation, and views with satisfaction the policy now in force of making all important purchases by public competition and tender.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, this being Wednesday, a day on which, under the rules, the House adjourns at six o'clock, we have only about five minutes to consider this question further. I am not aware whether the object of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in the course of his interminable remarks on the history of the government purchases prior to 1896 and going back to 1878, was to kill time or to kill the discussion. But it is clearly impossible to discuss the matter now, and I suppose that, following the usual order, this will go to the bottom of the paper and so we shall not hear of it again this session. This makes it impossible for a member on this side to reply. It is so obvious that the party patronage system has permeated the body politic that any man has only to look about him to be aware of that fact. Yet, directly we approach the question from this side of the House and try to put it in such a way that men of all parties can deal with it, there is a hyper-sensitiveness at once shown that a personal attack is made on hon. gentlemen opposite, and they immediately shield themselves behind the walls of party. I conceive that it is our business to help a discussion of this kind if we can by lifting the whole discussion to a higher level than before. It is a most singular thing for the hon. member for South Wellington to quote documents—interminable documents—to the effect that the spoils system existed prior to 1896, but that it was abolished by the present government when it came into power in that year. The hon. gentleman states that in 1892 the Royal Commission on the Civil Service recommended certain things which the Conservative party deliberately refused to adopt. This is a strange argument in view of the fact that the trend of our criticism is directed to this government in connec-

tion with this very matter of the Civil Service when party patronage had eaten the heart out of the departments for thirteen or fourteen years. I have only to refer to the report of the commission for 1908 and to quote two short statements from that report to reply to what the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) has stated. These commissioners, appointed by the present government said:

The public service, the commissioners believe, not only at Ottawa, but elsewhere throughout the dominion has fallen back during the last fifteen years.

And then, at page 26, there is the following:

It has been pointed out in the most simple way that this practice had been followed by everybody and it could not be altered. Your commissioners, however, consider that, while the practice was always bad, yet through the great development of the country the extent was not so great as to become serious until of recent years.

The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said that the whole thing was a farce. Well, if it was a farce when it went on from 1878 to 1896, how much greater has the farce been even according to the words of their own commissioners, from 1896 down to the present time. If the Conservatives chastised the people with whips, the hon. gentlemen opposite since they have been in authority, have chastised the people with scorpions. I would recommend to the right hon. gentleman who sometimes leads this party the words of a friend of his in the old country, and I think they may very well be applied to his career since 1896. John Morley said, ' He who begins life by stifling convictions is in a fair way for ending it without any convictions to stifle.' It being now six o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

LAND TITLES AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 125) to amend the Land Titles Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is to make necessary provision for the registration of titles in what is now the Northwest Territories. At present registration must be made within the territories. In a few instances property within the territories is in such condition as to require registration, but it is not thought advisable to establish a registry office in the territories until the business to be transacted is much larger than it is at present. It is therefore proposed that for the present registration of titles of properties within the territories should take place at Ottawa, and this Bill is to provide for that.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TRADE TREATY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to correct a clerical error in the French Convention Act 1908. He said: In schedule C to the Act for the convention reference is made to wines containing more than 23 per cent and not more than 26 per cent of proof spirit. It is printed correctly in the French version but the English version reads: 'Containing more than 23 per cent, and not more than 23 per cent'. The error is obvious. The figure '23' in the last case should be '26'. This is to correct the error.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

MEANING OF RECESS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. C. A. WILSON:

Do the words during the recess of parliament in section 119 of the postal regulations, mean the period of time which elapses between the adjournment of one session and the opening of the following session, and also all periods of time during which the Senate and House of Commons are adiourned during the session?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

The period of time referred to in the regulations as ' the recess of parliament ' means only the time elapsing between the prorogation of the House and the opening of the next session of parliament.

DAMAGES, CHAMBLY CANAL.

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Was Dr. Arsene Godin, of St. Johns, Que., ever paid an indemnity by this government in connection with certain damages to his land on Ste. Therese Island, county of

St. Johns, Que., caused by waters of the Richelieu river and the Chambly canal?

2. If he was, what amount was paid, through whom was said amount paid, was any interest added, and to what amount and through whom were said amounts so paid?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Dr. Godin was paid $2,000. (b) Dr. Godin was paid through the Department of Justice. (c) No interest was added.

DREDGING IN FRASER RIVER.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What depth of channel is the present objective of the dredging operations being carried on by the dredge 'Fruhling' at the mouth of the Fraser river?

2. What is the estimate of the quantity of material requested to be removed to secure that depth?

3. By what date will that depth of water be available, according to the estimate of the department?

4. Have representations been received from New Westminster or elsewhere, respecting the urgency for more rapid carrying on of these dredging operations? If so, is the department making preparations to meet this urgency?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. Twenty feet at low tide, or thirty-one feet at ordinary high tide.

2. 500,000 cubic yards.

3. The resident engineer reports that the work, if carried on without any interruption, would be done in ninety days; but, allowing for delay from bad weather, repairs and practical suspension during fishing season, it will probably not be completed before six months.

4. (a) Yes. (b) The work is being carried on as rapidly as possible.

DREDGING AT GASPEREAUX.

Mr. CROCKET.

1. What was the total amount of the payments made through the Public Works Department to the Maritime Dredge and Construction Company, for dredging at Gaspereaux River, N.B., in the fiscal year ending March 31, last?

2. What to date during the present fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $29,470.

2. $4,499.60, for work done during fiscal year 1908-9. No dredging was done by the company at Gaspereaux during the present fiscal year, as by reason of the alleged difficult and exposed location where the work was being performed, they declined to return to it last spring at their tender price of the previous year. They also gave as a further reason for declining to accept an extension of their contract, and as evidence of the unusual difficulties attending this work that one of their tugs had been wrecked, resulting in large financial loss.

Later on in the season one of the departmental dredges was sent to Gaspereaux to continue the dredging.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the minister be kind enough to lay the papers on the table of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The answer will go in 'Hansard.' If the hon. gentleman will move in the ordinary way the motion will be responded to.

Mr. CROCKET. Surely the minister does not require that I should make the ordinary motion?

PUBLIC WORKS PAYMENTS TO A. AND R. LOGGIE.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. What was the total amount of the payments made through the Public Works Department to the firm of A. & R. Loggie in the fiscal year ending March 31, last?

2. What to date during the present fiscal year?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $44,056.44.

2. $16,366.48.

EMPLOYMENT OF R. J. WATSON.

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Is Mr. R. J. Watson, ex-M.P., still in the employ of the government.

2 If so, what salary does he receive, and what was the date of his appointment?

3. If not in the government employ, when were his services dispensed with?

4. Did he make any reports? If so, what was done with them?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. Yes.

2. $2,500 per annum. 15th February, 1909.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Yes, a considerable number. They were dealt with in the ordinary way. If the recommendations were approved action was taken on them.

MR. ALLARD AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Was Albert Allard, of the firm of Provost & Allard, Ottawa, on the 22nd day of January, 1910, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other person, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada, on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada was to be paid?

2. If so, have all such relations with the government or with any of its officers ceased since, and when?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government is not aware that Mr. Allard is interested in any contract, directly or indirectly.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. KING moved that the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with Bill (No. 101) now before this House respecting the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers, to provide for the appointment of Boards of Investigation for the purpose of inquiring into alleged combines causing enhanced prices or restricted competition, for the appointment of counsel to conduct investigations before such boards, and for the payment of the members of such boards and of counsel, and of witnesses appearing before the boards, and of all expenses of boards, including transportation expenses incurred by the members thereof, or by persons under order of such boards, in making investigations under the Act, and salaries of employees and agents and the payment of clerical and other assistance.

He said: His Excellency, having been appraised of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES AND ELECTION CAMPAIGN.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. G. TAYLOR. I beg to inquire from the Minister of Public Works if it is a fact, as I have heard it is, that a number of employees of the Public Works Department are away from their duties and attending to electioneering in the present campaign in the city of Ottawa. If that be the case, will the services of these gentlemen be dispensed with?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My attention has not been called to this alleged fact.

NECESSITY OF MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. CROCKET. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if, as a member of the House, I am not entitled to demand that papers which are referred to by a minister in an explanation to this House be laid on the table without further order? The Minister of Public Works a few moments ago, gave an answer to a question in which he stated that certain representations had been made which accounted for the discontinuance of the dredging at Gaspereaux. I assume he is referring to correspondence, and if that answer referred to correspondence I submit that the House is entitled to have it laid on the table of the House without a notice of motion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be found that I stated in the answer that the Maritime Dredging Company declined to accept an extension of the contract for dredging at Gaspereaux during last year. They gave as a reason the unusual difficulty and exposed character of the work and also the fact that one of their tugs had been wrecked, involving heavy financial loss. I did not state in the answer that there was any correspondence on file to that effect.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand it is verbal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure that there is any correspondence. I know there were verbal communications. I verbally requested the president of the company to go on with the work, and I know he declined. If the hon. gentleman will move for a return I shall be very glad to have the records examined and see if there is any correspondence.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely the minister will not call on the hon. gentleman to move for a motion of this kind. The government complain that the time of the House is taken up with too many motions. If the minister will state there is no correspondence, that will settle it; or if he says he will have the records searched and if he finds correspondence in the department he will lay it on the table without further motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) insists I shall look into the matter.

Mr. CROCKET. I submit I am entitled to have the correspondence laid on the table without a motion.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. CONMEE.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Some few days ago an article appeared in the 'Free Press' of this city in regard to evidence or a statement that was taken before the Committee on Mines and Minerals. Some discussion took place the day following in this House, the matter was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) and the minister and myself made some remarks. I find in an issue of the 'Citizen' of this city what I consider a very gross piece of misrepresentation, which I wish to call to the attention of the House. First I desire to call attention to what was complained of. The article published in the 'Free Press', which I shall not quote in extenso, makes reference to statements made before the Mines Committee, and goes on to say:

That it is the duty of the Canadian government to step in and take over those nickel deposits for the benefit of the Dominion and the empire was the proposition which was

placed before the Mines and Minerals Committee of the House of Commons this morning by Mr. Arthur Wilson, at present of Toronto, but officially engaged in an investigation on behalf of the British government into the nickel deposits in Canada.

Continuing further, the article contains this paragraph:

He advocated that the government should take over the nickel deposits as a matter of imperial urgency, which would give Great Britain an enormous advantage over all other countries in the construction of warships, and would insure for all time that the material which is a feature in the construction of modern battleships would be retained for the empire.

I may say, as was explained by myself on that occasion in my remarks, which will be found in 'Hansard,' that Mr. Wilson was very much annoyed at having been misrepresented as this article does misrepresent him. I stated on that occasion that I had gone with Mr. Wilson to the editor of the 'Free Press,' and that I gave him a correction of that statement. Let me read the correction which was published:

I was much surprised at the report contained in your issue of this day with reference to Mr. Wilson's remarks before the Committee on Mines and Minerals this morning. Nothing he said could have warranted any one in stating that he was officially employed in an investigation on behalf of the British government into the nickel resources of Canada, nor had he advocated that the government should take over the nickel deposits as a matter of imperial urgency. He merely attended before the committee at their invitation to give evidence as to the present condition of the nickel industry and suggested that it would be in the interests of the country generally if the larger deposits of nickel ore at Sudbury could be worked on a larger scale, and that not only should the matte be refined in Canada but that the government be recommended to foster the production of nickel steel in the country.

Sir, notwithstanding the fact that that correction was published, there appeared the following day in the same paper an editorial to the effect that its statement was correct. The paper insisted on this, notwithstanding the remarks made both by myself and my hon. friend from Nipissing (Mr. Gordon).

Then in the Ottawa 'Citizen' of a couple of days ago, appeared this article, which is the one I rose more particularly to complain of. It is headed the 'Nickel Monopoly,' and goes on to discuss what it alledges to be Mr. Arthur Wilson's statement. I shall not read the article through, but only that portion which it is necessary I should read in view of the remarks I propose to make:

A discussion subsequently took place in the House of Commons regarding the purport of Mr. Wilson's remarks, and Mr. Gordon, M.P., and Mr. Conmee, M.P., undertook to describe the report as inaccurate, and furthermore denied that there was any such thing as a monopoly of the nickel production in Canada.

Let me call attention to the fact that what was complained of in the article and corrected in the letter written to the newspaper and signed by myself was not the question at all of a monopoly, but the question of the misrepresentation of a witness who appeared before this committee. I take it for granted that it is not only the duty of the committee—and I feel that responsibility as being chairman of that committee—to protect those who come before it and give expert evidence or information, but it is also the duty of this House to protect its members and those from whom it may obtain information on such important questions. Then this article goes on to say:

Mr. Conmee expressed something akin to pained surprise that any one should allege such a thing and conveyed the impression that Mr. Wilson had repudiated the reports of his evidence which appeared in the press both Liberal and Conservative.

As to that statement, Mr. Wilson came with me to the newspaper office. I introduced him to the editor, and Mr. Wilson explained where the misrepresentation occurred and the editor replied that it was not his regular reporter who had attended to that matter. If it had been, he explained, the mistake would not have been made. Yet the editor returned to the same misrepresentation the following day. The article in the 'Citizen' continues:

Mr. Templeman, the Minister of Mines, reinforced the other two gentlemen by stating that the chairman of the committee had assured him that the reports of Mr. Wilson's evidence which appeared in the press were inaccurate. In what detail the report of Mr. Wilson's evidence may have been inaccurate, it is difficult to determine; but whether or not he stated that a monopoly of the nickel industry is enjoyed by the International Nickel Company of the United States, the same is true, the chairman of the Mines and Minerals Committee, Mr. Gordon and Mr. Conmee to the contrary notwithstanding. The two latter gentlemen in making the statements that they did on the floor of the House were simply engaged in the congenial occupation of gold bricking parliament with an engaging air of candour. They pointed out that, so far from the nickel resources of Canada being monopolized by the American company, there was a large area of nickel mineral claims which were not owned by the Americans. This is true, but it by no means disproves the monopoly charge. On the contrary, it is the strongest evidence against it, seeing that this territory is lying idle and its development paralysed.

I wish to call the attention of the House to the extravagant language used by this writer. He represents that the witness did make statements which that witness

has not only denied, but has taken every reasonable means of contradicting, feeling that he was injured by the misrepresentation. He says also that two hon. members of this House are engaged in the work of gold-bricking the House in regard to what was placed before the Mines Committee. The press is an important medium of information for the public; no one is stronger in his belief in the press than I am; but I do protest against the gross injustice of a writer, who knows nothing about the subject—for this article is proof that this writer is absolutely ignorant of the conditions that exist in connection with this mineral—and who has no personal knowledge of what took place before the committee, seeking by these extraordinary statements of his to misrepresent members of this House. There ought to be some decency in conducting discussions in the press. Members of this House have some responsibility, and, in carrying on their duties they ought not to be wantonly and grossly misrepresented at the mere will of some one who happens to write for a newspaper. I do not think it is to the credit of the newspaper itself. I will not go further in the matter. I think these gentlemen have committed an offence which deserves some punishment; nevertheless I shall not do more than call the attention of the House to the wrong that has been done. I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing fully all this writer's opinions and the policy which he advocates for the country as elaborated in his article. But let me say that what it was stated that there was a monopoly of the nickel deposits of Canada in the hands of a particular company. That was denied both by the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Geo. Gordon) and myself. There was also the statement that Mr. Wilson had represented himself, wrongly, fraudulently, before the committee as a representative of the British government; yet the very contrary was the case, for when Mr. Wilson was asked by a member of the committee if he did represent the British government his answer was, 'No'. Yet this misrepresentation is persisted in notwithstanding what has taken place. Now, it may be in the mind of some hon. members that efforts have not been made to develop the nickel resources of Sudbury. But great efforts have been made——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) ought to confine himself to the question of privilege.

Mr. CONMEE. I am doing so. If the House wishes me to read the whole of this article, though it is a long one, I am prepared——

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be an abuse to do so at this time.

Mr. CONMEE. All right, then, we will read——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have indicated——

Mr. CONMEE. Oh, you do not require more of it read.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) has had full privileges accorded him——

Mr. CONMEE. This article refers to the aims of the provincial government, and I thought it not necessary to take up the time of the House in reading it. But if I cannot go on without reading the whole——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) must confine himself to the question of privilege.

Mr. CONMEE. I am doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a question.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like to understand the ruling of the Chair. I have here a newspaper article to which I am calling attention as a matter of privilege. Have I not the right to read that article?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed the hon. member full latitude on the point, and I think he should not abuse the privilege He has been given every opportunity to explain, and, having done so, that is an end of the matter.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not quite understand your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to disobey the Chair. Am I at liberty to read the whole of this article or not?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know what the article contains. But the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) rose to the question of privilege, and he has been heard on that question of privilege. I think he should confine himself strictly to explaining the position, and, having done that, I think he ought not to go beyond it.

Mr. CONMEE. I deny that I have gone beyond it. I think I am within my rights in reading any portion of this that I please.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be on a question of privilege, and I reserve to myself the right to call the hon. member to order. Of course, if he does not take the friendly advice offered from the Chair, I cannot compel him to do so.

Mr. CONMEE. I shall have to bow to the ruling of the Chair, although I fail to see on what it is based.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the ap-

pointment of a special committee to investigate certain allegations of Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden against a portion of the engineering staff of the National Transcontinental railway.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, I had not the advantage of being in this chamber when the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced his resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the circumstances surrounding the resignation of Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden as chief engineer in charge of the construction of the Transcontinental railway. But, after a careful perusual of the motion and of the speech delivered by the Prime Minister on that occasion, I shall take the opportunity to make a few remarks, first, upon what should be the object in introducing a motion of this kind; and, second, what I think is the apparent object of introducing that motion.

In 1903, this government conceived the idea of building a second transcontinental railway, or rather some person else conceived that idea, and, as we afterwards proved, the government took to itself that idea and claimed it as its own. However that may be, the record of this House shows that, while we were in favour of the idea of constructing a great national transcontinental railway, we objected—and we still object—to the manner in which the government carried that idea into execution. And, because we did not approve of the principle of carrying that road to successful completion, it carried with it, I think, a corresponding duty on the part of the members on this side to see to it that the road was constructed in the most economical manner.

Now, without going into the figures, let me say in a cursory manner that there is no doubt—it has not been disputed—that this railway has cost a very much larger sum than was estimated. We were told that the government had most reliable information upon the subject, and that the construction of the road would cost in the neighbourhood of $51,000,000. And to-day, as we all know, according to the latest revised figures of the Minister of Railways and Canals, produced in this House in December last, it is costing over $114,000,000.

Now, I would say, in the first place, need we go further than that? That change casts a very serious reflection upon, makes a prima facie case against, the government of the day, that there has been recklessness and mismanagement, or at least, carelessness, in the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. From 1903 down to 1907, while there were occasional grumblings, so far as I know there was no distinct eruption in connection with the construction of that road. But in 1907, Mr Hodgins, who was then in charge of district 'B', came out boldly and said, in effect: 'I have been endeavouring, in my own way, to keep down the estimates, to cut down the classification in respect of the division over which I have charge. But the commission is not satisfied with that, the commission, he said, have been urging me to be more liberal in my classification.' That is the charge he made. That charge was investigated, to a certain extent. A committee of this House was appointed, a majority of whom were supporters of the government; and, while it it true that to a certain extent Major Hodgins withdrew his charges, it is equally true that the reason why that committee did not proceed was that the matters to be investigated were matters that came exclusively within the jurisdiction of the tribunal of arbitration appointed under the Act of 1902. Matters went on until 1907. The man in charge of the railway, the chief engineer, is the man upon whom this country must depend for honesty in the construction of that railway, because there is no man who has greater powers, or should have greater powers, he certainly has greater responsibilities than the commissioners themselves. The commission is composed of men who know nothing whatever about railway construction. So far as I know, not a single gentleman on that commission to-day has ever built a mile of railway, or any portion of a railway, or has ever, in his lifetime, had control of any railway or any portion of a railway. So I say that as regards the position of the chief engineer of the Transcontinental railway, I thoroughly agree with the hon. the Minister of Railways that he is the most important person that we have under our control in the construction of that railway, because he is the man that can return common excavation into loose rock, loose rock into solid rock, or solid rock into common excavation. That is the man who can turn $25 into $50, who can turn $50 into $150, who can turn $25 into $150. Therefore, I say he acts in the position of guardian of the treasury of this country.

Now what do we find? We find that in 1907 the chief engineer, being unable to agree with the most liberal classification being made by his sub-chiefs, resigns his position because he cannot countenance what he claims to be an unjust, unwarranted and dishonourable manner of classifying, especially on sections 'B' and 'F' of the Transcontinental. Now I say this fact, coupled with the fact that this road has cost $12,000,000 more than double what was originally estimated, these two facts alone, I submit, make out a prima facie case against this government, that the road has not been constructed in an eco-

nomical manner, and that therefore we are called upon to investigate. Now, having in view these circumstances, what is the duty of the government upon this occasion? I say it is the absolute duty of the government to place such an instrument in the hands of a committee of this House of Commons that we will be able to go thoroughly into the cause of that gentleman's resignation. A committee of the House should be given full power to say to Mr. Lumsden: You have resigned because you say that certain of your engineers have forfeited your confidence by reason of their over-classification; that means that you have resigned because certain of your engineers were changing 25 dollars into 50, and 50 into 150. You say that in consequence thereof you have lost confidence in them. We ask you to say why you have lost confidence in those men, we ask you to prove your allegations. Until we do get a committee that will enable us to ascertain whether these charges are true, we have not done our duty to the country. If the government do not give us that power, I maintain that they are afraid to give it, they are afraid to let the country know what is taking place under the regime of that commission. I maintain that the government are in a worse position if they grant a commission which does not give that authority, than if they granted no commission at all, because they might consistently take the attitude they took on the Hodgins inquiry and say: We did not grant this commission because these matters were under the exclusive jurisdiction and control of another tribunal which we appointed in 1903. But when they appoint a tribunal and do not give it the powers which they should give it, then we are justified in saying that if they take this position, they do it for the purpose of deceiving the public.

What have they offered us by this motion? Mr. Lumsden says in effect: I, Hugh Lumsden, having lost confidence in the engineers in district 'B' and 'F' hereby resign my position. The government says: We will investigate that. Now that, boiled down, is what the government have offered us. But how does the Prime Minister look at it—I take his own words. The Prime Minister says: This is altogether a question of classification, that is the reason that Mr. Lumsden resigned. You can investigate that, but you cannot investigate whether that mistake, or improper classification, arises from carelessness, negligence or bad faith. Why, Sir, those are the very things which caused Mr. Lumsden to resign, he would not have resigned, as he says himself, unless he had lost confidence in his sub-engineers. and the reason he lost confidence in them was because they had been guilty of over-classification, and that can only arise by reason of carelessness, incapacity or bad faith. The Prime Minister himself says that if this investigation led to that conclusion, namely, that Mr. Lumsden was resigning for either of these reasons, incapacity, bad faith or dishonesty on the part of his sub-engineers, then you cannot go one step further in that investigation. If that is so, then I say that the whole investigation proposed by this government is an absolute farce.

Now, let us see what the Minister of Railways had to say. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has a very unhappy method, a very unhappy manner, a very unhappy custom, I might say, of interjecting questions which go to the whole root of the matter. The hon. member for North Toronto asked the Minister of Railways what, in his opinion, in his own language, we could investigate under this motion, and the Minister of Railways was absolutely dumbfounded, and could not say what was to be investigated. I will read what the minister said:

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the hon minister to dispense.

Because he wanted him to say in his own words what there was to investigate. The minister could not say, but he started to read the resolution. So Mr. Foster said:

I would ask the hon. minister to dispense. What I want from him is an explanation of that resolution. Any man can read it, but we do not all grasp what it means.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), with his usual precision, puts the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) right. He says the last paragraph explains it. I will read that.

Mr. FOSTER. I have read that and understand it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not see that I can use any plainer language.

Then the hon. minister goes on to read that portion of the motion:

Mr. FOSTER. What are the charges?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find that in Mr. Lumsden's letter, read by myself and by the Prime Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend tell us what they are, in his own language?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to detain the House longer recapitulating what is so plain.

So the Minister of Railways himself cannot explain what there is to investigate, under his leader's motion. Then we take the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and what does he say? The hon. member for Pictou says, at the bottom of page 2488 of 'Hansard' of the 25th January:

And the result is we get down to this question as to whether or not there have been mistakes in classification—

Now, a mistake in classification is an improper classification and if it is an im-

proper classification it is not a proper classification. I think that goes without saying. That means that the mistake that he was referring to was not a proper classification. Then he says:

—whether or not Mr. Lumsden was correct in his statement that there was disobedience of instructions and failure to record what he had told these men should be done.

Well, failure to follow instructions leads to overcharge in classification, and overcharge in classification means improper classification. So far as the hon. gentleman has simply said that the matter to be investigated is whether or not there has been a proper classification. Now he says:

These are proper subjects for the committee.

He says that whether or not there has been over-classification is a proper subject for the committee. But then he says:

The question as to whether there was proper classification is a matter entirely for the tribunal constitued by parliament in 1903.

So that he says in one case that the question of classification is a proper one for this committee and in the next case he says that the question of classification is a matter entirely and exclusively within the jurisdiction of the arbitrators appointed under the Act of 1903. It is impossible to reconcile these two statements. It shows that there is nothing whatever to investigate under the resolution proposed in this House. I will put a concrete instance. We will say that we have a committee appointed and we will say that we have on that committee the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell) who have done such herculean service in the Hodgins inquiry and who succeeded so well in burking that inquiry.

Mr. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has no right to charge me, or any other member of this House, with burking an inquiry as a member of a committee.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What I do say is that it was largely through the efforts of the hon. member for Pictou—

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member can explain what he meant.

Mr. MACDONALD. I take the point that no hon. member has the right to make that charge with reference to a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must hear his explanation of what he meant by these words, before I can give a ruling.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I did say, and if it is not what I did say, I certainly meant to say, that it was largely through the exertions of the hon. member for Pictou and the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., that the whole matter to be investigated by the Hodgins committee was referred to the arbitrators appointed under the Act of 1903, and from that day to this, although it was referred back in 1907, the arbitrators have not given one single decision in reference to it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I desire to know whether the hon. member for North Grey persists in the statement that I burked the inquiry as a member of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the word 'burked' is not parliamentary.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I thought it was in order for an hon. member to explain what he meant and I did explain what I meant.

Mr. SPEAKER. That means that the hon. gentleman does not persist in the use of the word 'burked'?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No.

Mr. MACDONALD. As an hon. member of this House I have a perfect right to rise to a point of order. I object to being charged untruthfully—

Some hon. MEMEBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. MACDONALD. I object to being charged by the hon. member, about a matter of which he knows nothing at all himself, with burking, as a member of a committee, anything which was referred to me as a member of that committee and I want to know whether the hon. gentleman is in order in persisting in the statement that I have referred to.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman to have withdrawn the words.

Mr. MACDONALD. Well let him withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER. He wanted to explain.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I understand the meaning of the word 'burked' it is to prevent, and I have endeavoured to show that the hon. member for Pictou was the chief instrument in preventing that Hodgins inquiry.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the expression 'burked the inquiry' is unparliamentary.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the word 'burked' is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it, but I am seeking to prove what I mean by the word 'burked.'

Mr. MACDONALD. For myself I want to have it distinctly understood as to whether hon. members can make statements of this kind, comply nominally with your ruling and then persist in not complying with it. Are we to have parliamentary rules or are we not? I want to say to the hon. gentleman that he is talking about a subject that he knows nothing at all about.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have given my ruling.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member has withdrawn the word.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I was proceeding to give a concrete instance of what would probably happen if we had the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for Pictou as two of the members of this committee. We will proceed now to show what exactly would occur. We have a committee of five, three of whom are government supporters, stalwart henchmen of the government. The chairman is put in the chair. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), we will say, calls Mr. Lumsden and puts him in the box:

Q. Mr. Lumsden, you were, until June 25, 1909, chief engineer of the Railway Commission?—A. Yes sir.

Q. You resigned your position on June 25, 1909?—A. Yes sir.

Q. Why did you resign your position?—A. The letter I wrote to the Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission shows that.

Q. What was that?—A. I resigned because I had lost confidence in the engineers on sections 'B' and 'F' of the railway.

Q. Why did you lose confidence in these engineers?—A. I resigned because they had classified contrary to my instructions.

Q. What were these instructions?—A. I have them here in my pocket.

I propose now to prove that by reason of over-classification against these instructions this country has lost, say, $500,000.

The hon. member for Pictou rises and says: This resolution does not authorize this committee to try the question of whether there was over-classification, it is a matter, according to my speech on this motion, which comes exclusively within the jurisdiction of the arbitrators appointed under the Act of 1903 and in proof of that I cite the speech of my own leader, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in which he says that whether that over-classification arose from bad faith, incompetence, or carelessness, this committee cannot determine such a question. There we stop. That is the very foundation upon which this inquiry proceeds and yet we are blocked from going into the case. What can we ask the man? We can say to him: Tell us some other reason why you resigned. Was it because your engineers smoked bad tobacco, or was it because he was not wearing a proper kind of clothing, or was it because of any other habits he had? There would be no objection on the part of my hon. friends because this is quite within the purview of this resolution, but when you go into evidence to substantiate your charges and which relates to the taking of a dollar out of the public treasury, these gentlemen are justified—and I make the statement advisedly—under this resolution in saying not one tittle or iota of evidence are you entitled to give here. Then it goes back to the very same tribunal which my hon. friend from Pictou helped to send it back to in 1907, or 1908, because he said that tribunal had the exclusive jurisdiction in the matter. In order to be precise I will read the hon. gentleman's own words on that occasion:

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD:—Now the fact is before us that Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Woods have gone over that section 'F' of this line. They have looked at various divisions there and at this very moment they are performing the function which was contemplated would be performed by section 7 of the agreement and endeavouring to agree upon what the proper classification is, and in the event of their being unable to agree as to that then the third arbitrator would be called in. In other words these gentlemen are now discharging the duty assigned to them and are going to arrive at some conclusion upon the differences which I understand my friends to be arguing this committee should engage in.

The absurdity of the position suggested by my hon. friends will be recognized when we consider that at this very moment the two gentlemen who are appointed by statute are performing their statutory functions and they are bound to come to some conclusion on the matter. Upon that conclusion the accounts will be adjusted. At the same time, if the view of my hon. friends were concurred in we would be taking up our time in dealing with a purely academic question. I do not understand my hon. friends to urge that there is anything improper in the position of the commissioners in dealing with the engineers, so it is purely a question of a difference of opinion between these engineers as to what the classification will be.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman ays, hear, hear, but if he follows the reasoning of his leader he will be found to acknowledge that the moment the question of classification comes up in this committee, it will be sent to these three arbitrators. Well, if that be the position taken by the government it simply means that there is not a single thing concerning the expenditure on this railroad which can be inquired into by that committee or any other tribunal appointed by this House. The very minute you touch the kernel of the matter which should be inquired into, the supporters of the government will say: these matters are solely within the jurisdiction of this arbitration tribunal and you have no right whatever to interfere with

them. Therefore, we can come to no other conclusion, but that this committee is now being appointed, not for the purpose of investigating, but for the purpose of whitewashing. We will go before this committee and we will present our evidence, but our evidence will be rejected and the next morning the 'Globe' newspaper will come out with great big headlines stating that after the most thorough, searching, and impartial investigation that has ever taken place Mr. Lumsden's charges have utterly fallen to the ground, that the skirts of the government are absolutely clean, and the opposition had to withdraw every charge. That is what the government want to do, and that is the reason they put this resolution on the order paper. But if I am wrong I now ask the right hon. gentleman to set me right. The Prime Minister knows that the gravamen of the charges made by Mr. Lumsden is over-classification which simply means taking money out of the treasury of this country illegally and unlawfully. I ask the right hon. gentleman in his place now, will he allow us to ask these questions and to prove these charges when the matter comes up before this committee. The right hon. gentleman is silent; he does not answer. I can quite appreciate his silence. I ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will he declare in the committee that we have the right to investigate the question of whether or not, there has been over-classification and money taken out of the treasury? Let the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) tell us that before we go to the committee. The hon. member is also silent. I ask the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who no doubt will be in the committee, what will he say if we offer to prove these charges? Will he allow us to do so or will he tell us it is a matter to be sent to the arbitrators who have not yet sent in their report. That is a fair question to put to these gentlemen. The hon. gentleman is also silent.

Mr. LALOR. They are dumb.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. They won't answer. Since it is quite evident that we will not have an opportunity of getting these matters before the committee let me now say a word or two on the merits of the case. In 1903 the right hon. the Prime Minister proposed the building of the National Transcontinental railway and he told us he had mountains of information upon which to base an estimate of the cost. I have a right to suppose that he sent out a staff of engineers who went along the route of this railroad and got the levels, and took the estimates of quantities that were to be removed, making borings in the different hills to find whether there were solid rock, loose rock, or common excavation. That was their duty and I presume they did it. I make this statement here—not as an engineer, but on what has been told me by experienced engineers—that an engineer can ascertain more correctly before a cut has been made than he can afterwards, what amount of material is in that cut. That is especially so in the case of a partial cut, say where the railway is going round a hill and only a portion of the hill is taken off, because he has the actual geographical formation of the hill to be removed in his eye, whereas afterwards he has not. In the case of a straight cut I will admit that he could measure that afterwards as correctly as before, but I say that the experience of engineers proves that in a location such as I have referred to, they can estimate more accurately before the actual cut has been made than afterwards. Now, that being the case, can any one conceive why there should be a difference of from 100 per cent to 150 per cent between the estimate and the actual cost in this road. The geographical position of the country is the same as it was when the estimate was taken, the geological formation is the same, and practically the only thing that has caused a difference in the price is, the classification of solid rock, loose rock, common excavation, and the over-break. It is because the juxtaposition of these four that the extra additional cost of the railway has come. It is very easy for a man to change common excavation into loose rock, an engineer's certificate will do that. It is very easy for him to change loose rock into solid rock, if the engineers are in any way in collusion with the contractor and if they will do it, and it is a very hard matter to detect when they have done it. But, in going along and boring down into a hill to find what was the character of the soil, how much was common excavation, how much loose rock and how much solid rock, was it possible for them to have made a mistake to the extent of from 100 per cent to 150 per cent. The best engineers say that it is not possible, nay, they would not be very much surprised if there was a difference of more than twenty per cent in the calculations of an engineer made in that way; but they say that when you get beyond a difference of twenty per cent there is a prima facie presumption that there is something wrong. Now, in this case the difference is not only twenty per cent between the cost and the estimate, but the cost has risen from $51,000,000 estimated—to which you may add twenty per cent as the outside difference that may arise and that will give you $62,000,000 estimated cost. Then the estimated cost has risen from $62,000,000 (including an allowance of twenty per cent) to $114,000,000, and there you have an increase of 100 per

cent and $12,000,000 additional to spare. Is there any common sense in that? Does not that very circumstance cast upon the government a prima facie case of negligence, mismanagement, or dishonesty? I think I am justified in saying it does.

I desire to say a few words in reference to Mr. Hodgins. As we all know Mr. Hodgins was district engineer in charge of district 'F', the district lying immediately east of Winnipeg. Mr. Hodgins, so far as we know, enjoyed an enviable reputation until the time he severed his connection with the Transcontinental Railway Commission. He was selected for that position because of his exceptional qualifications as an engineer, because of his great experience in other portions of the world in railway engineering, and, so far as we know, no suspicion had been cast upon him on any occasion. Why was Mr. Hodgins dismissed? I make the claim that Mr. Hodgins was dismissed because he was keeping the classification down too low to suit the contractors and to suit the commission. I prove that in this way. In 1907 complaints were coming in from the contractors to the commission that the classification which Mr. Hodgins was making on his section 'F' was altogether too low as compared with the classification that was being made in the province of Quebec. This commission sent out their inspecting enginer, Mr. Gordon Grant, to investigate whether or not Major Hodgins was giving estimates that were too low for the contractors. Perhaps that was not putting it fairly; to investigate the question whether Major Hodgins was not giving as liberal classifications as he should. What did Mr. Grant say? After examining the work he came back and reported to the commission, under date July 23, 1907, under the head of 'classification on district 'F' as follows:

> Classification on this work, where the vast majority of it is solid rock, is not a serious matter, and where material has been moved that could be classified—and the greater part of it was moved last winter when it was frozen, such as the opening of cuts, the stripping of rocks, &c., I found, from questioning the resident engineers and from looking over the progress estimates, that the classification given the contractors has been very low, and in many cases absurdly low, and for that reason alone there are probably 1,000 men less on the work to-day than there would have been if the work had been fairly and justly classified. Classification is left entirely to the resident engineers, and they are all to timid to give the contractor what he is entitled to in that line.

Mr. Gordon Grant reported to the commission that Mr. Hodgins was classifying too low, yes absurdly low that his resident engineers were afraid to give the contractors what they were entitled to. What was the result? Two months afterwards Mr. Hodgins was made to walk the plank. It is not the inference that he walked the plank because he was keeping the classification down too low to suit the contractors? Now, what is the truth? Fortunately we have, I think, Mr. Hodgins being justified by after events. The hon. member from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) went very carefully and concisely into the amount of over-classification on the different divisions of the Transcontinental railway. So far as I know the calculations he made are absolutely correct and they have not been denied by the Minister of Railways. I am, therefore, assuming that what he gave us in the House on Tuesday is absolutely correct and is justified by the returns brought down by the Minister of Railways and Canals. According to these returnes we find that there has been an over-classification on the same district 'F' of $2,798,791—and Mr. Hodgins was removed from that section before that because he was keeping down the classification. Mr. Poulin, his successor, was appointed. Do we find then that his estimates were too low? Do we find any contractors making complaint that his classification is kept down too low? Not a bit of it, not a word of complaint. What do we find? But we find Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, of the commission, finding fault with the classification there and we find that the reason Mr. Lumsden resigned was because there was over-classification in that district. We even find Mr. Gordon Grant himself, after he is appointed chief engineer, after he goes over that road, coming back and cutting off $360,000 voluntarily. Is that not proof that Major Hodgins was justified in the charge he made? Is it not proof that the commission wanted Major Hodgins to give more liberal classification? Their inspecting engineer came back and reported that Major Hodgins was not liberal enough. Major Hodgins is discharged and an engineer put in who allows over-classification of $2,789,000, and Mr. Grant himself comes back, and, of his own volition, not as an arbitrator, but simply as engineer for the commission, lops off $360,000. Yet we hear it said that Major Hodgins did not do his duty when he came to the conclusion that they were trying to make him over-estimate the classification. What could an honest man do but to resign. The Minister of Railways yesterday put on record a great number of letters in reference to this subject, many of them not very germane to the discussion. I, therefore, propose to quote from some of the letters to be found in this return from Mr. Woods, assistant engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in which Mr. Woods makes complaint as to over-classification in differ-

ent portions of the contract. The first letter appears on the first page of the return. It is a letter from Mr. Woods, dated October 7, 1907, shortly after Mr. Hodgins had been removed from his position. So far as I know, certainly so far as this return shows, there were no complaints by the Grand Trunk Pacific against Mr. Hodgins while he was in charge as to over-classification. This return shows that in October, 1907, shortly after a successor was appointed, there were serious objections to the classification on that section from the Grand Trunk Pacific. He says:

With the latter portion we had detailed percentages for each cut and were greatly surprised at the allowances made for solid and loose rock. In nearly every case, where the cuttings were not entirely all ledge, the estimate given for solid rock is double, or more than double, what it should be. In fact, the specifications had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made, not by reason of any error in judgment, but, as I understand, by special instructions from the assistant district engineer.

Let me give you some illustrations:—

Take the cutting from stations 5818 to 5826. Estimated 71 per cent solid rock and 29 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Very little ledge in this cut. Some large boulders but a very large percentage is common excavation.

Station 5842 to 5860. Classified 94 per cent solid rock, 6 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Solid rock over-classified at least 100 per cent.

Mr. CARVELL. What distinction does the hon. gentelman draw between the slopes of solid rock and common excavation?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In common excavation you will naturally remove more material, because you will require to have a greater slope from the perpendicular.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the percentage?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Not being an engineer, I cannot say; but if one and a half to one is a proper slope for common excavation, it is too much for rock.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the proper slope for rock?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I have told my hon. friend I am not an engineer, but I have sufficent common sense to know that if one and a half to one is a proper slope for common excavation, that slope is not required for rock. Notwithstanding, Mr. Woods says that in this particular excavation solid rock is over-classified at least 100 per cent, yet the return of the slope is given as one and a half per cent to one. That means that you have allowed the contractor to go back from the slant twice as far as you should, and back of that legitimate slope, he has taken rock at $1.50 per yard. That is properly over-break. He takes that at $1.50 a yard and uses that in the next grading and calls it filling and gets paid for it as such. Although they are cutting solid rock, they are returning it as one and a half to one slope and getting $1.50 per yard for it. The next letter I shall read is on page 5. It is dated 20th February, 1908, from Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden:

I do not know the date of those instructions or when they are supposed to have become effective, but from reports of my assistants at Winnipeg and at Quebec, there does not seem to have been any change in classification of work previously reported, the percentage of classified material being steadily increased. We are satisfied that on some parts of the line the work previously estimated was not classified according to your recent instructions, being overestimated in both loose and solid rock. The attention of your district engineers has been called to this fact, but apparently without effect. If your instructions were effective when the January estimates were made, we certainly will have to object to the classifications as rendered on certain parts of the work.

On March 24, 1908, Mr. Woods again writes Mr. Lumsden as follows. He is referring to sections 'B' and 'F,' the two sections concerning which Mr. Lumsden sent in his resignation because of the insubordination of the engineers:

In examining these estimates I find no apparent change in classification since your instructions to district engineers of January 28, 1908. On the contrary the percentages of classified material seem to be constantly increasing and are even higher than when we made our objections in September last.

I am quite aware that during the winter season it is natural that classified material should run higher than at other times, as little earth work is opened, but I had hoped to see a reduction in classified material so reported prior to January last.

I have before me a detailed sheet showing classification as made on district 'B,' and am surprised to find material classified as solid rock which, if I am correctly informed, under your instructions could only be classified as loose rock. I also find very large quantities returned both as loose and solid rock in borrowed embankment. On the work east of the Quebec bridge a large amount was done with teams, side borrowed material, and yet the entire contract for the 150 miles only shows 24 per cent of the work done as common excavation. It appears also that the item 'assembleed rock,' No. 5 in your instructions, is made to cover most material where explosives are used in handling.

In excavations for foundations, where hard material is found, under this item it is classified as solid rock, giving the contractor three times the usual price for that material. Our district engineers are not satisfied with the classification as made. On district 'F' the objection lies in the first and second divisions.

It is imposible at this time to go over the work with a view of examining classification, but, from reports from my assistants, I cer-

tainly must object to the classification as rendered being considered final, and request that as soon as the season will permit, you accompany me over at least a part of the line, that I may have your views in regard to this most important matter of classification.

H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

Then on April 2, 1908, Mr. Woods again wrote to Mr. Lumsden:

There are a few exceptions to be taken to these estimates so far as I am advised, except to the classified material, which is constantly increasing, and a very large amount of overbreak in solid rock cutting also increasing and representing in all a very large amount.

The next letter I shall quote is dated June 19, 1908. This is rather an important letter from Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden:

Dear Sir,—I have before me estimate of rock excavation, district 'F,' for the month ending April 30, 1908. You will recall these statements as being made showing the overbreak on each division from month to month.

It is a little surprising to find that the total overbreak on this district to April 30, is over 500,000 cubic yards. From the column furnished showing how some of this might have been used where rock borrow otherwise would have been required, and earth borrow, and deducting the same, I still find about 451,000 cubic yards of overbreak.

I have nothing to show how this overbreak is estimated. Articles 37 and 38 would indicate that a large amount of this overbreak might have been estimated as loose rock rather than solid. Can you say if this has been done? None of my reports indicate such to be the case. I think you will readily agree with me that if these cuttings are being measured month to month by actual quantities taken out, and no allowance deducted, little effort will be made by the contractors to keep overbreak within reasonable limit and in the end we shall undoubtedly be paying $1,000,000 additional for the work on this section probably not contemplated in your approximate estimates.

H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

There you have the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, a very experienced engineer, saying: If you go on in the way you have been going, with respect to this very question of overbreak—that is taking out more material than you should on this contract alone, the government will lose one million dollars. In order not to weary the House, I desire to put on record without reading them, the following letters.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the practice in this House. We allow it sometimes in informal proceedings, but on important questions we should have everything read.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The next letter I shall read then will be found on page 24, and is dated June 23, 1909. It is as follows:

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 19th instant, together with the copies of settlement sheets of contractors' progress estimate returns for the month of May, as follows:—

District 'A.'—Grand Trunk Pacific.
J. W. McManus & Co.
Lyons & White.
Willard Kitchen & Co.
District 'B.'—Grand Trunk Pacific.
M. P. & J. T. Davis (east).
M. P. & J. T. Davis (west).
Macdonell & O'Brien.
E. F. & G. E. Fauquier.
District 'D.'—Grand Trunk Pacific.
District 'F.'—J. D. McArthur.

Upon comparing these estimates with those received since January last, I find that upon percentage of classified material in districts 'B' and 'F' remain practically in the same proportions as in former estimates received since January last. As I cannot believe that this classification, as rendered, as in accordance with the specifications, or with your letter of instructions to your district engineers of January 30, I must again object to the classification. Our recent visit to certain portions of the line on district 'F' confirms my views relative to classification on both these districts.

H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

The next is dated July 8, 1908, and will be found on page 35. It is from Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden, and the portions I shall read are as follows:

Dear Sir,—Referring to our recent visit to the work on district 'B' east of the St. Lawrence river, our examination of classification as rendered at points visited, and our conversation regarding same, I hope to repeat in writing what I stated to you verbally: that we still vigorously protest to the classification as returned to date. For example:

The first cut we visited, station 7135 to 7142. Gravel cut with little or no ledge. Classification returned 7,900 yards solid rock, 12,100 yards loose rock.

Then he goes on to say:

These are loose rock cuttings containing many large boulders. My judgment is that the solid rock returned is double what it should be, 25 per cent being a liberal allowance.

And again:

The gravel cut on stations 7175 to 7182 is returned as 8,000 yards loose rock and 12,000 yards common excavation. This is purely gravel cut. There may have been a few small stones, which, if found in sufficient quantities, might be termed loose rock, but certainly not more than 10 per cent at the outside. Classified as 40 per cent loose rock at present.

Then, towards the bottom of the page:

For another example further west, take the cut station 5940 to 5950. Estimated 44 per cent solid rock, 56 per cent loose rock. While there is a small amount of ledge in the bottom of the cut I should say 25 per cent solid

would be ample, unless actual measurements of ledge and boulders have been taken.

And on the following page:

Station 3239 to 3247. Classified 45 per cent solid rock, 55 per cent loose rock. While the quantities in this cut are not large, it is, in my judgment, classified out of all reason. I can see no solid in it and nothing to exceed 20 per cent of loose rock.

Now, the last letter to which I will refer is dated July 28, 1909, and is printed at page 43. This is a letter from Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden:

In a recent letter from district engineer Mann, he writes that:—The classification is undoubtedly going from bad to worse, even on the parts of the work you saw when out with Mr. Lumsden.

Then, later on:

Another point to which Mr. Mann makes objection is the returning of dry masonry as third-class. He gave instances at stations 2618 and 2628-60 stating that these culverts are dry, and have been plastered on the outside and inside with mortar and returned as third-class. One of these culverts was under construction when he saw it, and others had settled so that the plastering had fallen away showing the entire lack of any mortar in the interior. He further states that some of these culverts were returned dry in former estimates and were later transferred to third-class.

That will give the House some idea of the complaints that were being made by the Grand Trunk Pacific and whether or not Mr. Lumsden was justified in the position he took when he resigned his office because he could not submit to the classification made by his subordinates. Let me give an instance. I cannot give the exact monetary sums involved—my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) did that. But it is just such cases as this to which I shall refer that account for the increase in the cost of this road from $51,000,000 to $114,000,000. Take the example mentioned in the first letter written by Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden, dated October 7th, 1907:

Stations 6030 to 6046. Estimated 40 per cent solid rock, 10 per cent loose rock. This is the large sand-cut west of O'Brien's camp. Of the 95,000 yards moved to August 31 in this cut, at least 80,000 yards were pure sand.

Imagine estimating a sand cut at 40 per cent solid rock, and 10 per cent loose rock. Let us figure that out. The estimate as passed by the engineers of this commission on the item to which I have just referred was as follows:

38 yds. solid rock at $1.50..	$57,000
9,500 yds. loose rock at 50c..	4,750
47,500 yds. common excavation at 25c.	11,925
Total..	$73,675

Yet Mr. Woods estimates:

80,000 yds. of sand at 25c..	$20,000
15,000 yds. loose rock at 50c..	7,500
Total..	$27,500

This amount, Mr. Woods says, would be ample. But instead of paying for the work in that cut on that basis, the engineers of the commission have declared that the contractors are entitled to $73,-675.

Now, let me come to this tribunal of arbitration about which so much has been said. In 1903, it is true, provision was made for the appointment of a tribunal of arbitrators. But they were only to act in case of disagreement between the engineer of the company and the engineer of the commission. Well, after Mr. Hodgins had made his charges, after Mr. Woods had repeatedly and yet again sent letters to this commission objecting to the over-classification, the commission finally decided that they would have an arbitration. And whom did they appoint? They appointed, of course, their own engineer, Mr. Lumsden. The Grand Trunk Pacific appointed their engineer, Mr. Kelliher. And these gentlemen looked around to find a third man. The government, in its wisdom, having confidence in the ability and integrity of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, suggested that that gentleman be appointed third arbitrator, and the Grand Trunk Pacific acceded to that suggestion. So that two out of three arbitrators were nominees of this government. And this government should have had confidence in at least that number of the arbitrators. The arbitrators, as a body, were considered by this government and by the railway company as the most competent men in the Dominion to decide this question. They went to districts 'B' and 'F' the districts in question. Using their knowledge as engineers—the best that could be obtained in this country—they went over the work. The sub-engineers watched the proceedings. I do not know whether they should be there or not. But I do know that these arbitrators were then taken on the ground, and that they had this matter, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) says sub-judice; they were considering these matters as a court. After going over these two sections they came back again. In the ordinary course of events, if public decency were the guiding principle, everybody would naturally wait until the commission made a report, and especially would this be true of the government of the day, since they had appointed two of these gentlemen practically themselves. But what happened? The district sub-engineers, Messrs. Doucet, Poulin and Huestes, who were subordinates of Mr. Lumsden in district 'B', rushed home and framed a

report and submitted it to the Transcontinental Commissioners. Why? From what they had observed of the action of these three arbitrators, the men who were best qualified to know what had taken place, the best qualified to know whether there had been over classification, from what they had observed they came to the conclusion that that Board of Arbitrators appointed practically by this government, was going to come home and say: 'There has been over classification'; and with a consciousness of what they were going to do, they came home and undermined the authority of the arbitrators, and the most shameful part of the whole transaction is what the commission submitted to it. What did they do? These three commissioners came home, and one of them wrote a report reflecting upon the action of the arbitrators; then every man of them wrote a report of that kind and submitted it to the commission. Now I propose to read from these reports. The first is that of Mr. Doucet, dated on the 22nd of June. After reciting a lot of things which he said the arbitrators did, and which in his judgment was not proper to do, he said, on page 23:

On Thursday a start was made at 5 o'clock in the morning, reaching the 150th mile at 9 o'clock. The first cut inspected consisted of classified material in which 1,000 yards of solid rock in masses had been returned by our engineers. Mr. Schreiber turned to me and asked me to point out where the 1,000 yards of solid rock were. I answered him that the cutting was classified material, and that the boulders of which it was composed were in the embankments. I was asked to point out where 1,000 yards of boulders averaging one cubic yard each could possibly be; to which I said that as the material was classified, it did not matter whether the boulders were a yard each so long as the mass consisted of boulders large and small cemented together. Mr. Kelliher, the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, then spoke up and said that if I read the specifications I would see that boulders to be estimated as solid rock must measure one yard each. I at once saw that the arbitrators had made up their minds to throw out everything which our chief engineer had returned as solid rock except ledge rock and boulders, each of which measured one cubic yard.

I just read that portion of the report to show that Mr. Doucet knew that the arbitrators were going to report against him, knew they were going to come home and say that there had been over classification. Now, I will read from the report of Mr. Huestes on page 26:

At about the 132nd mile cut station 6576-92, resident engineer Girdwood was questioned as to how he got his 1.174 cubic yards of solid rock, and he replied in boulder measurements, and led the arbitrators to believe that each individual boulder measured one cubic yard, which I knew he did not mean, and which afterwards Mr. Bourgeois informed me was not the case, as the cut in question was a mass of boulders cemented together, and Girdwood had taken measurements of all boulders for a certain time to arrive at a means of estimating the percentage of solid rock in the cutting, based on our interpretation of 'assembled rock' as the material was cemented together.

The rest of the report shows that they were not at all satisfied with the classification being made by the arbitrators, because it was going to exceed what they thought it should exceed. Now, I will quote from the report of Mr. Poulin, on page 21:

I do not know of what nature the reports of said inspectors may be; but as district engineer in charge, I must protest against the manner in which such inspection was made as being altogether inadequate and too superficial to form a correct idea of what the material was like at the time the work was done. . . . . The only question asked me by Mr. Schreiber about the work was, how I would return a certain portion of one cut. On my answering 'assembled rock' he answered, 'you are wrong, the chief engineer meant there should be at least 80 per cent of large masses of rock.' I said nothing, but wondered how he knew so well the meaning of that which the chief engineer had apparently in his mind, but did not say in the interpretation given to us.

Now, the point I desire to make is that these understrappers were criticising the proposed decision of the board, the arbitrators consisting of the most expert engineers in the whole country, two of them appointed, as I said, practically by the government itself. It would have been decent to allow the arbitrators to come back and make a report, and to ascertain, first, whether or not that report was going to justify the sub-engineers. But they did not do that. They came back, and to my mind, concerted a conspiracy, because I find that one of the reports of these sub-engineers is made on the 22nd of June, another is made on the 23rd of June, and the third one is made on the 23rd of June, and all these reports are sent into the commission, and each one of these reports is an attempt to undermine the authority of the chief engineer and the probable result of that Board of Arbitration. What were the duties of the commission in that case? It was the duty of the commissioners to say: We have ordered a board of the best and most experienced engineers in this country to go and see whether or not there had been over classification in these two districts 'B' and 'F'; what business have you to come in here and attempt to influence our judgment until we receive the report of these arbitrators? Did they do that? I am sorry to say that the most unwarranted and humiliating spectacle is presented to us of the commis-

sion, not only apparently being only too willing and in too great a hurry to receive these reports, but of receiving each one of them at the same meeting of the commission, and considering the reports of these understrappers at 11 o'clock on the 25th of June last, without consulting the chief engineer, without consulting the Board of Arbitrators, and without first submitting to the chief engineer the reports of his subordinates. Does not that look as if the commission did not want over-classification to be found out in districts 'B' and 'F'? Is not that just what they wanted in 1907 when they sent Mr. Grant to inspect district 'B' under Mr. Hodgins, and he came back and said Mr. Hodgins' classification is absurdly low, he has not given the contractors enough, and so Mr. Hodgins is displaced two months afterwards. These understrappers come back here, the commissioners first get their reports in hand and turn round and send these reports to their own chief engineer and say: Mr. Lumsden, what do you think of that? Under the circumstances what could any self-respecting man do but say: If that is the kind of treatment that is accorded me I will resign my position as chief engineer. The records show what took place. At 11 o'clock in the morning on the same day the meeting took place. The same afternoon, and without notice to Lumsden, they sent to the chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, the report of these three sub-engineers which favours the contractors as to said classification. On the same day, as soon as Mr. Lumsden got this impertinent communication, he did as any self-respecting man would do, resigned his position. Now, what I want to show is this: I will quote the words of the Minister of Railways in this House on Tuesday last. The Minister of Railways said: If there is one man we ought to stand by, it is our own chief engineer. These are his words on page 2435:

> Surely the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission ought to be able to look after the commissioners side, which is the public side, ought to be able to defend his own work, the work of which he has approved in the months past, and be able to give reasons for the decisions arrived at.

I thow these words back to the Minister of Railways and ask him: Why didn't you do as you say ought to have been done, give your chief engineer the right to defend his actions, instead of allowing the commission to undermine him by his own understrappers, without giving him the slightest opportunity to define his attitude?

But for the life of me I cannot conceive the action taken by this commission. This commission seems to think that it is their bounden duty to do what?—to fight the Grand Trunk Pacific when the Grand Trunk Pacific say there is over-classification, when they should, if the contractors are not doing the honest thing, be right in line with the Grand Trunk Pacific, because every dollar that the Grand Trunk Pacific successfully objects to means a saving to us of 50 cents interest as I hope to be able to show in a moment. But, they seem to think that they are fighting for the interests of this country when they are fighting for over-classification. Yet, they are opposing the Grand Trunk Pacific when the Grand Trunk Pacific are trying to lessen the cost. The facts, as they seem to take them, are diametrically reversed because if they are going to serve the public interest they will fight with the Grand Trunk Pacific and try to keep down the cost to the country. When they were going to call the arbitrators in what was their attitude? Mr. Lumsden had resigned his position as chief engineer. No self-respecting man would go on and act as arbitrator, and he says: I resign my position as arbitrator as well. The consequence is that this body to which the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for Pictou were going to leave all questions before the Hodgins inquiry, has been suddenly and rudely dissolved by the action of the government's own commission. Now, what happens? Still, the Grand Trunk Pacific are objecting, in these many letters that I have produced, to over-classification. They object first to the appointing of a new arbitrator; they say that the old arbitration board has not been dissolved because Mr. Lumsden has resigned. All you have to do is to appoint a new engineer and then the three engineers will decide the matter before them. The biggest bungle and tangle that it is possible to conceive is displayed by the correspondence which has taken place between the commission and the Grand Trunk Pacific in reference to the appointment of a third arbitrator and in reference to getting down to the specific matter that is to be considered by the arbitration board. There, we have what?—the commission fighting tooth and nail and for what?—to limit the matters to be arbitrated to those mentioned in the letters from the Grand Trunk Pacific. In other words, they are trying to say to the Grand Trunk Pacific that this arbitration board cannot consider one single question except those questions mentioned in your letters; that is the over-classification to which you have objected in those letters. The Grand Trunk Pacific say: We do not want to be bound to that; we want a full, complete and thorough investigation into the classification over the whole system. In reply the commission say: You cannot have that. Why should they not have it? Is it not in the interest of the public to know if any money has been misspent

not only on sections 'B' and 'F' of the Transcontinental railway, but on the whole railway that is being built by this commission? This commission conceived it to be their duty, and they think they are serving the public thereby, to limit the inquiry and have no investigation into other portions of the road, when, as a matter of fact, if they took a diametrically opposite course, they would be best serving the interests of the country.

How is this country interested in the matter? Under the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, as hon. members of this House know, we are to furnish the money to build the railway. We pay the interest on the money during the time it is being constructed. We will take eight years as the time that it will take to construct that railway, and I think I am fair at putting it at eight years. We do not, of course, borrow the whole cost of that railway at the beginning of the eight years, and to be fair we will cut that in two and make it four years. I will say that we pay four per cent for our money, because, while we are not paying that rate of interest, I contend, and the statement of my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) bears out that contention, that when you consider compound interest, brokerage, commissions and underwriting, our money will cost us four per cent. What does that mean? The estimated cost of the railway, as brought down by the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) in December last, is a trifle less than $115,000,000. One hundred and fifteen million at four per cent for four years amounts to $18,400.000. We will pay that on the cost of construction providing that $115,000,000 will cover the expenditure. What after that? One hundred and fifteen million dollars plus $18,500,000 is what it is going to cost us. But we must add to that seven years more interest at four per cent which amounts to $37,352,000 because we get no rental for this road for the first seven years. Adding these two together it makes the total amount that we pay in interest $56,752,000, practically $57,000,000 and $57,000,000 is just exactly half of $114,000,000 which is almost the estimated cost of the road. It means that we are paying half of the estimated cost of the railway. It means that every dollar of over-classification costs this country 50 cents. It means that every million dollars that we pay for that road costs us $500,000 in interest. So, in that way it will be appreciated what we are paying. When Mr. Woods stated in that letter that I have quoted that the over-break alone would be $1,000,000 on one section alone, we see that this country will have to pay $500,000 in excess of what it would otherwise pay. When Mr. Hodgins was trying to keep down the expenditure of section 'F' every dollar that he saved in classification meant fifty cents to this country. When Mr. Grant, of his own volition, went over sections 'B' and 'F' and cut down $647,000 of the estimates, without one single kick from a contractor, he saved this country $323,000. But, in addition to that we have this interest, and it is the country's interest and it is our duty to keep it in view, that we should not only for our own sake but for the sake of the Grand Trunk Pacific keep down the cost of the railway. Why? The greater the excessive cost of that railway the greater will be the freight rates, because their freight rates will depend on the amount of interest they pay and the amount of interest or rental they pay will be three per cent upon the total cost of construction. So, we are interested in that way in keeping down the cost of that road.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that when it was brought to his attention that the Grand Trunk Pacific purposed to undertake some of the contracts with this commission for the building of a portion of the railway, at first sight he was not quite certain whether it would be proper for him to allow them to do so. I think his first thought was probably the best. What has happened? Here is the Grand Trunk Pacific under contract with this government to lease the railway after it is constructed at a certain rental. Here is the very same company building a portion of the railway. The engineer of the company is the engineer who will oversee their contract. He is the engineer who will say, of his own company, whether or not their contract has been over-classified, whether or not they are getting too much money. It is the same thing as if I were to say to myself that I should be the sole arbitrator as to whether I was getting too much money for the work that I was doing. That is the position they are in. What has been the effect? I am only going to cite two instances. The Grand Trunk Pacific have, I think, five or six contracts with this commission. The first contract is for 50 miles west from Moncton. The estimate of solid rock under that contract as officially given to this government was no solid rock whatever, and the amount certified was 10,000 yards.

We find that the estimate of loose rock was 130,000 yards and the amount certified 850,000 yards so that these two items alone make a difference of $375,000 on the first of the Grand Trunk Pacific contracts. Where is the man, where is the check, where is the engineer who is to say that the Grand

Trunk Pacific is getting too much for that contract? Surely the Grand Trunk Pacific is not going to make any objection; and yet the history of the whole construction of this railroad is that unless objection is made by the Grand Trunk Pacific practically no objection is to be made with reference to any portion of the railroad whatever. All the material above common material is called classified material, and the engineers appointed by the government estimated that the classified material on that section was only 7 per cent whereas it turns out now to be 52 per cent. Here is an increase of $238,000 on that item alone, and on the whole contract an increase of $600,000 for this one section. We say that is because the Grand Trunk Pacific there is occupying a dual position, and its engineer has certified in favour of itself what itself is entitled to. Now, we come to district 'A,' mileage 96 to 164 from Moncton, and the increase in the solid rock there over the estimates, loose rock amounts to $63,367, and the increase of solid rock out of common excavation—and this is a remarkable thing—amounted to $272,983, a total increase of $341,000 on that section. On these two sections therefore there is a total increase of practically $1,000,000. And where is the check on the Grand Trunk Pacific; where is the check on this increase of $1,000,000 on these two contracts alone? We know that the whole history of the construction of the line is that no check can be applied except by the Grand Trunk Pacific themselves. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister this question: Suppose that no objection whatever is made by the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers and there is consequently no dispute to be referred to the arbitration tribunal at all, are we to infer that there has been no mismanagement, no dishonesty and no over classification in the construction of this railway? The right hon. gentleman has told us that those things go to the arbitrators which are in dispute between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, and even on his own words we are surely entitled to an investigation into the cost of this road in matters where no dispute has arisen, and in reference to which the country may have suffered. It seems to me, Sir, that if the right hon. the Prime Minister expects this to be an effective inquiry, if he expects it to attain the object which he professes to have in view, he has got to give the committee the right to investigate the cause of Mr. Lumsden's resignation. Mr. Lumsden said in so many words that the reason he resigned was because the engineers in districts 'B' and 'F' had over-classed material. In other words they had converted earth at 25 cents a yard into loose rock at 50 cents a yard, and loose rock into solid rock at $1.50 per yard, and in that way money was improperly taken out of the treasury of the country. Surely if we are going to ascertain whether or not Mr. Lumsden was justified in losing confidence in the engineers, we cannot possibly attain the desired end unless we are permitted to prove what he alleged and go into this whole question of classification.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) As I was a member of the committee which investigated certain questions in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific two years ago and as I have been referred to by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Middlebro), I trust I may be pardoned if I take a few minutes to discuss what to me is a very important question. I compliment the leader of the opposition on the good sense shown by him in marshalling his forces on this occasion and leaving it to a man like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) to resurrect the Hodgins' charges which have been buried for two years and upon which the people of this country have already passed judgment. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who know what took place with reference to the Hodgins charges had the good judgment not to discuss them in the manner they have been discussed this afternoon. I am sorry that the action of my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) has rendered it necessary to refer to these Hodgins charges at all, because it must be a painful matter to Major Hodgins and his friends, and to the hon. gentlemen opposite as well, to have these things rehashed. The facts of the Hodgins case are simple. Major Hodgins was a district engineer employed by the commission. He did not get along with the engineers under him, he had lots of trouble and the commission sent an officer to investigate the matter and report, and as a result of the investigation Major Hodgins was discharged. Major Hodgins made the statement that he estimated the cost at $12,000,000 and that he had seen in one of the Toronto newspapers that contractor McArthur had stated that the cost would be about $16,000,000 and therefore he concluded that the increase of $4,000,000 above his estimate was due to the excessive classification which was known as the Quebec classification. He also stated in substance that he had been taken down to Quebec to be taught how the classification was made there, and the inference was that he had been asked and had refused to adopt the Quebec classification in district 'F,' and because he had refused he was dismissed from his position as district engineer. Well, the evidence showed that Major Hodgins went to Quebec in company with 15 or 20 other engineers and the commissioners of the Grand Trunk Pacific, that they examined a certain cut in the vicinity of

La Tuque and the report of the engineers had shown that that cut contained about 87 per cent of solid rock whereas in his judgment 40 per cent of solid rock would be the outside figure to allow. And, because of what he saw in this cut he considered that unfair and dishonest classification had taken place and that he would not apply it to district 'F.' This matter was investigated for about a month and Major Hodgins was assisted by able counsel whose services were paid by the government. Every chance in the world was given Major Hodgins and the Conservative party to prove the charges, and after a month's inquiry, without any pressure or promise or anything else, Major Hodgins voluntarily stated that he found he was entirely wrong, because the cut to which he referred as having been classified as 87 per cent and upon which he would have allowed 40 per cent solid rock, was actually classified as only 29 per cent solid rock in one month and 30 per cent in another, and the very month in which he was at the La Tuque cutting it was classified at 29 per cent, while he himself had allowed 40 per cent. When Major Hodgins was brought face to face with this statement of facts, there was nothing for an honourable man to do but to say what he did, that he was wrong, that he had been misled by somebody, he withdrew his charges and that was the end of the whole transaction. My hon. friend tries to resurrect these charges and to show that after Major Hodgins failed to prove that there was anything wrong in Quebec and consequently that he had been asked to do anything wrong in his district, we should have gone into the question of classification. I do not propose to discuss that because it was threshed out at the time and if the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) had been here he would have exercised the same good judgment displayed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and refrained from discussing that question at all. My hon. friend says that after Mr. Poulin was made district engineer in 'F' the over-classification amounted to $2,798,000. Why, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. The amount he cites is a certain conclusion arrived at by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and I shall refer to it in a while. But the hon. member for Simcoe does not claim that it is an over-classification, he says it is a difference between the estimate of the engineers who surveyed the work in the first place and the actual result of construction. He does not say it is an over-classification, he says it is an increase in cost. My hon. friend from North Grey who knows nothing about it, comes here and says that since Mr. Poulin was put in charge of the work the over-classification has amounted to over $2,000,000 and he contradicts the hon. member for Simcoe himself. I am sorry the hon. member for Simcoe is not here; I believe that hon. gentleman tried to give a fair statement of the case as he viewed it. I cannot agree with his conclusions but, so far as his figures are concerned, he took them from the returns furnished. He has been very industrious, he has asked time and again for returns, and I understand he has gathered information, he has codified that information and while I think in some cases he has been unfair, he has given us the result of his investigations, and has something to back it up. The hon. member for North Grey comes here this afternoon and I would not like to say through malice, I would not be entitled to say it, but I think I have the right to say through sheer inability to understand the purport of these figures, makes the broad statement that after Mr. Poulin, a Frenchman, took charge, the over-classification amounted to more than $2,000,000.

The hon. member for Simcoe in compiling his statements took the amounts and quantities in district 'F' from the estimate of Major Hodgins and you will all remember that Major Hodgins stated before the committee of inquiry that as a result of his investigations and re-surveys of his district he was able to reduce the estimated cost from about $13,000,000 to about $12,000,000 or in other words that he was able by a re-survey to reduce the cost of district 'F' by $1,500,000. The hon. member for Simcoe takes that $12,000,000 as being the true estimated cost of district 'F' and builds up a case from that, the result being his statement that it cost $2,798,000 more than it was estimated by the engineers it would cost. He fails to say that it was proved beyond any shadow of a doubt that Major Hodgins, in arriving at these estimates, not only did not save $1,500,000, but had left out $1,500,000 which should have been put in, and if he had put in what he should have put in and what he left out, the cost would have been brought up to exactly the estimated cost of the other engineers. I shall not take up time in reading long documents to prove all this, I shall leave it to the decision of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who was a member of the committee and knows all about it. It will be found in vol. 7 of the debates of 1908 in a number of places in the report of the discussion which then took place. I shall give one illustration that Major Hodgins left out of his calculations entirely. It is known by some members of this House, probably not by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), because he admits he is not an engineer, it is known by the hon. member for Hamilton that these speci-

fications require that all rock excavations shall go one foot below grade. That foot is to be filled in again with other material in order to give a better surface on which to lay the rails. Major Hodgins in his estimate of the cost of this work did not take into consideration that fact at all, and the result was that that one item alone would increase the cost of that work by $500,000. That was proved at that investigation, Major Hodgins was present, he never attempted to deny it, because they had his cross-sections and profiles there to show it.

There were other items in this estimate left out which brought the total up to about $13,500,000. When Mr. McArthur, the contractor, was speaking to the newspapers in Toronto about the total work costing $16,000,000, he was not talking about the grading alone, but about the finished road. His contract did not include rails, sleepers, laying track, station houses, and many other things, and he said that when the road was completed it would cost $16,000,000, but he did not say that his portion of the work would cost $16,000,000, and that is where the whole trouble arose. If I am right—and my hon. friend from Hamilton knows I am right—

Mr. BARKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is now arguing that the hon. member for Simcoe made an error in contrasting the work that has been paid for with the original estimate. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has taken the estimate upon which the tenders were made and the contracts entered into, not Mr. Hodgins' figures at all. He took the estimates that were in the government offices, and which the hon. gentleman can see as to the quantities in every mile and section of that district F and against that he is taking the quantities for which the government have already paid. He was contrasting it in that way.

Mr. CARVELL. I always like my hon. friend from Hamilton to make a statement because he wants to be fair, but he fails to realize that Major Hodgins was the very engineer who made the estimate and when my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was contrasting the estimates of the engineer he was contrasting the estimates of Major Hodgins with the results.

Mr. BARKER. No, he took the figures that the government accepted the tenders upon, which were settled in the head office of the commissioners. I do not care who made them, it could be half a dozen men.

Mr. CARVELL. I am willing to be asked a question, but I want to say that those figures were made by Major Hodgins.

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. BARKER. Not all of them.

Mr. CARVELL. He was the district engineer and in the archives of the office, hon. gentlemen will see every one of these figures signed by Mr. Hodgins. My hon. friend knows that, he is not an idiot and he knows a good deal about railway matters. I tell him he knows it and he knows that Mr. Hodgins prepared the estimates. My hon. friend yesterday referred to the fact that when Mr. Hodgins came to review the estimate he reduced it from $13,000,000 to $12,000,000.

Mr. BARKER. That is where the hon. gentleman, perhaps untentionally, is misleading the House. The figures he refers to—

Mr. CARVELL. I object.

Mr. BARKER. You have called on me.

Mr. CARVELL. Does my hon. friend want to ask a question?

Mr. BARKER. I say to the hon. member that he is missing what I endeavoured to say. The hon. member says that Major Hodgins claimed that by certain work of his he has reduced the quantities. That did not enter at all into the argument yesterday. The argument of the hon. member for Simcoe was this, that contracts had been entered into by the government on certain quantities, and he showed that the quantities the government had been paying on grossly exceeded the actual quantities as regard solid rock and loose rock, and were less on the cheap common excavation.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend has had his say, and I hope he is satisfied, but I come back to the proposition that Mr. Hodgins was the engineer responsible for district 'F,' and it was on his figures the estimates were based. If you will turn to the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) you will find the figures on page 2412. The hon. member for Simcoe gave us only $10,093,873 as the estimated cost, which he says has been increased by $2,798,600. To come back to what I was trying to impress on the House, hon. members opposite have tried to make out that this increase was due to Mr. Poulin, but Mr. Poulin went there after the grading work was practically all graded. We have the admission from the hon. member for Simcoe that when Mr. Poulin went there the grading was practically all done.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that the hon. member for Simcoe took these figures from a return brought down by the government itself, that he took no other figures, and that he embodied no information in that table except what the government put before him in the return brought down.

Mr. CARVELL. I understand that the hon. member for Simcoe based his figures entirely on returns furnished him by the department, but his estimate is based not only on the amounts taken out up to the present, but on what the department estimates will be taken out and paid for in the future.

Mr. FOSTER. All given by the government.

Mr. CARVELL. Yes. My hon. friend from North Grey made the astonishing statement this afternoon that the engineer of the department estimated his work would only cost about $58,000,000 and that, taking what has been done already and what is estimated in the future, it is going to cost $115,000,000, or an increase of over 100 per cent. My hon. friend from North Grey may have honestly believed that, but if he did, that is only another evidence that the leader of the opposition never should have allowed him to talk on this important question, because the estimate of $58,000,000 was an estimate made by members of this House, in discussing the proposition in 1903, before the road had been surveyed at all.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It was made by the Finance Minister.

Mr. CARVELL. It was made before the engineers had gone over the road with their levels, and it was simply based on common knowledge. Taking the fact that certain roads in other sections of the country had cost $25,000 per mile, and certain other roads elsewhere had cost $35,000 per mile, the Finance Minister arrived at an estimate for this road of $58,000,000. But my hon. friend from North Grey attempted to show that that was the first estimate of the engineers, and that, on account of the dishonesty of the engineers, the total cost is going to amount to $115,000,000, or an increase of 100 per cent over the estimate. Let me give the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the result of the figures furnished by the hon. member for North Simcoe. That hon. gentleman was dealing with the construction of practically the whole of district 'F'—of the work from Moncton to Quebec and 150 miles west. I have taken his figures and carefully worked them out, and I find on that portion, or about one-half the work, he only claims that the cost has been increased $7,590,000 above the estimate of the engineers after the work was laid out and surveyed. That would be only an increase of $15,000,000 on the total work, and that, I submit, in a work of such magnitude, is a very satisfactory showing and very creditable to the engineers. Let me discuss the question of the increase in the several contracts set forth by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). In the first place, Mr. Lumsden, in his letter of resignation, complains that certain engineers on districts 'B' and 'F' had not carried out his instructions regarding classifications. That brings us to the consideration of what were the instructions of Mr. Lumsden, and I propose to read them. There was in the first place a general specification for all the work, including every item, prepared by the chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden himself, and placed in the hands of every engineer and contractor, and it was on these specifications that tenders were called for and contracts entered into.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Prepared by Mr. Lumsden?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know who did the clerical work, but Mr. Lumsden was the chief engineer, it was he who signed it and who is responsible.

Mr J. HAGGART. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Railways stated how the specifications were prepared, and said that Mr. Lumsden had nothing to do with them.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Lumsden signed them and adopted them and made them his own, and has to stand by them. Now, I want to read these specifications. I am going to take up the question of solid rock only, and I confine my reading of the specifications to that:

> Solid rock excavation will include all rock found in ledges or masses of more than one cubic yard which, in the judgment of the engineer, may be best removed by blasting.

I think it would do many of our hon. friends on the other side a vast amount of good if they would read that, and read it carefully. This presupposes two conditions of affairs to exist. First, it presupposes that there would be rock found in ledges. Every member of this House, and every intelligent member of the reading public of Canada, knows that if you come to ledge rock there is no question that that rock is solid rock. It is the other branch of the specifications over which the difficulty arises—rock in masses; if the rock were all ledge rock, there could not be any question about it. But as it provides also for rock, 'found in masses of more than one cubic yard,' it presupposes that some substance must be classified as solid rock which is not ledge rock. Were this not the case, of course, the specification would have been confined to ledge rock itself. Now, the question arises: What is meant by the term 'rock in masses?' This work commenced early in 1906, I think. Of course, it would not be very long before differences of opinion would arise between the engineers as to what was meant by 'rock in masses of more than one cubic yard.' The Grand Trunk Pacific, who want to keep the price down to the lowest figure, because they will

have to pay interest on the cost of it for the next forty-three years, contended that it meant practically nothing but boulders which would measure one cubic yard. If it was not a boulder, they contended, it was not solid rock. Other engineers on the work said that it did not mean that at all. And Mr. Lumsden applied to the district engineers, the district engineers to their divisional engineers, and, in some cases, to resident engineers. The contractors applied to their solicitors, and some of the ablest legal minds in Canada were brought to bear on the interpretation of these words. I will not quote any of these opinions, it is enough to say that such legal authorities as Blake, Lash & Cassels, Alexander Lacoste and others were consulted and gave opinions. Eminent engineers also were asked to interpret the words. A variety of interpretations was given, but, with one or two exceptions, every one of these authorities, both technical and legal, held that the specification did include something beyond rock in ledge or in boulders measuring over one cubic yard. Therefore, after a great deal of discussion, Mr. Lumsden, some time, I think, in December, 1907, issued to his engineers, further instructions as to his interpretation of this clause. He then went so far as to say that rock in masses meant rock joined together in such manner that, in the opinion of the engineer, they could be best removed by blasting, so long as the individual pieces of rock in these masses exceeded one cubic foot in size.

Mr. FOSTER. That was in 1908?

Mr. CARVELL. I may be wrong, but I think it was in 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister's date is 1908.

Mr. CARVELL. I was wrong; it was on January 6, 1908. I made a mistake of a month. On January 6, 1908, the deputy minister of justice gave his decision as to this interpretation of the clause:

Mr. FOSTER. Were there two separate constructions?

Mr. CARVELL. I was wrong; it was on January 6, 1908. I made a mistake of a month. On January 6, 1908, the deputy minister of justice gave his decision as to this interpretation of the clause:

> I see no reason to differ from the classification stated by the chief engineer in his letter to the commissioners of the 16th ultimo, except as to the statement that 'rock assembled (the individual pieces of such assembled rock exceeding one cubic foot in size). . . . Such as in the judgment of the engineer may be the best removed by blasting,' is to be classified as solid rock excavation under clause 34. I do not understand upon what principle the chief engineer limits the size to pieces exceeding one cubic foot. The specification speaks of rock found in ledges or masses of more than one cubic yard which in the judgment of the engineer may be best removed by blasting.

That is signed by Mr. Newcombe. When Mr. Lumsden received this from Mr. Newcombe he issued his final instructions to his engineers on which the work has been classified from that day to the present, and will be classified from this time forward, because it has been agreed within the last two months by the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the National Transcontinental that Mr. Lumsden's interpretation of section 34 of the 10th January, 1908, and that upon that interpretation the classification shall be made. Hon. members will find it recorded at page 430 of the proceedings in the Hodgins charges. Mr. Lumsden issued a blue-print of which I have a copy here. If hon. members have not seen it, it is here for their inspection. A copy of that blue-print is also to be found at page 430 of the Hodgins case to which I have already referred. In that blue-print Mr. Lumsden gives six illustrations of what he would classify as solid rock, including both rock in ledges and rock in masses of more than one cubic yard.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. As the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) seems acquainted with the details, would he please tell us what is the difference between the opinion Mr. Lumsden held prior to the opinion given by the Minister of Justice and the instructions that he issued to his engineers?

Mr. CARVELL. I shall need to go back a little. In the first place, while I have no specific statement of Mr. Lumsden's definition of the term, I assume from the correspondence that Mr. Lumsden interpreted rock in masses above one cubic yard to mean a boulder above one cubic yard. But, just before writing to Mr. Newcombe, he did arrive at the conclusion that assembled rock of one cubic yard or upwards no portion of which was less than one cubic foot in size and which in the opinion of the engineer could best be removed by blasting, was solid rock. After receiving Mr. Newcombe's opinion he changed it to rock assembled in masses, no matter what size the individual pieces might be so long as the total was above a cubic yard, which, in the opinion of the engineer could best be removed by blasting. The first illustration was something which neither my hon. friend from North Toronto nor myself classify as solid rock, because it means a rock in the ledge, it is simply a straight ledge of rock. You cut through it, and you measure up the quantities.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be rock in the mass.

Mr. CARVELL. No, rock in the ledge.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Lumsden said it may be in masses.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Lumsden says in the illustration that it is rock in ledges. The next is rock in boulders over one cubic yard, and here he gives an illustration of two big boulders, which I think both the hon. member for North Toronto and myself could distinguish as solid rock, because we know solid rock when we see it. As long as it is above a cubic yard it becomes solid rock. The next is not so easy to understand. No. 3 is conglomerate or plum pudding stone. He gives no specific definition of what that means, but he gives an illustration. It means a number of rocks of different sizes, probably not above a cubic yard, cemented together by some solid substance, making it so solid that in the opinion of the engineer it is a conglomerate rock. The fourth is smaller, because he says it is detached ledge rock in masses over one cubic yard. This, to my mind, is not very different from the boulder. The fifth illustration is the one over which the difficulty has arisen; that is rock in masses of over one cubic yard, assembled rock, which in the judgment of the engineer can be best taken out by blasting. Now, I want my hon. friend to pay special attention to the comments made upon this illustration by Mr. Lumsden.

No. 1 is a mere matter of measurement by the engineer. No. 2 is a mere matter of measurement by rock measures. No. 3 is a mere matter of measurement by the engineers. No. 4 is a mere matter of measurement by rock measures. No. 5 and 6, to form a judgment as to whether or not it is best removed by blasting, the chief engineer must view the work in progress or leave it to be decided by the engineer in charge, whose duty it is to frequently visit this work during its operation and be governed thereby and act accordingly.

Remember, he admits himself, in 1908, that to settle this question, either the chief engineer must view that work himself, or leave it to be decided by the engineer in charge whose duty it is frequently to visit the work during its operation, and be governed thereby, and act accordingly. Now, Sir, I want to state here, and I am not doing it for the purpose of finding fault with Mr. Lumsden, I am going to say that up to the month of June, 1909, Mr. Lumsden never travelled over 25 miles of the whole 800 miles of railway under construction. I say I am finding no fault with him, he was an old man, probably his physical infirmities prevented him from doing so, and under his instructions given to his engineers in January, 1908, if he had not been able to do that himself, if he had not the physical ability to carry out that side of the instructions, then I say there is no other logical conclusion but that he should have left it to the engineers in charge of the work, and there were engineers in charge of every mile of the work, an engineer in charge of every ten miles, then a divisional engineer and a district engineer. There is no man on this earth who has any right to classify this work, or who has the ability to classify this work, except the engineer in charge of the work. I have taken up more time on this point than I intended, because I think it is the basis of the whole controversy. This blue print is the one sent out to his engineers by Mr. Lumsden. That blue print was received by every engineer on that work, down to the resident engineers. The work went on, and we have it in the evidence in the Hodgins case, of Mr. Armstrong, who was the district engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific over district 'F' that if he had known the contents of Mr. Lumsden's letter to his engineers, which I have referred to, then he would not have recommended that there was any over-classification in district 'F' at all, up to the day when he left the work, which I think was in March or April, 1908. My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Middlebro) read letters written by Mr. Woods away back in 1907. Why, Mr. Woods did not know what was the interpretation of this clause of Mr. Lumsden when he was writing those letters. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) did not refer to these letters in that sense, because he knew that Mr. Woods did not know what this interpretation was when he received these letters. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) knew it, and every member who followed this investigation with any degree of intelligence knew it, and it is left to the hon. member for North Grey to come here and read this letter of Mr. Woods, and then say that because Mr. Woods put up these kicks there must be something wrong with the engineer when, as a matter of fact, Mr. Wood did not know what instructions were given by Mr. Lumsden when he wrote those letters.

Mr. MEIGHEN. No instructions had been given then.

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly not, but after the instructions had been given.

Mr. MEIGHEN. They did not apply to this at all.

Mr. CARVELL. The engineers say they did apply to this. The engineers were on the work, and they say it applied to this, and that they classified this work according to those instructions. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he ever visited a portion of a railway under construction, I mean a portion of the work that is classi-

fied in the material as loose rock or solid rock. If he has, then he will see that Mr. Lumsden was absolutely right in giving the instructions he did as to the classification of figure 5.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have lived within 200 or 300 yards of such a work. However, I am not criticising Mr. Lumsden's instructions.

Mr. CARVELL. Now I would recommend any hon. member of this House to visit any portion of this work while it is under construction. I may say that after I went home in 1908, from this Hodgins inquiry, I had the curiosity to visit some of the work, I visited something like 75 miles of the work, travelled over it; I visited hundreds of sections and examined them myself, and I make the statement that there is no man, not even an engineer, who can go to a finished cut of classified material and honestly come to a conclusion as to how that cut should be classified. I will admit that if you have only got a matter of ledge rock, you may take your cross sections and measure them up. But if you have got conglomerate material, or assembled rock, then I say there is no man, not even Mr. Lumsden nor the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, who is able to tell exactly how that work should be classified. Let me give an illustration. I think my hon. friend from North Grey says there may be a cone of rock rising up in the centre of the work. That rock is taken out and thrown over a dump and no man can tell of what material it was composed. There is another thing I want to point out. After this work is completed, if there is any earth on top of the rock at all, that has all to be smoothed back to a slope of one and a half to one, as my hon. friend has stated, which means that it slopes back to a foot and a half here it rises perpendicularly one foot. And when that is all sloped down to the rock, no man on earth, unless he be a practical engineer, would come to the conclusion that there is half as much classified material in that work as there actually was. I admit that probably the engineer realized this difficulty, I will admit that he would make allowances, and he would come much nearer to the proper classification of that cut than a layman would. But even the practical engineer cannot tell except it be solid rock. To carry that a little further, we have rock such as is found in figures 3 or 5. That is the conglomerate rock or assembled rock. That material has been, according to the judgment of the engineer, removed by blasting.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to infringe again if my hon. friend will allow me. When he reads out these numbers what is he reading from? I go by the minister's statement on Tuesday and the documents he presented with reference to the chief engineer's interpretations. His instructions with his interpretations bear the date of January 14, 1908. They were interpretations given by Mr. Lumsden on January 14, 1908, accepted by Mr. Woods on February 20, 1908, and embodied in the agreement of all a little later. There are some differences between this and what my hon. friend is reading.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think there is very much difference between my hon. friend and myself. He is a little mixed up in his dates, but evidently he is referring to the same subject that I am.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking the dates given by the minister.

Mr. CARVELL. Then the minister was mixed up in his dates, but he is referring to the same subject as I am. I have sent over to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) a blue print and if he will do me the honour of looking at it he will find that it is an exact copy of the illustration found on page 430 of the Hodgins charges and he will also find that it is actually signed 'Hugh D. Lumsden.' Of course, he understands that it is a blue print from a tracing.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what Mr. Lumsden refers to, I suppose, when he says:

I attach a diagram in explanation of the above which, in my opinion, is all that is included in 34 solid rock.

Mr. CARVELL. I think so.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CARVELL. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was endeavouring to point out some of the difficulties of classification in railway construction from a practical standpoint. I had read the instructions given to Mr. Lumsden by his engineers on the 10th of January, 1908, as to his interpretation of the specifications in regard to solid rock. I now refer to clause 35 of the original specification, and here is what Mr. Lumsden says about it:

All large stones and boulders measuring more than one cubic foot and less than one cubic yard, and all loose rock whether in situ or otherwise, that may be removed by hand, pick or bar, all cemented gravel, indurated clay and other materials that cannot in the judgment of the engineer, be ploughed with a ten-inch grading plough, behind a team of six good horses properly handled; and without the necessity of blasting, although blasting may be occasionally resorted to, shall be classified as loose rock.

Under the heading I would include:—

1. All large stones and boulders more than

one cubic foot and less than one cubic yard not covered under clause 34.

2. All loose rock in situ or otherwise that may be removed by hand, pick or bar, and not covered under clause 34.

3. All cemented gravel, indurated clay, and other materials that cannot, in the judgment of the engineer, be ploughed with a ten-inch grading plough behind a team of six good horses properly handled: and without the necessity of blasting, although blasting may be occasionally resorted to.

That was an interpretation of this clause that might be given by any person, and, let us apply the test. Take material which the engineer may say cannot be classified as solid rock, and then the first question that arises is: Can it be ploughed with a team of six horses and a ten-inch plough? Well, in almost every case that must of necessity lie purely in the judgment of the engineer who is classifying the work, because, of course, you could not by any possibility get a team of six horses and plough on to some of this work. The next question is: Can it be removed by hand, pick or bar? There is no trouble in telling whether it can be removed by hand, because a man can get down and try it. But, can it be removed by a pick? Well, a railway navvy will take a pick and if he takes time enough he can remove a solid ledge of rock, or he can with a crow-bar, if he takes time enough drill a hole three feet deep in solid rock. But, I submit that no engineer ever intended that if it were reasonably a physical impossibility to remove this material by pick or bar, it must necessarily be classified as loose rock. We must apply common sense to the thing. The question is whether a man engaged in railway construction could fairly and reasonably remove this material by means of a pick or bar, or whether in the judgment of the engineers you could with a team of six horses and a ten-inch plough, plough it. If it cannot be ploughed in such a way, then it should not be classified as loose rock, and if it can, then it should be so classified. I merely mention this to point out the large degree of judgment which must be exercised by the engineer whose duty it is to classify the work. I am also endeavouring to show the next to impossibility of you or I, Mr. Speaker, or even an experienced engineer classifying that work on an examination made a year afterwards, when the weathering has caused the face to become smooth and to look different from what it was in its original state. Under the specifications anything other than solid rock and loose rock would be called common excavation. Let me for a moment refer to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who has given the question a good deal of consideration, and to whom the country and the House owe a debt of gratitude for the labour he has expended in preparing his case. I wish to discuss the points raised by the hon. gentleman in a fair manner and to give him credit where credit is due. In one connection the hon. gentleman was manifestly unfair, although perhaps unwittingly. He gave us instances of work which was estimated by the engineers to cost so much, but which had cost more than the estimate, and he said that this increase had arisen on only three items of the contract. Well, there are 104 items in the contract altogether, and while he did not say so, yet the inference was that the discrepancy between the estimate and the cost would proportionately increase in the case of the other 101 items. Well, my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who is somewhat of a railway man, knows that in such a contract as this, the three items of solid rock, loose rock, and common excavation will represent 90 per cent of the total cost of the undertaking, and in some cases more than that. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox), considering the three items, wants us to believe that there will be an alarmingly greater increase when the remaining items are taken into account, I am sorry to think that he did not treat the House with that fairness to which we are entitled and which indeed the hon. gentleman usually exhibits. Then, another thing, the hon. gentleman did not touch at all upon the price of the quantities to be removed. The prices range practically from 25 cents a yard for common excavation to 50 or 60 cents for loose rock, and $1.50 for solid rock, but the hon. gentleman omitted to mention what is called train-haul. Under the contract the contractor agrees to remove all cuts down to the grade and to place the material in the nearest hollow on either side or wherever he is instructed to do by the engineer. The contractor has to haul that material 500 feet without extra cost, but when he hauls it beyond 500 feet he gets, I think, one cent per 100 feet per yard. After all that is done, after the amount of earth taken out of the cut is used in the embankment or fill adjoining it, if there is nothing left at the fill-up, they have to resort to some other method. That is called train-haul. They get from 45 cents to 50 cents a yard for train-haul, and as a rule it must be common excavation unless the engineer authorizes the contractor to take something else. There you see, you have millions of common excavation which actually figure up at 45 cents to 50 cents a yard instead of 25 cents a yard, and any gentleman who assumes to discuss quantities and prices of this contract ought to know it. I am bound to say the hon. gentleman must have known it, and it probably has escaped his attention.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there not a special price for that kind of work?

Mr. CARVELL. Certainly, that is what I am telling the House, but it is common excavation and it is included in the quantities of earth removed and is a special price. That price is about 45 cents or 50 cents a yard, and that price rules as long as the distance to be carried is not more than, I think, five miles. If, for any reason, they have to go more than five miles for material, they get a certain amount per mile after that, I think one cent a yard per mile for the train haul. This increases the cost of common excavation in many cases by 100 per cent, and it accounts for the increased cost to some extent, but yet my hon. friend took good care not to say anything about it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. How much of that kind of work is there?

Mr. CARVELL. I know one place in district 'A,' for instance, where there is 300,000 yards of train haul; another place where there would be 250,000 yards. I think in New Brunswick I could pick out in district 'A' probably 1,000,000 yards of train haul and these are things which we must understand if we are to discuss this matter intelligently.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think that an engineer giving the original estimates would take that into consideration before he gave the estimate?

Mr. CARVELL. I am not a judge of the engineer, and I do not think the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) or any other hon. member will say that any engineer can go over the ground in making preliminary surveys or even locating surveys and figure exactly to a yard what he will have to do to build a railway 1,800 miles in length.

I will take up district 'F' and take the different sections in the order in which they were discussed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). He stated that there would be an increase in the cost when the work was completed of about $2,700,000 over the estimate made by the engineer before the work was commenced. Let us look at this like reasonable business men. The engineer goes over 200 miles of proposed railroad. He looks at the contour of the country, at the hills and hollows, he examines the rivers, he makes up his mind as to whether there will be much rock, and he says: I come to the conclusion that out of 1,000,000 yards of excavation there will be 1,000 yards of solid rock and 200,000 yards of loose rock, and the balance common excavation. I want to know how any man can tell to a thousand yards or a hundred thousand yards or a quarter of a million yards what different classes of material there will be in a million yards of excavation. He cannot dig pits, they do not do that in modern engineering. He may drive steel bars down and come to the conclusion that after so many feet of common excavation he will have solid rock. I want to be reasonable and I want the members to be reasonable; I am sorry my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is not here, in order to ask him to be reasonable and to tell me what no man on earth, no matter what his ability may be, can tell whether he is going to find this cemented material of which Mr. Lumsden speaks, this conglomerate or plum-pudding material of which he also speaks, or material which can or cannot be ploughed by a team of six horses when it is found twenty or thirty feet underground.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. member mean to argue to this House and to the country that any capable engineer has the slightest difficulty in estimating whether 100,000 or 500,000 yards of material is sand, or solid rock?

Mr. CARVELL. There never was a railway constructed on earth, let alone in Canada, but that very thing happened, and it is the most common error known to engineers. I shall give an illustration under my own observation. About a year ago, in company with the chief engineer, I visited a large portion of the work in New Brunswick. We came to a cutting in which there are probably 150,000 yards of material. The engineers returned this in their estimate as solid rock. The sub-contractor, a man from Sydney, Nova Scotia, took the work believing he had this 150,000 or 200,000 yards of solid rock, and it turns out there are not 25,000 yards of solid rock in the whole cut, yet the engineers told him it would be solid rock. There is a concrete illustration. If the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), a practical railway contractor, were here he would bear out every word I say, and the remark is true in many cases. Engineers say they believe from looking at the ground it is going to be sand, and it turns out to be very solid rock. I tell my hon. friends they should go on some of these enormous works and see for themselves, and they will conclude that what I say is true.

Now, we will go to district 'F'. There we have an estimate based on the quantities and the estimated classification of Mr. Hodgins, of $12,000,000. I said before dinner that Major Hodgins left out a number of items in his classification, one of which, the excavating of a foot below grade in all rock cuttings, amounted to half a million dollars. I find in referring to the debates, that it would amount to $495,000, about 300,000 yards of solid rock which he

had not estimated at all. I also looked up Mr. Poulin's evidence at page 485 of the investigation. Mr. Poulin there submitted a statement to which I have already referred, and he states there that Mr. Hodgins had not estimated work in the contract and in the grading which amounted to $1,500,000, and therefore, instead of this work being estimated to cost $12,000,000 as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) stated the other day, it should have been estimated by Mr. Hodgins himself, if he had included these things which were left out, at $1,350,000. According to the statement given by my friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) it did cost only $12,892,000, or less than it should have cost according to the proper estimate made by Mr. Hodgins himself. I wish to tell my hon. friend another thing concerning this district. This is a matter of which there is no public record, but I will make the statement, and it is the easiest thing in the world for my hon. friends to verify it by asking for a return which will be readily brought down. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) complains that in this contract, as in many others, for some unexplained reason—and there was always the insinuation that there was something crooked at the bottom of it—common excavation had constantly dwindled and solid rock had increased. In district 'F' half a million yards of common excavation disappears and appears as solid rock, and this was done designedly and with the consent of the engineers and of the Grand Trunk Pacific and every body else. It had to be done.

Mr. BARKER. Give the particulars.

Mr. CARVELL. I will.

Mr. BARKER. Give them now.

Mr. CARVELL. It was in filling across lakes. The experience of railway contractors and engineers is that, in many places, where you fill up a body of water with common earth—if it were even sand it would not be so bad—it will not stand; it is only mud and will melt away. We have illustrations of that in many places. There is one on the Canadian Pacific railway between here and Montreal, and there is one as my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) knows in New Brunswick, between St. John and Rothesay. They have been filling up that New Brunswick hole for 40 years and it is going down all the time. In order to meet these conditions they have taken solid rock out of the cuts and have put it in these embankments and made solid rock embankments.

Mr. BARKER. You would not get solid rock where there was none.

Mr. CARVELL. It is called rock-borrow, and that is the subject I am going to talk about.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What was the estimated quantity on that particular section, and how much was it increased by the difficulties the hon. gentleman mentioned?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not know. But I can tell the hon. member that the solid rock has been increased from the actual requirements of the case, according to the estimates, by half a million cubic yards. The engineers estimated to use half a million yards of common excavation for the fills and they have had to get rock, not from the ordinary cuts, but from outside the cuts. They broadened them out and took half a million yards of solid rock, borrowed it and made the fills.

Mr. BARKER. Give the mile-post where that occurred.

Mr. CARVELL. I cannot. I think I treated the House fairly——

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member cannot give it.

Mr. CARVELL. I told the House that I got the facts from the engineers, but that they could be verified by a return.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member ought to have given the mile-post.

Mr. CARVELL. I am willing that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) or any other member should make any criticism of my remarks after I have finished, but I hope the hon. gentleman will not lecture me while I have the floor.

Mr. BARKER. I want the facts while the hon. member is stating them.

Mr. CARVELL. I would like to show some more rock-borrow. And I can give the hon. member the mileage—I can give him the whole thing. That is, I can give him the stations, and he is railway man enough to know what that means. I have here a return to this House, file No. 12,603, brought down some time before Christmas. This refers to the Kitchen contract, district 'A'.

Mr. BARKER. I thought the hon. gentleman was dealing with Mr. Hodgins.

Mr. CARVELL. I was. But my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) wants facts, and I am going to give him facts. Take from stations 500 to 1,070 in District A. That is better than giving the mileage, because it gives every one hundred feet. They required a borrow which ordinarily would be a train haul of 392,000 cubic yards. The engineer reported that it was impossible to find a borrow of common excavation on the Kitchen contract. The proposition was made to borrow rock near the site of these fills or embankments, outside the ordinary line. Now, it was stated by the hon. mem-

ber for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) that earth embankments have what is called a slope of 1½ to 1—that is, for every foot you go perpendicularly your embankment goes out 1½ feet. If the perpendicular distance from the shoulder of the embankment to the bottom is 50 feet, it will be 75 feet from that point to the outside of the embankment. It is known to engineers that rock embankments will not spread out nearly so far. I think they figure out at 1¼ to 1. or, in some cases, much less than that.

Mr. BARKER. Very often perpendicular.

Mr. CARVELL. Not when broken up.

Mr. BARKER. You can see it often on the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. CARVELL. I want to tell the hon. member he does not know how roads are constructed to-day. He is about twenty-five years behind the times. They go to a rock cut ten to forty feet deep—I have seen one rock cut on the Grand Trunk Pacific eighty feet. They tunnel into the hill—they call it 'coyuting'—perhaps forty feet. Then they sink a shaft and then spread out from that. After all is ready they put in five or ten tons of explosives, and break up ten or fifteen thousand cubic yards of material at one blast—break it up so small that it is taken out with the steam shovel, hauled and dumped over the embankment. That will not go perpendicular; you have only to tell how it is done to show that the hon. member (Mr. Barker) does not know what he is talking about.

Now, let us go back to section 'A.' They had to have 392,000 yards of train haul, and the engineers reported they could not get this material on the work. As a rock embankment would not be so wide at the bottom as the other, it would not require so many yards to make it. Then, it is known to all engineers that a yard of common excavation, when placed in an embankment, will not occupy more than a yard of actual space, and it will shrink a little for it will pack closer than when it was in its native position in the earth. Besides that, all measurements of railway construction are made, as you may say, in situ. That is, when they pay the contractor for rock-borrow they pay for the number of yards, as the material is in the ledge from which it is taken. But when it is broken up and hauled out and put in the embankment, a yard of rock will make from 1 6-10 to 1 9-10 yards. So, you have more yards in the embankment itself, and you have a smaller number of yards to pay for in situ—you will reduce the number of yards both ways. Then they figure out the cost by train haul. Suppose they had to go fifteen miles. That, in the Kitchen contract, was forty-five cents a yard. So they figured out that the embankment built out of common earth would cost the country the same amount of money as an embankment built of rock borrow at $1.10¼. The engineer made a proposition to the Kitchen Company, to give them a special contract to make these embankments at that figure, and they accepted it and did the work. Thus, 400,000 cubic yards of solid rock—

Mr. GRAHAM. Not figured in the specification?

Mr. CARVELL. No, it had appeared in the specification as about 500,000 or 600,000 yards of common excavation. There you have an illustration of how common excavation dwindled by 600,000 yards, and solid rock excavation increased by 400,000 yards, yet without costing the country a cent.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. member would give the mile post we could see if that applied in the other case.

Mr. CARVELL. I have told the hon. member the station.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member is giving what occurred in New Brunswick. Give the mile post where you say a similar thing occurred on section 'F.'

Mr. CARVELL. I do not propose to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) on that point. As my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) suggests, there is nothing the matter in New Brunswick. I am showing that they had to borrow rock in New Brunswick, and it can be shown also that they had to borrow rock in district 'F.' And it was done with the consent of everybody, it has not cost the country a dollar more, and you have a great deal better work. More than this, I can show places on the Grand Trunk Pacific where the original estimate was for steel viaducts, but the Grand Trunk Pacific Commission thought it would be better to make solid embankments. Of course, that costs more. In the estimates, these fills did not appear because the places were to be crossed by steel. But the commissioners made up their mind that it would be better to have permanent works. I can show one place on district 'A' where it has taken 250,000 yards of material to fill up one of these places which, under the original estimate, would have been crossed with steel. That adds to the quantities. More than that, in one of these cases it is being filled with rock because they cannot get the earth. I think that is section 'A.' I hope now I have given enough illustrations to show how these quantities are changed from the original estimates down to the actual quantities afterwards completed. My hon. friend from Simcoe referred to all these, and I will refer to them. He took the first

section west of Moncton. It is a matter of common knowledge that practically all these Grand Trunk Pacific contracts have been handed over to sub-contractors; the Grand Trunk Pacific taking a very small percentage, simply enough to pay them for doing some financing, and the balance goes to the contractors. They are not ordinary sub-contractors, because a sub-contractor in an ordinary contract probably allows 15 per cent to the main contractor; whereas on these contracts, less than 5 per cent goes to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, if any hon. gentleman has the idea that the Grand Trunk Pacific are not watching this matter very carefully all over the line of railway, he is very much mistaken. I can state that there is a feeling on the part of engineers all over this line, and I have met most of them, that the Grand Trunk Pacific are acting in a really unfriendly spirit, and are finding fault with everything that is going on. They are not objecting down in New Brunswick, as they are probably in every other part of their work. There are very few objections in New Brunswick. In one of these contracts, No. 2, there has not been a solitary protest. On the Kitchen works, which my hon. friend referred to as costing much more than they should, there have been very few protests. But that is not a Grand Trunk Pacific contract. My hon. friend says that in the first estimate of No. 2 contract there was no solid rock at all. It turns out now that there is something like 10,000 or 20,000 yards of solid rock on that whole contract. Now, I want to know if you are going to condemn an engineer as being a dishonest scoundrel because, in a work 50 miles long, he says he did not think there was any solid rock, and did not get within 20,000 yards of what turned out to be the fact. You have only to read the specifications to know that any man might make a mistake like that. It is only an error in judgment, and the marvel to me is that these engineers get as near to the facts as they do in their first estimates.

He takes up next No. 3, that is from Chipman to the Intercolonial. There, he says, they have also an increase of 231,289 cubic yards of solid rock which should be called excavation, giving a total increase in this one item alone of $341,000. I want to tell my hon. friend that there is a place on that contract where soft work has been cut out and a solid embankment put in the place of it, and that accounts for 200,000 yards of this work, and it has been done with the consent of the Grand Trunk Pacific's engineer and the commissioners' engineer. Yet my hon. friends say that because of these apparent discrepancies in the figures, somebody has been guilty of fraud, and somebody should be brought to the bar of this House, and somebody should be disgraced for the rest of his natural life, as an engineer who had sold himself out to the contractor. I want to know if that is the standard by which my hon. friends would want one of their friends, or sons, or brothers, or their friends' sons or brothers to be judged? I wont use any harsher term. I think I have shown some reasons why these discrepancies appear between the estimate and the actual results, and if they will make a thorough investigation they will come to the conclusion that there is very little real fault to find.

Next, we have the contract from 164 to 195, that is the Kitchen contract. On that contract, no doubt, the cost has very much increased over the original estimate. I am bound to say, however, that on that contract the engineers made a mistake as to the amount of solid rock to be found. But I have accounted to you for 400,000 yards of solid rock, which has been borrowed entirely elsewhere and put in there, and as I said before, it does not cost the country one dollar more than it would if the work had been completed according to the specifications, and if they had got a rock embankment instead of an earth embankment. Then he goes on to the lines in white. That is hardly worth discussing because the increase is so very slight. Now I am not going to discuss the case in the province of Quebec, because I have no personal knowledge of it. No doubt there has been an increase in quantity, no doubt the matter will be investigated, and if there is anything wrong it will be cut out. But I am only talking of things of which I know, or of which I have evidence before me in the returns from which I can discuss the question intelligently.

Then that brings us back to the object of all this discussion. My hon. friend from Simcoe says that there has been dishonest classification on the part of the engineers, he says that the quantities of solid rock and loose rock have materially increased, and the quantities of excavation have decreased. I have pointed out some of the reasons why solid rock was increased, and I have given you actual illustrations. But, there is another matter to which I want to refer as showing why solid rock has increased. Any hon. member who knows anything about railway construction knows that when you go into a cut, say 20 or 30 or 40 feet deep, of solid rock, you dont take this out by pick and bar, or by a little stick of dynamite, it would cost you $10 a yard to do it; but you take it out by putting in monstrous charges of explosives of dynamite, or nitro glycerine, or things of that kind. Is it possible for any man actually to gauge the width of that explosion when he is taking down 10,000 or 15,000 yards at a time? If that overlaps the actual width of the cutting according to

the prism, as it is called, then the balance is called an overbreak, and on the Canadian Pacific railway they admit there ought to be at most 15 to 25 per cent allowed for overbreak. That adds to the cost. When engineers are estimating quantities they estimate actual quantities according to the prism as laid down on the plan; and when you add to that ten per cent or twenty-five per cent, which of necessity must happen in the way of overbreak you have that much added to your original estimate. In all these cases more rock is broken than they expected. Then that becomes a question for negotiation. Is it fair to allow the contractor for this extra amount, or not? That is a matter to be decided mutually.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says that the estimate is formed on the prism quantity.

Mr. CARVELL. I do.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. How is it that the prism quantities are less than the actual quantities? The actual quantities generally taken out are a great deal less than the prism quantities.

Mr. CARVELL. They are a great deal more than the prism quantities. My hon. friend has got it reversed.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The quantities that were estimated by the engineers are less than the amounts taken out.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend is at liberty to say that, I say it is the other way.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. No, I went carefully into it, and I find that the amounts estimated by the engineers are the actual quantities paid for.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. With the hon. gentleman's permission—according to the figures brought down by the hon. member for Simcoe yesterday, which figures were not disputed by the Minister of Railways, because they were compiled from information brought down by the minister himself, these figures show that in one case, while the estimate of the amount to be excavated was 15.000,000 yards, there was actually taken out, according to his certificate, only 10,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not propose to discuss this matter with my hon. friends, they will have all the chance they want to tell their side of the case.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. But we want the facts.

Mr. CARVELL. I think I know as much about the facts in this case as my hon. friend does and perhaps before I am through he will think I do. There is this question of overbreak. The hon. member for North Grey made the statement this afternoon that after Mr. Grant was appointed district engineer he went over the work and, of his own volition, deducted something like $350,000 from the work on districts 'B' and 'F.' I can tell my hon. friend, and perhaps he does not know this, but he could get it by asking for a return, that of that portion of the $350,000 belonging to district 'F' $100,000 of it is a question of overbreak and not a question of classification at all. So, therefore, you have reduced the actual amount in dispute as to classification within districts 'F' and 'B' down almost to a minimum. The total amount in dispute between the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers and the commission engineers is less than $1,000,000 on $50,000,000 worth of work; or less than two per cent of the whole work in question is in dispute between these engineers. When you consider the difficulties of classifying material, as I have pointed out here to-night, under Mr. Lumsden's instructions, ought any engineer to be branded as a scoundrel because there happens to be a difference of two per cent between the estimates by himself or his predecessor and the actual results of the excavation? I think you have only to state the proposition to see the unfairness of it and it is a remarkable thing that the engineers were able to estimate these quantities and costs as accurately as they have done. I stated in the early part of my remarks, and I wish to repeat it here, in order to have it emphasized, that according to the figures of the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), there is only an increase of $7,500,000 over the estimates, which are only estimates made by the engineers at the beginning of this work.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I would like that authoritatively. I suppose the hon. gentleman gets it from the minister?

Mr. CARVELL. Authoritatively? Why, I figured it out from the figures given by the hon. member for Simcoe on Tuesday, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) or any hon. gentleman can figure it out for himself and see. I have taken the figures as he gave them and that is the result.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I thought they were figures given to you.

Mr. CARVELL. No. Now, the question we have to decide is whether or not a committee shall be appointed to go over these big piles of work, go into all these different cuts, apply our technical knowledge to them and see whether these cuts have been properly classified by these engineers or not when there is only a difference of less than two per cent of work that is under discussion at all. Let us see how it works

out. We will say that the hon. member for South Simcoe and four other hon. gentlemen are appointed. They go down into one of these cuts, and if it happens to be all ledge rock there is no trouble because they know ledge rock when they see it. But, suppose it happens to be cemented material of conglomerate, or plum-pudding as they call it, it is taken out, the sides are all smoothed down, it has had the action of the elements for a year or two, the sides are all run together and look as smooth as if it were all common earth. You cannot go into the dump and dig that up. What are you going to do? You are going to get a force of workmen, you are going to get some dynamite, bore a tunnel into the side of that cut for 15 or 20 feet in order to make up your mind whether it is cemented material or not. I want to know whether the hon. member for South Simcoe and the hon. member for Hamilton would consider themselves proper judges of whether it is cemented material or not. I would like to know whether this material is going to be ploughed with a team and six horses when they cannot get their team and six horses in there. You have only to enunciate the proposition to show its absolute ridiculousness. If you do not do that there is another modus operandi. We can bring before us engineers and say: Now, Mr. Jones, have you properly and honestly classified that? He says: I certainly have. The hon. member for South Simcoe says: I do not believe you; I want to have my friend appointed and, by the way, he is very liable to be a good Conservative. He is sent down on the work and he bores into a cut and comes back and says: I will admit that there is a question about this; it is not like rock, not ledge rock, not boulders of more than one cubic yard, but it is a substance which the engineer says is cemented material, it is material which in his judgment can be best removed by blasting. I think he is wrong. I do not think you can get a team and six horses and a ten-inch plough into that cut at all and therefore it will be called loose rock. They want us to appoint a committee to investigate 800 miles of railway under these circumstances and come to a finding. If they think I am going to vote for a thing like that, all I can say is that I will not insult my intelligence by voting for such a proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. Hon. gentlemen say 'hear, hear.' I stand by my statement. I think every hon. gentleman in this House, if he will let his reason sway him, will stand by the same statement because of the absolute nonsense of a proposition like this. Then, they say we want to do more than that. We want to investigate everything that has taken place in the conduct of this work. We want to investigate whether this or that engineer exercised proper judgment in locating the line, whether he should have located it half a mile east or a quarter of a mile west. Let me give an illustration. Hon. gentlemen bring up Major Hodgins here as the acme of perfection in all engineering matters. I will show you what it will amount to. There is a place—I cannot give the name, but I can get it for hon. gentlemen if they desire it—where an engineer located on the work on Major Hodgins' district, when he was district engineer, a five per cent curve in order to get around the edge of the lake. Major Hodgins said: That should only have been a four per cent curve, and because you have located a five per cent curve you are wrong, your judgment is no good. He fired him. That man has gone forth a dismissed engineer and to this day is looking for a position because he is sent off, his reputation is injured, and has no means of redress. Worse than all that, on the advice of this same Major Hodgins, $40,000 was expended on the line which he projected, or caused to be projected, and they had to go back and abandon that $40,000 worth of work and adopt the line projected by the very engineer who was fired because he exercised his common sense and judgment in laying out this line. These are some of the things that my hon. friends want to have investigated, and they want to have a hundred and one things like this investigated all over the country. You have only to enunciate the proposition in order to see the absolute nonsense of it.

Now, Sir, I submit that these are very grave charges which have been made by Mr. Lumsden. Mr. Lumsden has said in effect, that these engineers were dishonest. Perhaps I am putting it too strongly. Well I will modify it. He says his engineers failed to carry out his instructions of the 10th January, 1908. I have pointed out to the House what these instructions were. If an engineer takes a certain view of the classification of a certain cut under the instructions of Mr. Lumsden, and if Mr. Lumsden says to him, I cannot go there myself, you are on the work, you are the only man that can do it, I want to know, Sir, whether we have the right to bring that man up and allow a prejudiced engineer to investigate him and say that because you have exercised your judgment in one way and our engineers would exercise their judgment in another way, that man is a scoundrel and is entitled to the castigation given to him by Mr. Lumsden. Therefore, I am driven to the conclusion that the only logical thing we can do is to have a committee appointed as suggested by the Prime Minister. We can bring Mr. Lumsden before the committee and ask him as business men whom he means when he speaks of those who did not carry out the

instructions which he gave them. Then, it will be up to Mr. Lumsden to say who these men are. Then, let us bring before this committee a commission of expert engineers and let this commission say whether or not, in their opinion, the engineers who have been so severely reprimanded or castigated by Mr. Lumsden are guilty or not. If they are, dismiss them. If the committee find that they have been wilfully guilty of a crime, prosecute them.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Can we not make an inquiry like that ourselves?

Mr. CARVELL. How are you going to make the inquiry? I pointed out the impossibility of it from a business standpoint. We would make laughing stocks of ourselves all over the country if we were to attempt to carry out the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad to hear my hon. friends opposite applaud that; I am glad they are coming round to a reasonable view of the case and that they will vote against their own motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understood the hon. member to say that before this committee suggested by the Prime Minister, you can call a committee of competent engineers to give evidence as to whether or not the Transcontinental engineers did not carry out Mr. Lumsden's instructions.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not say that at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then who would give the information?

Mr. CARVELL. The commission appointed by parliament to settle these matters; the arbitrators.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Who would give the evidence?

Mr. CARVELL. Why the arbitrators of course; they are the only men who can give the evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN. All right.

Mr. CARVELL. They are the men created by parliament to have the right to give the evidence, and I can say more than that, there is one man on that commission who has visited every cut and every fill on the Grand Trunk Pacific from Moncton to Winnipeg, and I say that that man has information which it would take the best engineer in Canada ten years to obtain if he spent the whole of his time doing it, and even then he could not do it because Mr. Grant has seen this work in the actual course of excavation; and visited it month after month as inspecting engineer, and he knows and has first hand knowledge which the most expert engineer on earth could not get now. Therefore, no committee of engineers that could be sent out is in as good a position to judge fairly between Mr. Lumsden and these engineers whom he has charged with incompetency or worse, as is the commission which is created by parliament, and for that reason I submit that the amendment should be voted down and the resolution moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister adopted by the House.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage-La-Prairie). It may be truly said of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) as it has been said is all that has reference to either the motion, that the very last part of his address is all that has reference to either the motion or to the amendment, and therefore the hon. gentleman will understand why I shall first reply to his closing remarks. The hon. gentleman gave as a reason why he was going to support the motion that, before the committee proposed by the First Minister, a committee of engineers could be called who would give evidence as to whether or not there had been bad faith on the part of the sub-engineers in not following the instructions of the chief engineer of the Transcontinental, but only a moment before that he said that no matter what any engineer said as to whether or not these sub-engineers followed the instructions, that would be no evidence of bad faith because they might in perfect good faith have given a different classification from that given by the chief engineer.

Mr. CARVELL. I must correct my hon. friend. I did not say: if they did not follow the instructions; I said: if they did not interpret the instructions as Mr. Lumsden would interpret them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) stated that no matter how great the divergence in the classification, that would be no evidence of bad faith on the part of the under engineers. Then, if that would be no evidence, and if that is the only evidence these arbitrators could give, there absolutely could be no evidence offered to the committee as to the bad faith of any of these men in the matter of over classification. Consequently if the resolution moved by the right hon. the First Minister is adopted, under the argument adduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) there cannot possibly be brought in a finding of bad faith. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) has given a speech and he has got through with it, and I have been at a loss to find one word or one sentence in that speech which argued any more against the amendment than it argued against the resolution, because whatever he may have said against investigation applied equally as well against the alleged investigation suggested by the First Minister in his motion as against the investigation asked for by the amendment. For fear I

should do any injustice to the hon. member by not paying the attention to his speech which it merits, I shall briefly refer to a few points which he adduced. Let me premise by saying that I do not for one minute expect that I can add as much to the knowledge of this House from the point of view of the skilled engineer as has been furnished by the hon. member (Mr. Carvell). I do not conceive that it is my duty to take part in this debate for the purpose of adding anything to the text-books on the subject of engineering; I conceive rather that my duty is to show why the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) should prevail against the resolution of the First Minister. Probably 75 per cent of the speech of the hon. member for Carleton was directed towards trying to show that it was impossible for engineers to make correct estimates by the yard of what would be solid rock, what loose rock, and what common excavation. I do not contend and nobody will contend that it is possible for absolute estimates so to be made. But, it is stated on the authority of engineers, and no engineering authority has been adduced to the contrary, that a margin of 20 per cent was ample to allow any engineer who could pretend to make a careful or competent survey.

Now, the point advanced by the hon. member for North Simcoe was that in district 'F' which is the principal district in dispute there had been a mistake, not of 20 per cent, but a very gross mistake which was sufficient to raise a prima facie case against the honesty or the competency of the estimate, or the honesty of the calculations at the time the excavations were made. The facts are that in district 'F' some 3,500,000 cubic yards were estimated by the engineers as solid rock, some 700,000 yards as loose rock, and 11,200,000 yards as common excavation. But, instead of this, the Minister of Railways has told the House that the actual figures are 6,500,000 cubic yards of solid rock, 2,100,000 cubic yards of loose rock, and about 3,000,000 yards of common excavation. There is a difference between the estimate and the result, not of 20 per cent, but of almost 100 per cent in the first case, and about 200 per cent in the second case, and less than one-third of the total estimated amount of common excavation. And, the hon. member for Carleton comes before the House and he gives it as his opinion as an engineering expert that it is a marvel to him how the engineers made so close an estimate as that. The only palliation he has to offer is that in district 'F,' somewhere he knows not where, he has heard that some 500,000 cubic yards of rock were used for the purpose of filling in lakes. Well, he can allow his 500,000 cubic yards wherever he wants to, and there will be almost 8,000,000 yards of excavation left which he has failed to explain away. Now, Mr. Speaker, we can take for the purposes of this inquiry whichever horn of the dilemma the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) wants to sit upon. He can argue that it is a first-class estimate, and then I will ask him of what use are any such estimates at all for the purposes of constructing a railway; of what use was it for the government to go to such great expense to be able to inform this country for the purposes of an election, that there were 11,000,000 cubic yards of common excavation in district 'F' when as a matter of fact there were only 3,000,000 yards. Of what use was it to go to the trouble of ascertaining that there were 3,500,000 cubic yards of solid rock when as a matter of fact there were 6,500,000 cubic yards of solid rock. And, of what use was it to inform the House and the country on the authority of competent engineers—as the Minister of Finance said—that there were 700,000 cubic yards of loose rock when as a matter of fact there were 2,100,000. Let me say to the member for Carleton and to the House, that if it is not possible to estimate within closer limits than that, if that is a marvellously correct estimate, then, the presentation of these estimates at all can only have been intended to deceive the House and the country and they should never have been made. If 20 per cent is the utmost that may be allowed for a divergence between the estimate and the actuality, surely a divergence of 200 per cent cannot be explained on any hypothesis consistent with honesty. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) pointed out that there was considerable more excavation required on account of the overbreak, and which he said would not be estimated by the engineers in the first place. I do not think the hon. member is correct in that, although on points of engineering of course I bow to his opinion as an exceedingly high one, judging from the assurance with which he gave it to the House. But at the same time, Sir, at page 12, of the report brought down by the First Minister, there will be found words of the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, Mr. Woods, which are utterly inconsistent with the supposition that overbreak was not allowed for in the original estimates. Mr. Woods says, under date of June 19, 1908:

> I have nothing to show how this overbreak is estimated. Articles 37 and 38 would indicate that a large amount of this overbreak might have been estimated as loose rock rather than solid. Can you say if this has been done? None of my reports indicate such to be the case. I think you will readily agree with me that if these cuttings are being measured month to month by actual quantities taken out, and no allowance deducted, little effort will be made by the contractors

to keep overbreak within reasonable limit and in the end we shall undoubtedly be paying $1,000,000 additional for the work on this section probably not contemplated in your approximate estimates.

How can any man say that that statement is consistent with the statement of the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) that overbreak would not be allowed in the first instance? An examination of district 'F' clearly proves, and the figures in rough were given by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), that there was a total estimate of 15,056,063 cubic yards, and the total excavation actually taken out to the date of return was 10,068,032, or a deduction of almost 5,000,000 cubic yards. But in the return there was embodied the statement that 94·66 per cent of the work only was done. Allowing for the balance of 5·33 per cent, there will altogether be only in district 'F' 11,222,433 cubic yards or about 4,400,000 cubic yards less actually taken out in the ultimate than was originally estimated by the engineers. Notwithstanding that the cost has far exceeded the estimate and will in the ultimate, to use the word of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), outrageously exceed the estimate. Surely an hon. member cannot expect sensible men to think engineers will give an estimate of loose rock or solid rock simply by taking a view of the country and not making any borings? Surely if the engineers did such a thing, the members of the government would not give the reports to the House as reliable. Surely the men who made the estimate would not reduce it to a single yard of rock, if they were going on the assumption that if they could come within 200 per cent of the correct figure they would consider, in the words of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell), that they were doing marvellously well.

The hon. member for Carleton, with a wise discretion which I have observed in many cases, got away from section 'F' with remarkable speed. He got down to a district near Moncton, and tried to show that there were there some lakes and that borrowed rock had to be used to fill, so that it did not cost the country any more. I must confess I did not understand his argument that this borrowed rock did not cost the country any more, but assuming him to be correct he must produce to the House the actual basis for the ultimate result that has ensued, that it is costing the country more.

Mr. CARVELL. I shall be pleased to send over a return in which the hon. member will find it all figured out.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That will be very kind. I will be able to make reference to it as soon as I go home, and I hope it will contain more pertaining to the resolution than the hon. member's speech.

Mr. CARVELL. You will find it all on that page.

Mr. MEIGHEN. On this district near Moncton it was brought out by the member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)—and it has not been denied except by the remark of the member for Carleton, New Brunswick, that the member for Simcoe, like the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and the member for North Grey did not know what he was talking about—that in the eastern 50 miles there had been an error not of 20 per cent, but of 556 per cent, in the estimate of loose rock. Will the hon. member say that this is explained by the fact that some little rock was dumped into a lake? An estimate of 135,000 yards of loose rock grows into 850,000 yards, an increase of 556 per cent. The solid rock is not quite so marvellous, it was estimated at nothing and grew to 10,000 yards. But the excavation estimated at 1,900,000 was reduced to a paltry 600,000 and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) still assures the House that he considers these estimates marvellously accurate.

Then we come to the next section, 50 to 58. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) shows that in that very section there was an increase in the cost of 166 per cent, and if, as the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, argued, there was nothing added to the cost by means of the borrowed rock, what accounts for the increase of nearly three times in that section. In the next section, 58 and 96, the hon. member for Simcoe shows by a return that the percentage of solid rock had increased not 20 per cent but 240 per cent, and that also, to use the words of the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, is a marvellously accurate estimate.

Take section 96 to 164, the increase of solid rock there, if the other is marvellously accurate, will be still more so for it is 95 per cent. Surely the member for Carleton does not pretend to be able to convince this House that estimates are worth one dollar to the country, are not a positive detriment to the country as tending to deceive, if they cannot come infinitely nearer the mark than has been the case in almost any division of this whole Transcontinental line.

The hon. member for Carleton gave some figures of $15,000,000 in the total cost. I confess I could not understand his argument where he stated that the increase would be only $15,000,000. The figures are in 'Hansard' and are to be found in the returns. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) assured this House that the cost would be $54,000,000 and he stated that his authority was not, as the member for

Carleton (Mr. Carvell) represented this afternoon, his own. I would like these two gentlemen to get together and reconcile their differences, because while the Minister of Finance assures the House he would not give the House an estimate based on his own authority, the member for Carleton, N.B., says that these estimates are not given on competent authority, but by members of the House. The Minister of Finance assured us that the cost would be $54,000,000 and in that the minister estimated the interest during construction because without that it would be only some $44,000,000. The figures brought down last December show an estimated cost of $114.-000,000, a rise from $27,000 per mile to over $63,000 a mile on the average. I do not know what the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., meant by referring to an increase of $15,000,000. Before he got through he also said: What is the use of appointing a committee to look into this matter of classification when the total amount at variance between the two contending parties at the present time is only two per cent? If the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., had been able to prove to the House that the total amount at variance was not two per cent but 1-100 of one per cent he would only have added to the strength of the argument that we require a committee to go into the rest of the over-classification. Why is there only two per cent now in dispute? It is because of the ingenuity of this Transcontinental Commission, assisted, as we were informed yesterday, by the Minister of Railways and Canals himself, by a document dated January 10, 1908, persisted in with a wonderful loyalty throughout two years and nearly three, with a marvellous tenacity, because by the ingenuity of that resolution they were able to shut out the whole burden of the complaint of the Grand Trunk Pacific from the purview of the arbitration board. It is more to revise and extend the scope of the investigation than for what is within the jurisdiction of the arbitrators that we require a committee for the purpose of investigation. I shall come to that point later on.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), in that part of his speech before six o'clock, laid great stress on the fact that it was absolutely impossible, once an excavation was taken out and the road laid down, to make an investigation and determine as to over-classification. He said it was a mere farce. Let us assume that the hon. member's knowledge of engineering leads him to a correct conclusion on that point. Then, what is the use of the arbitration board now sitting? What is the use of putting the country to the expense of that board appointed last November to investigate work done prior to January, 1908? The hon. member's argument is that the whole principle of the arbitrations propounded by this agreement of which the government is the father, is a farce.

Now, I wish to refer for a few minutes to the resolution, and I confess that I cannot make the point stronger or clearer than it was made by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). Still I submit, in my own humble way, that this resolution of the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) means absolutely nothing;—plainly and on its face it can result in nothing. As the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) said, it is a gold brick, it is made for the purpose of being announced from the house-tops as showing the Prime Minister's desire for pure politics. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) avoided the point that nothing could result from this investigation. If the committee is appointed in pursuance of the resolution, the hon. member for Carleton and possibly the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) will be members of that committee. For I have learned this, if nothing else, since I came to this House, that the cold and frigid logic—or perhaps I should say the narrow scrutinizing method—of these hon. members confining the limits of investigations in this House appeals with great force to this government for the hon. member for Carleton in particular appears to have a perpetual retainer from the government for committees of this description. Should that hon. member be appointed as one of this committee, I cannot conceive that he will remain the man he has always been unless he contends before the committee that nothing can be investigated except according to the strict language of the resolution as interpreted and explained by the mover. Then it must be pointed out in the first place that the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is careful to include and quote only such language of Mr. Lumsden as meets his purpose, that he leaves out Mr. Lumsden's charges that there was over-classification in districts 'B' and 'F.' The only thing quoted is to the effect that there was a disregard of the instructions of Mr. Lumsden and that Mr. Lumsden had lost confidence in his staff. Consequently, all that will come within the purview of this committee is whether or not Mr. Lumsden had lost confidence in his staff and whether or not they disregarded his instructions. Investigating that narrowest of all points before the committee, the committee would be hemmed in by the fact that, as soon as they used the matter of over-classification to prove that these men had disregarded instructions they would be stopped by the hon. member for Carleton and the hon. member for Pictou on the ground that this over-classification, whether it results from bad faith or incompetence, is not within the purview of

the committee. If bad faith, if insubordination—if you call it such—on the part of these district engineers is not to be proven by over-classification, you cannot prove it at all, and it does not matter whether it existed or not. So, the only element by which insubordination could be proved is shut out from the domain of the committee altogether. If there ever was a resolution cunningly devised to forbid investigation, this is the one. The hands of Judge Cassels when he went to investigate the affairs of the Department of Marine were not anything like so securely tied as those of the committee will be when started on its narrow course. The resolution of the First Minister is not the whole truth; it is 'the seeming truth that cunning times put on' to entrap the people. But the people cannot be deceived, because the facts have been clearly pointed out three times in this House, and no attempt made to meet the points raised.

Now, let me approach that point from another side. If any committee should be appointed by this House that would in any way duplicate the work of the arbitration board, there would be no work for that committee to do. This committee, as I want to argue later on, has infinitely greater work before it, if it is given power to do that work, than any arbitration board, because there is so much excluded from the jurisdiction of the board as to justify the appointment of the committee anyway. If they could not investigate any of these two per cent difficulties which the hon. member for Carleton has spoken as between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Commission, they could not investigate the point of bad faith, because that point is inextricably involved in these two per cent difficulties.

The question before the House is whether or not we, having for our clients. not the Transcontinental or the government, but the people of the country, are justified in inquiring into all the facts regarding this expenditure of public money. My remarks will be almost exclusively along the line that we should have such an investigation. And in this we are supported by the powerful authority of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway itself. What we ask for is little if anything more than what the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have been asking for for over two years—as evidenced by the very return brought down by the government—and what the government, through its commission, has been steadfastly refusing. I am relieved of the necessity, in order to form a basis for my argument, of placing on 'Hansard' the letters of Mr. Woods in which he argues against the classification as made by the district engineers of the Transcontinental. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) thought he did justice to himself and the people by putting on record certain letters consistent with his own position, without putting on record those that were against his position. But these other documents have been placed on record by the hon. member for North Grey. Before I proceed further, I wish to correct the Minister of Railways —I regret to see he is not in his place, but perhaps his absence and his inattention to this debate is the measure of the importance that he attaches to the resolution of the First Minister—in regard to one statement he made yesterday. The hon. gentleman said that since the appointment of Mr. Grant as chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission, there had not been any new objections to the classification. If the minister—or those behind him who are present—will take a look at the return brought down, pages 35, 36 and 69, they will see that that statement of the minister is incorrect. Let me read from page 69. In a letter to Mr. Woods by Mr. Gordon Grant, dated October 21, 1909—several months after Mr. Grant was appointed—in reply to a letter written by Mr. Woods to Mr. Grant, of October 5, 1901, an acknowledgment of the criticisms of Mr. Woods is made.

I must comment here on the fact that throughout this return there is a marked absence of copies of the letters, in the first place, written by Mr. Lumsden to Mr. Woods. There are only the letters written by Mr. Woods to Mr. Lumsden, and they are more or less unintelligble without the replies of Mr. Lumsden. Not only is there a marked absence of those letters, but there is an absence even of the letter from Woods to Lumsden of October 5, 1909. At all events, in the reply, the purpose of Mr. Woods' letter is clearly shown, because Mr. Lumsden writes as follows:

> I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 5th instant in which you file objections to the classification as returned on contracts 4 and 5 in district 'A.'

And so on. These objections cover the work done one or two years ago, notwithstanding that they were the same as the objections found by his engineers. This is pointed out by Mr. Lumsden. Further on, Mr. Gordon Grant acknowledges the receipt of objections to the following classifications as having been received, which objections are not referred to prior to the appointment of Mr. Grant, and which consequently, I take it, were made after Mr. Grant's appointment:

> In district 'A' 24, Grand Trunk Pacific Company: in district 'A' 25, district 'B' 15, Macdonell & O'Brien, districts 'C' and 'B' 14, Grand Trunk Pacific; district 'F,' O'Brien & Macdonell.

All these objections were made after the resignation of Mr. Lumsden, although it

was stated by the Minister of Railways none were made. It is worth while to refer to the objections made after Mr. Lumsden's resignation by Mr. Woods, as shown on page 35 of the return, where Mr. Woods says:

> Referring to our recent visit to the work on district 'B' east of the St. Lawrence river, our examination of classification as rendered at points visited, and our conversation regarding the same, I hope to repeat in writing what I stated to you verbally, that we still vigorously protest to the classification as returned to date. For example:—

And he proceeds to give examples covering several inches of the page of the return. Further on he says:

> I take it that the above are fair samples of classification on this residency, if not on the entire division.

Emphasizing the point that the instances mentioned by himself are typical only. He says:

> In the aggregate you can readily see the effect upon the cost of construction.

Now, Sir, the importance of the great divergence between the estimate and the result, is illustrated by the latter part of the letter which I read a few moments ago, found on page 5 of the return, in which Mr. Woods charges that if the overbreak on this district 'F' is allowed to go on in the haphazard, unchecked style in which it had been going on, the loss on that connection alone would be $1,000,000 from overbreak. Now surely if, on one section of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton the loss in overbreak is estimated by Mr. Woods, through the error, through the dishonesty, of the officials of the Transcontinental, to be nearly $1,000,000, what would be the loss, not on overbreak alone, but on classification also on the whole district from Moncton to Winnipeg? Surely the importance of it was worth the while of the commission, in the first place, to grant an investigation from Winnipeg to Moncton, and if they did not do it, then it is for this House to take the matter in hand.

I now come to a point which I think will be of interest to members of this House, because it bears most directly on the necessity for a thorough investigation, I refer to the arbitration that was to take place last summer by Mr. Lumsden, Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Schreiber, the last being the third arbitrator called in. In the first place, I say that if ever there has been anything in the whole conduct of the construction of this road that reflects upon the Transcontinental Commission, and through it on the members of the government of the day—because the government countenanced and tacitly approved of all the Transcontinental Commission did—if I say, there is anything that establishes the discredit of that commission it is the arbitration farce that proceeded in the matter of over-classification and overbreak during the months of May and June, 1909. Now what are the facts? Throughout the whole of 1908 and part of 1907, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the Transcontinental Commission had been unable to agree in the matter of classification. Objections had been filed early in 1907, they continued throughout all of 1908. The summer was the only time, admittedly, when arbitration proceedings could be intelligently gone on with. But the harvest was past, the summer was ended, and nothing was done. The Minister of Railways has been pleased to account for the delay by ascribing it entirely to the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and quoting Mr. Lumsden as his authority. But I can equally well quote Mr. Kelliher, and Mr. Woods, and Mr. Chamberlain as authorities for stating that the delay was caused just as much by the Transcontinental Commission as by the Grand Trunk Pacific. In the month of May, when the Prime Minister wrote the letter which was quoted by the Minister of Railways, in which he asked for an investigation, and when he stated that, as a result of that letter, proceedings were at once taken for an investigation, I say that he stated what was incorrect, and what this return proves to be incorrect. It is a remarkable fact that in the month of May, the Hodgins investigation was taking place, it is a remarkable fact that throughout this month and the previous month, the press and members of the government were contending that there was no over-classification. At any rate, on the 11th of May, the first minister writes to the Transcontinental Commission and suggests that an inquiry be instituted, and suggests the appointment of an arbitration board. Notwithstanding the fact that the letter was written at that time, and that it was answered by the chairman of the commission with the assertion that proceedings had already been instituted, there is no record to show that until the 22nd of July, or over two months after, the first step had been taken towards pushing these arbitration proceedings. Mr. Lumsden's letter written in October, says that on the 22nd of July last he wrote a letter to Mr. Kelliher asking that an arbitration be started. So the letter of the Prime Minister, whether it was intended to be peremptory or not, at all events had no peremptory effect, because they stood still until the 22nd of July. Then one dilatory step was taken and then another, until the winter came on; and then the letters of Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Kelliher show that to attempt an arbitration in the winter months was an absolute farce, that no arbi-

tration and no investigation could take place when snow was on the ground. I commend these words to the Minister of Railways, who assured this House yesterday that since the 18th of November, and during the winter of 1909 when snow was on the ground, arbitration has actually proceeded. These words in the House, and the statement made by the minister's own engineer on previous occasions mean that the present arbitration also is an absolute farce.

Well, after a while, and after much correspondence, an arbitration board is constituted in the winter months. They can do nothing until May. In the letter appointing Mr. Schreiber as third arbitrator, in the very last sentence of that letter, it is stated that if he accepts, a formal submission to the arbitration board will be drawn up for execution. Mr. Schreiber accepted, his acceptance appears appended to that letter. And notwithstanding the fact that the engineer, with the authority of the Transcontinental Commission, signed that letter and assured Mr. Schreiber and all interested in the arbitration, that a formal submission would be drawn up for execution, no such formal submission was ever executed by the commission, or by any one representing it. A formal submission was drawn up by the Grand Trunk Pacific, a very fair, a very comprehensive, a very useful document, but the Transcontinental Commission knew too much about the game to sign that and they further knew too much about the game to give the actual reasons why they refused to execute it. I stated in reference to the submission that it was a very fair and reasonable one. I want to read that submission, I want to read the agreement that the Grand Trunk Pacific laid before the Transcontinental Railway Commission for execution and to ask the members of this House whether it was not a fair and reasonable agreement and whether it was too comprehensive as it was at a much later time stated to be by the Transcontinental Railway Commission. At page 17 of the return that agreement appears. The usual recitals appear in the first place setting forth the fact that an Act of parliament calls for the arbitration of all differences, and the fact that differences have arisen. Then, it goes on to say:

Therefore this agreement witnesseth that the following question in regard to the specifications and the work in respect of which the said engineers have differed shall be submitted for determination to the said engineers and the said Collingwood Schreiber, Esquire, as third arbitrator, namely:—

(a) The interpretation of the specifications as applied to the actual work, each party under this heading to be at liberty to ask for the construction or interpretation of any particular clause of the specifications not already approved by the engineers and such construction or interpretation when given to be conclusive as to all work already done, and to be thereafter binding in regard to all future work to be done.

Is that unreasonable? Is there anything to fear by an honest Transcontinental Railway Commission or by honest engineers in asking that certain clauses which may contain an ambiguity, or which may be difficult of interpretation, shall be settled as to their interpretation, once and for all? Nothing unfair to my mind.

(b) Classification of material handled by contractors in the formation of the roadbed, or incident to other work forming part of any of the contracts on the eastern division.

Surely it will be in the interest at least of the people of this country, if it is not in the interest of the commission, that that matter shall be investigated. Classification of material handled by contractors. The technical point is raised and is persisted in with a steadfastness, a perpetuity, if I may use the word, that would never be expected of the most technical lawyer in a court of law, that unless you put in your objection at a specified time and put in your objection to a certain mile there is nothing to dispute over as to that and consequently nothing to investigate. As Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Lumsden went over the road, if Mr. Kelliher found something that was over-classified, could not he object then and would not that be a question in dispute? Would not a question in dispute be raised the moment Mr. Kelliher said: There is over-classification and Mr. Kelliher having stated that and that point in dispute having arisen, was it not in the interest of the people of the country that that point in dispute be settled there and not be relegated to obscurity and refused settlement for all time? Surely it was. Would it not have been absolutely fair to have investigated a dispute raised by Mr. Kelliher on the ground? He is looking over the work. He goes over a mile and he says: There is over-classification amounting to 100, or 200, or 500 per cent and I want you to investigate that. If Mr. Lumsden did not agree with him let Mr. Collingwood Schreiber decide it. That is what the Grand Trunk Pacific asked for and that is what the commission refused. The attitude of the commission on that point is consistent only with the proposition that they wanted to confine the limits of the overbreak and over-classification, they wanted to confine the dollars that the country had lost in the construction of this road by these frauds—and these incompetencies of various people in order that Liberal politicians might go through the country and say, as did the hon. member for Carleton: Why, there is only two per cent; there is only $1,000,000 out of $50,000,000. That could

have been the only result. They could not have had the interests of the people at heart. They could not have cared one single straw for the treasury of this country, or they would not have allowed the Grand Trunk Pacific to have raised objections and refused to have allowed these to be fairly and amicably settled by the tribunal appointed to discharge this duty under an Act of parliament. This agreement goes on:

(c) Payment to contractors for handling material in cutting in excess of the theoretic section to be excavated, whether caused by slides, excessive use of explosives or otherwise, and commonly termed overbreak.

They wanted that investigated, but the commission refused to investigate that unless it also was bound within the narrow and frigid letters which happily Mr. Woods happened to write on a previous occasion and since the 10th January. The commission not only absolutely refused to investigate anything except such as was within each specific mile post embodied in Mr. Woods' letters, but they refused to investigate anything embodied in Mr. Woods' letters prior to the 10th January, 1908. Later, the Transcontinental railway secretary of the commission addressed to Mr. Schreiber, as appears in the return under date of about the 20th January, 1909, a letter which shows clearly that the commission had absolutely made up their minds that no objection, however specific, raised by Mr. Woods, prior to the 10th January, 1908, would be allowed to be investigated. They shut the door first to all objections raised on the ground, they shut the door to Mr. Woods' objections wherein he says the whole division is wrong, they shut the door lastly, and they locked it, and said that no matter how specific your objections, if they were made before the 10th January, 1908, they are shut within a dark closet and you cannot investigate them now. Then they go on. Here is a general clause and could anything be fairer?

(d) All other matters not included in the foregoing but which may properly form the subject to arbitration under clause 7.

How could anything be fairer? Everything that could properly form the subject of arbitration under clause 7 of the Act passed by this parliament in 1903 should be investigated. Let me ask any member of the government who may be present—and if there are none present who know anything about it, then let me ask any hon. member of this House who is interested in the people's behalf—what right had the commission, what jurisdiction had the Minister of Railways and Canals to limit the powers of investigation granted by the House of Commons in an Act passed in 1903?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as a very singular thing, not to say a very discourteous thing, that in the discussion of two resolutions of this kind, the only man who really knows anything about it, absents himself from this House. Questions are raised and debated; three or four have been raised by my hon. friend who is now speaking in which it would be very pertinent to have from the Minister of Railways and Canals why such and such a thing did not appear in the return and other things of that kind. The Minister of Railways, with either contempt or an utter disregard of his duties in a debate of this kind, leaves the House. Mr. Speaker, I make my protest against having such treatment accorded to such an important question as this.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) was in his seat until a few minutes ago, but he was called out of the House. I have no doubt that he will return shortly, but it is unreasonable that any minister should be required to stay in the House constantly through a prolonged debate of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Either the Minister of Railways, or the Prime Minister, or some minister who knows something about this debate, ought to be here, and I think it would be a good thing to take a recess until one of the responsible ministers comes back. I move that the House do now rise.

Mr. FISHER. In reference to that motion, I have only to say that I cannot accept it at all as a reasonable censure on the government, or as a reasonable censure on the minister. It is true that when a prolonged debate occurs, as in this case, the ministers have to leave the House occasionally. It is true that at this present moment the minister in charge of this particular question is not in the House, but at the same time there are ministers here. We have frequently seen what is practically the same thing on the other side of the House. Members on the front bench of the opposition make a motion, then leave the House, pay no more attention to it afterwards in any shape or form, and even leave the House during the speeches which are being made by members on that side. A rule of this kind should certainly work both ways. It should work on one side just as much as it does on the other. When a debate is prolonged to a very considerable extent, one cannot expect that any one individual or any number of individuals shall remain in the House during the whole time of the debate. I regret very much indeed that members frequently leave the House, and that applies to all members. That is perhaps one of the reasons why our sessions are so prolonged. But it comes with ill grace from any member of the opposition to take exception to that condition which they so largely bring

about, or to cast a reflection upon the Minister of Railways who is one of the hardest working ministers of the Crown, and who attends as constantly and continuously to his arduous duties as any member of any government ever did. I feel under these circumstances that the strictures made by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) are entirely uncalled for.

Mr. FOSTER. As the purpose for which I moved my motion has been accomplished and as we now have the inexpressible pleasure of having the Minister of Railways with us, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is usually courteous to me, but if I am rightly informed he has to-night gone to the limit of being almost unparliamentarily discourteous. For a moment I was called out by a gentleman from Winnipeg (who by the way does not happen to be a political friend of mine, either) to discuss a matter of public business with him. That gentleman has been here for two days waiting to get an interview. My desire is to treat gentlemen who come to see me from a distance with courtesy and to facilitate business, and I left the chamber for two or three moments. Now, I have seen the hon. member for North Toronto leave the chamber five minutes after he delivered an address and never return while a reply was being made to him. I did not intend any discourtesy to anybody; I am not built that way, I am not afraid of any criticism that can be offered; on the contrary I am glad to hear criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite willing to accept the hon. gentleman's apology for leaving the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not apologize by any means.

Mr. FOSTER. I take exception to the argument made by the Minister of Agriculture and which was implied in the statement of the Minister of Railways. There is every difference in the world between a responsible minister and a member of the opposition, and there is in this case a still greater exaggeration of that difference because it happens that the only man on the ministerial benches who knows anything about this question and is able to answer details is the Minister of Railways himself. I was perfectly justified in making the strictures I did. I was not discourteous personally to the Minister of Railways; I was speaking of his office and not personally of himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I was referring, before this very convenient recess took place, to the celebrated memorandum of the 10th of January, 1908, which the Minister of Railways assured us yesterday he was the father of,—I am very glad, indeed, to see that the Minister of Public Works appears on the scene in this debate as in much the same manner he flitted over the scene in the Transcontinental Commission correspondence, just at the close of the incident. That memorandum of the 10th of January purports to be made in pursuance of clause 7 of the agreement, ratified by the Act of parliament of 1903, and it reads:

> Monthly estimates for contractors shall be submitted promptly from time to time by the chief engineer of the commissioners to the company's assistant chief engineer at Montreal for approval. If he has any objection to such estimates he shall promptly file the same with the chief engineer of the commissioners, and any objections from time to time filed shall thereupon be considered, and, if possible, determined by the said engineers, and in case of their failure to agree, may then or at any time before or at the time of the final payment, at the option of either party, be considered and determined by arbitration as provided in the agreement of the 29th July, 1903, but in no case shall the payment of monthly estimates be delayed except with the consent of the commissioners.

Now, that agreement purports to be in pursuance of the Act of parliament of 1903—I am sorry to say the Minister of Railways avows himself the father of it—but that agreement distinctly limits the operation of that Act of parliament, confines the powers of arbitrations, restricts within very narrow limits the possibilities of arbitration, and confines within bounds so as to render almost useless the only protection that the people of this country had under the Act of 1903. I want to know by what authority the Minister of Railways or the Transcontinental Commission limited the powers of arbitration granted by the Act of parliament within the narrow confines of the memorandum of the 10th of January? What right had the Minister of Railways and what right had the Transcontinental Commission to say that matters that might have been arbitrated under the statute cannot hereafter be arbitrated. I say that the ingenuity and purpose of that agreement is only too plain, and I say that it has worked disastrously for the people of this country. However, the winter months passed and the arbitration board proceeded to its work on the 21st May, 1909, and finished their work on division 'F' on the 5th day of June of that year. During that time Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, in whom the Minister of Finance professed such unlimited confidence, Mr. Lumsden, who was the choice of all engineers of the world as the chief engineer of the Trancontinental, and Mr. Kelliher, selected by the Grand Trunk as their chief engineer, devoted their time to an

investigation of the classification and overbreak on district 'F'. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the argument of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., is right: that after the work was done no classification could be made that could compare with the work of the engineers on the spot at the time of excavation, then, surely Mr. Lumsden, and Mr. Kelliher, and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber would not have addressed themselves to a task, which, if the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) is correct, they must have known was a farce from beginning to end. Surely, they were in a position to make the classification or else they would not have come back, and while not presenting a formal report, practically reported through the mouth of Mr. Lumsden that they found against the honesty or the competency of the classification that had been made. The very words of Mr. Lumsden, and the tacit concurrence in them of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber and Mr. Kelliher, give denial to the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) that it is impossible to properly classify such work, unless the engineers were there when the actual excavations were made. They finished with district 'F' over which Mr. Poulin presided, on the 5th of June, and on the 6th of June they proceeded to district 'B' and finished there on the 22nd of that month. These three men, the most competent engineers in the country, the choice of the government, considered that they competently did discharge their duties, and they must be conceived to have acted honestly. Now then, I say that the facts in connection with that arbitration which appear from the record as brought down by the government, facts that are undeniable on the very face of that return, clearly show that no sooner did that board which was the creation of the Transcontinental Commission, with the ratification of the government; no sooner did these men finish their work than the Transcontinental Railway Commission started to wreck it. No sooner was the work of their own arbitration board completed, and no sooner had they got an inkling of what their finding was, than they set deliberately to work to wreck the report, and if possible obviate the possibility of a report at all.

On what do I base that? It is a remarkable coincidence, and I notice that this has already been brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways or he would pay more attention to it, he knows it as well as I do, he absolutely knows that it is impossible on reasonable grounds to believe that the letters of Messrs. Poulin, Doucet and Huestes were written otherwie than at the instigation or with the concurrence of the Transcontinental Commission, in the light of the return brought down. The Minister of Railways asked this House, whether, if we had been engineers in the case of Messrs. Poulin and Doucet we would not have acted exactly as they did. I tell the minister no, and I say further that no engineer could possibly have done so, acting as a reasonable man, if he conceived he was being wronged by an arbitration board. What does Poulin do? Notwithstanding the fact that the work of arbitrating on the over-classification on section 'F', his own section, was finished on June 5, he sits silent under it and says not a word until June 22, about two and a half weeks afterwards. How does the minister explain that, that a man so grossly wronged as Poulin said he was, by his own superior officer, would not protest or open his mouth until the 22nd day of June, some 16 days after the whole work was done. It is a remarkable fact also, and I do not need to draw this to the minister's attention, because he knows it, that Poulin says nothing from his head office in Winnipeg, nothing from the ground, but he waits until he gets down here, within the sanctum or within the influence of the Transcontinental Commission, and there makes known his complaint, because his letter is dated not from Winnipeg, but from Ottawa on the 22nd of June, 1909. Not only that but section 'B' was finished on June 22, the very day that Mr. Poulin made his complaint. Mr. Doucet immediately, on the 23rd of June, the very day after Mr. Poulin makes his complaint, also writes to the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission and complains as well. The same day that occurs Mr. Huestes writes a memorandum and makes his complaint. Let me say to the minister that neither he nor any other man can justify these district engineers in making their first complaint to the Transcontinental Railway Commission instead of through the medium of their own superior officer, Mr. Lumsden, except on the hypothesis that the whole thing was instigated by the Transcontinental Railway Commission itself. Furthermore it is a remarkable fact that Mr. J. D. McArthur, the contractor on a large part if not all of district 'F', about the same time and also two weeks after they got through with his work, by a wonderful coincidence writes to the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and he protests also against the work of the Arbitration Board. On the 22nd or 23rd of June, at the very time these engineers are making their protests, another remarkable coincidence occurs, and Messrs. Macdonell and O'Brien also write a letter to the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission, making complaint exactly along the line of Mr. McArthur's. It is also difficult to explain and it would be interesting to know the cause of a clause in Mr. McArthur's letter wherein he states that he is informed an examination of the district engineers

was made by the arbitration board, and as a matter of fact notwithstanding that subsequently the commission upset the whole findings of the arbitration board on the presumption that the engineers were not examined notwithstanding the fact that Mr. McArthur says they were. We have all those facts coinciding. We have Mr. Doucet's letter written from Ottawa on the 22nd of June, Mr. Huestes' memorandum written on the 23rd, and Mr. Poulin's on the 23rd, all along the same line, and we have Mr. McArthur's letter on the 19th and Mr. Macdonell's on the 23rd. How do you explain the fact that all those men came to write on the very same line to the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, all to the same man, just at about the same time, and for the same obvious effect? Surely that is not a coincidence. What do they do? What does this Railway Commission, in which the Minister of Railways places such confidence do? A most remarkable thing, and for that act no other is responsible than the government of this country and the Minister of Railways in particular, because that act was made known at once to the Minister of Railways by a letter from the secretary of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and there is no protest against it and the Minister of Railways subsequently concurs in the action of the Transcontinental Railway Commission wherein they disallow and utterly condemn the work of the first arbitration board.

The commission did the following with the tacit concurrence of the Minister of Railways: On June 25, at 11 o'clock in the morning, the commission held a meeting, and they read the letters written to them by Messrs. Doucet, Huestes and Poulin. They also read the letters written by Messrs. McArthur and Macdonell & O'Brien, and in the light of those letters, taking those letters as correct, even although those letters assumed that Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, in whom the government have absolute confidence, Mr. Lumsden, the man whom they appointed themselves, and Mr. Kelliher, acted like perfect school boys, the Transcontinental Railway Commission, with the concurrence of this Minister of Railways took those letters without question and immediately stamped the whole proceedings as illegal. Sir, if it is unfair and wrong, as the Minister of Railways contended yesterday, for any one to find these district engineers guilty without a hearing—and nobody asked that they should be found guiltv without a hearing—was it not far more wrong, was it not an outrage, for the Transcontinental Commission on June 25, to pronounce on the authority of engineers, without the other parties being heard, that Messrs. Lumsden and Kelliher and Schreiber had been so absolutely derelict in their duty, had so absolutely forgotten the fidelity they owed to the people of this country, as to upset without a hearing the finding these three engineers on the authority of understrappers.

The Minister of Railways yesterday pronounced as an outrage in a hypothetical case that he ascribed to the mover of the amendment, an act which he himself condoned on the 25th of June, 1909, an act which on that day was certainly outdone by the Transcontinental Railway Commission that absolutely overtopped anything that would be done were we to find these men guilty without a hearing; and the Minister of Railways, by his tacit concurrence in that act is responsible for that outrage on the 25th of June last. There is no reasonable deduction from this correspondence other than that a deliberate conspiracy was entered into on that day to annihilate the report of that arbitration board simply because it resulted in finding a large amount of over-classification which would have brought discredit on this government and on this country, and if there is any bad faith to examine, if there is reason for an investigation with the object of finding bad faith, this government and the right hon. the First Minister who moved for this committee, would far better act in the service of the people if they investigated bad faith on the part of their own commission instead of (as they only pretend to do) on the part of certain unmentioned understrappers on the engineering force.

The Transcontinental Railway Commission, at 11 o'clock in the morning on the 25th of June, pronounced the following remarkable words on the authority of letters written to them, which should never have been written to them, in reference to the conduct of Messrs. Schreiber, Kelliher and Lumsden:

> Whereas, it is inconceivable that proceedings of such great importance, and possibly involving a very large sum of money, and which may result in much expensive and troublesome litigation between the contractors and the commissioners, should have been conducted in such a hasty and superficial manner, without a sufficient hearing being granted to the engineers on the work.

If Mr. Collingwood Schreiber was guilty of inconceivable conduct, if he was guilty of conducting a great public duty in a hasty and superficial manner, why does the government, and why does the Minister of Railways, assent to his appointment again on the same arbitration board? Surely, if he was guilty of such conduct as that, if he was so absolutely forgetful of the duty he owed to the people of this country and to the government, he is not a fit man to conduct proceedings of such importance. But they go further and ar-

gue—and here is a most remarkable thing —that Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Kelliher, in the course of that investigation, proceeded along lines of this awful memorandum of submission which I read to the House some time ago, and which called for no more and no less than arbitration on matters that were properly the subject of arbitration under clause 7 of the Act passed by this parliament. Because they did such a heinous thing, because they so absolutely forgot their duty to the country as to follow the provisions of this Act of parliament instead of doing as directed by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, their whole finding is illegal and void. Did anybody ever hear of such an argument? Can the Transcontinental Railway Commission or the government of Canada produce a reputable lawyer who will say that, because they proceeded under the authority of a form of submission which provided only that such matters should be submitted to them as provided by Act of parliament, therefore the whole proceeding must be upset for illegality? The Transcontinental Commission had no authority whatever for that statement. Furthermore, there is nothing to show that the arbitrators had proceeded under that authority. But even if they had, Mr. Collingwood Schreiber was justified in doing so by the very document to which the Transcontinental Commission is a party. In the document appointing him and which he signed, it is clearly stated that a form of submission would be presented to him. It was never presented to him, unless it was the form of submission under which, they charge, they acted; they never presented any other. And when they refused the form of submission which was sent, they did not apprise him of the fact. They wrote, if not to their own engineer, then to Mr. Kelliher, that they did not see any necessity for it. If the Commission wanted to be above board in the matter, why did they not say that it would be illegal to proceed along that line and state specifically their objections to that form of submission, instead of saying in an offhand way: 'We do not think any submission is necessary?'

On June 25, at eleven o'clock in the morning, these gentlemen, or three of them, held a meeting to pass a resolution, which is reported at page 30, protesting against the proceedings of the arbitrator as being 'improper and illegal,' in that they were based in all or in part on the draft agreement of May 14, 1909, which had been rejected, and which had no existence in fact—and for that they had the authority only of a district engineer under Mr. Lumsden, and against it they gave Mr. Lumsden, Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber no hearing at all. The report goes on:—

> That the engineers on the line who classified the work were not afforded a sufficient hearing or an opportunity of presenting evidence.

What right had they to say that the engineers must be heard by the arbitration board? Did the Act of 1903 say that arbitrations should be upset by the Transcontinental Railway Commission unless these engineers, who were charged with being guilty of wrong-doing, were on the spot to argue the matter out? I do not think so. But, further, Mr. McArthur's letter was by that time in the hands of the Commission in which it was stated that the engineers were heard before the arbi tration board.

Again, I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals—though I know he will not listen—and I ask the Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Murphy), did the Act of parliament state that contractors must be heard before the proceedings could be legal? The Minister of Railways and Canals said the findings would be of no use unless they were heard, because the government wanted such evidence as would be taken by the Exchequer Court. The minister is not a lawyer, and I do not pose as a very great lawyer myself. Still, it does not require a great lawyer to know that even if they had been heard the evidence would not be binding upon them before the Exchequer Court. Evidence against a third party would not be taken by a court in a subsequent case. So the hon. minister's argument falls to the ground, though I confess that it had the best face of any that could be given in support of clause (D) of the resolution of this Transcontinental Commission of June 25th last. They say that the contractors were not heard. That was a significant statement. But there is the significant fact that, on the 19th of June, when the conspiracy referred to was being hatched, Mr. McArthur wrote a letter saying he was not heard before the arbitration board, and he protested against it. Yet, on the second arbitration board being formed, and Mr. McArthur notified, he immediately writes to the commission that he has nothing to do with the arbitration and does not want to be heard. Is it not most remarkable that the commissioners should upset the findings of an arbitration on the ground that the contractors were not heard, when in the first place, there was no legal authority for their being heard, and, in the second place, they did not want to be heard? After the commission makes the finding condemning Mr. Lumsden, Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Schreiber as being superficial, as being derelict in their duty—as well paraphrased by the hon. member for Carleton—as not knowing what they were talking about

—Mr. Lumsden resigns. The Minister of Railways said there was no justification for his resigning. There will be plenty of opportunity for the Minister of Railways to answer, but surely he will never contend before any sane audience that an engineer, the head official under a commission, could possibly retain his office after being censured in such language by his superiors, by the very board that had appointed him—being called, almost in plain words, a school boy and told that he was derelict in his trust. Under such conditions no self-respecting man could retain his job. The minister said that he did not know whether the letter was written before the meeting or after it, but if he had read the return he would have seen that it was pointed out under the authority of the chairman that Mr. Lumsden resigned after the meeting held at eleven o'clock in the morning. What is the authority for the hon. member for Pictou and the Minister of Railways and Canals saying that Mr. Lumsden resigned in a huff because his men disobeyed his instructions? He could do nothing but resign, and the Minister of Railways knows it. And, what is more, the Transcontinental Commission knew that he could do nothing but resign, and that is why they passed the resolution on the 25th of June. They intended that he should resign, and that there should be no doubt about it,—and not only that he should resign as engineer, but they made sure also that he should resign as arbitrator as well. Read his second letter of June 26th:

Ottawa, June 26, 1909.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway,

Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sirs,—

How he must have emphasized the adjective.

Referring to my letter of yesterday wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff, I would like to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie Crossing in district 'F' lately gone over by me.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

And here is a most significant postscript.

P.S.—In order to make the matter clear, I may say I assume my resignation as chief engineer also carries with it my resignation as arbitrator in matters of dispute with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but as there is a doubt raised by you, I also resign as arbitrator.

HUGH D. LUMSDEN.

So, to be absolutely certain that the work of wreck was complete, that they had utterly annihilated the work of this arbitration board which was so disastrous to them, they come to Lumsden after he has resigned on the 25th of June, and say there is a doubt whether he was not still arbitrator and he had better remove that doubt. And so, he resigns as arbitrator too. Surely they must be given credit at least for the greatest possible efficiency in carrying out their evident determination of having Mr. Lumsden out of the road and the arbitration proceedings made null and void.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that expression of doubt verbal?

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is a distinction between this intimation on the part of Mr. Lumsden, and other intimations of Mr. Lumsden, that seem to favour the contention of the board. Mr. Lumsden says over his own signature that the doubt as to this was raised by the members of the Transcontinental Commission, whereas all these statements of the board launched out before the public to the effect that engineers on the ground are the only persons who can make a competent estimate, were made only on the authority of the Transcontinental Commission, as a memo. by the secretary.

Now we go on. The work of wreckage, they contend, is complete. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company take another view; they say that notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Lumsden resigned, his successor is ex-officio arbitrator, and notwithstanding the fact that he resigned as arbitrator, there is nothing to hinder Mr. Schreiber making his report. There may be some doubt about that. There is no doubt in my opinion that the work of the arbitration board up to that point was absolutely valid; at all events, the Grand Trunk Pacific claimed that it was valid, notwithstanding the resignation of Mr. Lumsden. At all events, if the Grand Trunk Pacific were content to call it valid, there was no reason why the commission should not call it valid, too. But they chose not to do so. They say: No, we want things done de novo, and we will try a new man, we want some different result. Then what occurs? They go ahead and appoint a new arbitration board, and after a long time they start again, notwithstanding the protest of the Grand Trunk Pacific. But in the meantime there is a remarkable coincidence. On the 25th of June, Mr. Lumsden writes his letter of resignation, he says in that letter that there has been over-classification carried on to a very large amount. He says that owing to this, and owing to the disregard of his instructions, he has lost confidence in the staff. That letter was written to the Minister of Railways or to the commission; at all events, the commission transmitted it to the minister on the 25th of June. The Minister of Railways was in the city on the 26th day

of June, and until the 30th of June, 1909, because on the 30th of June there is a nice letter put on file by the minister, and I must compliment him on the graceful language he uses. He writes to Mr. Lumsden, who has been in the plainest way fired by the commission, or has been put in a position where his self-respect demanded his resignation. The minister writes thus on the 30th of June:

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, inclosing correspondence sent by you to the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, and also proffering your resignation as chief engineer. It will be considered in due course.

That must have been news to Mr. Lumsden; at all events, it shows that the Minister of Railways was in the city from the 25th day of June to the 30th. Later on he evidently went across the water, because on the 31st of August he writes a letter to the Transcontinental Railway Commission. And I want to say that I cannot understand this correspondence on any other hypothesis than that it was born of a laudable ambition on the part of the Minister of Railways to make the correspondence look as nice as possible, to give it a high moral tone, notwithstanding the awful facts that had transpired. I cannot see anything in it but a nice piece of stage-play. Here is the letter, and I invite the attention of the House to the matter, because the spectacle of the Minister of Railways breaking the bread of official fidelity to the Transcontinental Commission, is a most inspiring one. The letter is found on page 48:

Dear Mr. Parent,—As I was leaving for Europe some time ago the resignation of the chief engineer of the commission, Mr. Lumsden, was received, and I left it with my colleagues for consideration. I find on my return—

Remember, the Minister of Railways did not find this until he got back. During the five days he was in Ottawa it did not come to his notice.

—I find on my return that in his letter of resignation Mr. Lumsden intimated that he had lost confidence in certain of his staff. I have no doubt that this intimation is unnecessary, but wish to emphasize the government's attitude in this matter. Should it be found that any member of the staff has been dishonest or wilfully negligent in the performance of his duty he should be summarily dealt with.

Now, that must have been news to the Transcontinental Commission.

What you desire and what we all desire is justice to all parties and the fullest protection of the public interest. Any employee who has forgotten this, or has failed to act on this principle, cannot be retained for a moment.

Now surely the Minister of Railways will concede that if there was any occasion for writing a letter like that to the Transcontinental Commission, he must have had grave doubts as to the fidelity with which that commission was discharging its duties. So it looks to me as a piece of stage play, put on in order to make the correspondence look wholesome. Then the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission, not to be lacking in his share of the pantomine, comes forward and writes thus to the Minister of Railways, he actually expresses the startling fact that the minister's views that dishonest officials must be fired, exactly coincides with his own; and the Minister of Railways, with sober face, read that correspondence to the House as emphasizing the high moral tone which the government of this country adopts in connection with the Transcontinental Railway. It does seem strange that notwithstanding the fact that the minister was here for five days, and that he discussed the matter with his colleagues, as appears by his letter, he never noticed Mr. Lumsden's statement that he had lost confidence in his staff until two months afterwards, and he never thought there was any occasion, during the whole of two months, to preach the doctrine of honesty to the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission. The chairman of the Transcontinental Commission actually goes on to say:

Should any reasonable proof be brought that employees in our service have been guilty of serious negligence or wrong-doing, you can rest assured that the commissioners would deal prompt justice, as we have done already in several cases.

But the whole correspondence up to that point, and subsequently, shows that there was no object so dear to the chairman of that commission as to see that all the avenues of proof should be closed, so far as he could close them. Now for two years the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were paraded in this country, during the election campaign of 1904, as the guardian of the people's rights in the matter of the construction of this road. The electors were told that the company was in such a position that they had actually to fight the battles of the people in order to preserve their own rights. Then the railway company, during two years, urges and struggles with the chairman of the commission that a proper and complete investigation be made of all matters complained of. Throughout those two years we have the spectacle of the chairman and the commission resisting, with every weapon in their power, the attempt of the Grand Trunk Pacific to preserve their own rights, and through them in some degree the people's rights. If the powers had been granted to that arbitration board, or to the second arbitration board which is now in existence, the powers which the Grand Trunk Pacific so ably con-

tended should be granted, then there would not be so much reason for the amendment of the hon. member for South Simcoe as there is. It is because the request made throughout those years by that company that the investigation should be thorough, was denied by the commission, that there is all the more need for an investigation now. What supports the position I take that the railway company, throughout these years, struggled for a complete investigation? Turn to page 52 of the return. Mr. Chamberlin, vice-president and general manager of the company writes as follows to the chairman of the commission under date of September 15, 1909:

Dear Sir,—Referring to conversation had with you to-day relative to Arbitration Committee.

We are ready to have the commission go on with their examination, and consent to their re-examining matters complained of and looked into by the former commission consisting of Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, third arbitrator, Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden, government engineer and Mr. B. B. Kelliher as chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I presume this committee will start their examination from Winnipeg and work east to Moncton.

That is a presumption that unfortunately Mr. Parent could not agree with.

Mr. Kelliher is now in Winnipeg, and will be ready to start any day which will suit the convenience of Mr. Schreiber and Mr. Grant. Will you kindly advise me as early as possible when Mr. Grant and Mr. Schreiber will be ready to start, so that we may arrange the affairs of our engineering department accordingly.

We trust that this examination will be very thorough and will be continued over the entire line, taking up and settling all matters under question.

That is a simple trust and one would think an honest and useful trust, but the commission, having the interests of this country at heart, could not coincide in it. Right on the next page, in a letter dated the 18th September, Mr. Chamberlin says:

I am quite willing as you propose and as mentioned in my former letter, that the arbitrators should go over all questions in dispute from the beginning, letting the two engineers discuss all differences on the ground as they go along and where they cannot agree call in Mr. Schreiber.

And that also is a willingness, in which the chairman of the Railway Commission, as guardian of the people's rights, refused to coincide. Then, on page 55, Mr. Chamberlin still urgently presses the same point. In a letter dated Winnipeg, 8th October, 1909, and addressed to Mr. Parent, he says:

You seem to misunderstand position Grand Trunk Pacific railway. My agreement with you which is outlined in your letter fifteenth was that all differences were to be discussed on the ground in accordance with article seven of the agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and your government, and we are ready at any time to proceed on that basis. Mr. Grant declined to discuss and settle differences as above suggested, therefore delay rests entirely with your commission.

Mr. Grant refused to proceed on the lines laid down by the parliament of Canada under clause 7 of the agreement of 1903, and he persisted in proceeding within the narrow, small and almost useless limits of the agreement of the 10th January, 1910, of which the Minister of Railways boasts that he himself is the father. On page 58, Mr. Chamberlin still continues the same struggle—the struggle that we are continuing now.

Have wired Kelliher——

He says under date of October 5:

To sign letter appointing third arbitrator and to proceed at once with arbitration, as per our letters. Trust you instruct Mr. Grant to make examination thorough, and to take all the time necessary to settle all differences between Winnipeg and Moncton.

If the commission had agreed to make a thorough investigation and discuss the difference between Winnipeg and Moncton the matter would have gone ahead, but they did not agree, they have not agreed yet, and consequently the amendment is absolutely imperative if the public interests are to be protected. At page 59 Mr. Ryan, secretary of the commission, writes instructions to Mr. Grant that if Mr. Kelliher refuses to go on within the narrow limits of the subsidiary agreement then they must stop altogether. He says:

Kelliher's attitude again delaying arbitration. Persistence in this will perhaps indefinitely delay it. If he adheres to refusal to sign joint letter, your instructions are to return to Ottawa. Show this telegram to Killiher, and advise result.

Then Mr. Chamberlin says on October 6:

We now find engineer Grant refused to take up anything but a few specific cases and not make arbitration cover all matters in dispute as you agreed when I saw you in Ottawa, and by your letter later, therefore Mr. Kelliher rightly refused to go on with arbitration. When Mr. Grant is prepared to take up all matters in dispute, Mr. Kelliher will be ready to meet him.

But Mr. Grant was not so prepared, because the commission refused to let him be so prepared. Then at page 60 Mr. Parent writes to Mr. Chamberlin on October 7, as follows:

For reasons which have been explained it is in the public interest——

Mr. Parent is very fond of that expression:

—that these differences should be promptly adjusted, and I hope, therefore, that you will

instruct Mr. Kelliher to prevent further delay by consenting to sign the joint letter, and proceed at the earliest possible date in the matter.

At page 61 Mr. Gordon Grant admits the whole point in a letter dated October 11, to the chairman of the commission. Mr. Grant says:

Mr. Kelliher also insisted in spite of the advice of the Deputy Minister of Justice to the contrary that I had no say in the appointment of a third arbitrator, that Mr. Lumsden's previous choice of Mr. Schreiber still held, and that another joint letter was not necessary. This, of course, was all in accordance with his instructions dated September 18. Not only was this the attitude assumed by Mr. Kelliher, but he also informed me that, before we went out, I would have to sign a formal agreement or submission similar to the one previously prepared by the authorities of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

So that if Mr. Grant had been willing to sign the general agreement which I read to the House the first arbitration authorized by the government and by parliament in 1903 would have been ready to go on, but Mr. Grant refused and the commission backed him up in refusing to allow the law laid down by this House in 1903 and which at that time was considered ample for the protection of the people's interest to be carried out; consequently the arbitration was delayed in 1908 and 1909. I might go on but surely the Minister of Railways will admit that the point is established. On October 21 the point is again raised by Mr. Kelliher and the letters all through that period establish the same contention. The matter is still in dispute. The deadlock still ensues, the deadlock which the Minister of Railways was able to remove, but the deadlock which was only removed when the serene presence of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) appeared on the scene about the 18th November last. It is a strange thing, it is a matter certainly that this return does not explain, but it is a remarkable fact that just as soon as the Minister of Public Works, carrying peace and blessing in his train, appears upon the scene in the middle of November last the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, with a complacency childlike in the extreme, without any explanation, without any introductory letters, without any reason being given, without anything to explain it, quietly submit in toto to the contention of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, evidently under the spell of the Minister of Public Works. Now, Sir, an agreement appears on page 74 of the return under which the whole thing is submitted to arbitration and absolutely within the limits urged by Mr. Gordon Grant throughout this controversy. What explanation can be offered for this docility? What explanation can be offered for the rapidity with which the Grand Trunk Pacific, the guardian of the people's rights, the only guardian of them, threw down the bulwarks behind which they had been doing battle all along and without qualification coincided with the contention of Mr. Grant and of the Transcontinental Railway Commission? Under that submission this board of arbitration now can only arbitrate as to matters specially mentioned in letters prior to 10th January, 1908, and subsequent letters wherein specific points are mentioned such as are in conformity with the limited agreement of the 10th January. The whole contention disappears. All the clouds of difficulty are removed in a moment, the sun shines serene and the whole operation of this arbitration board is limited, as the hon. member for Carleton correctly says to the two per cent difference contended for all along by Mr. Grant and the commission. That is the whole history of the affair. There is quite a little stage play which it may be interesting to glance at. After Mr. Grant had written repeatedly to the Transcontinental Commission explaining Mr. Kelliher's attitude at Winnipeg and after Mr. Chamberlin had written to the Transcontinental Commission a letter in which he stated very innocently that the commission had called Mr. Lumsden back to Ottawa away from his duty as arbitrator, a letter appears on the file in which the secretary of the commission asked Mr. Grant to again report on this Kelliher matter. I have been unable to find what reason in the world there could be for that other report, and I should be glad if any gentleman on the other side can explain. But here is where the stage play comes in. In the course of that report Mr. Grant very correctly says that he has covered the whole matter in former reports so far as Kelliher's conduct is concerned, but he says that Mr. Chamberlin's letter saying that the commission called Mr. Lumsden back to Ottawa is incorrect. Now, what suggested to Mr. Gordon Grant to report on that point in Mr. Chamberlin's letter? Was not the whole purpose of that correspondence to, if possible, remove from the public mind the evidence of the conspiracy that Mr. Lumsden was called back. On page 67 of the return will be found the letter of the secretary of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and Mr. Grant's reply. The secretary very innocently asked Mr. Grant for a report, and inclosed Mr. Chamberlin's letter, and Mr. Grant replied:

With reference to Mr. Chamberlin's statement that Mr. Lumsden was called back to Ottawa by the commission, I understand from you that you did not call Mr. Lumsden back

to Ottawa, and in the records of my office I find a letter addressed by Mr. Lumsden to Mr. Schreiber, dated June 22, 1909, in which he says:—

Now, June 22nd is the date of the completion of the investigation in district 'B,' district 'F' having been gone over before; and as soon as the inspection was completed in district 'B' Mr. Lumsden evidently wrote this letter to Mr. Schreiber:

As it is important that I should be in Ottawa on the 24th instant and the work of inspection of the Macdonell and O'Brien contract in connection with matters in dispute between the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and myself having been completed, I am unable to proceed further with the work at the present time.

Mr. Lumsden states in that letter, that it is important he should be in Ottawa on the 24th of the month, and I cannot see anything which would make that important, except that the commission wanted him there. Now, Mr. Grant's explanation of that paragraph in Mr. Lumsden's letter is:—

I understand from my secretary who was also Mr. Lumsden's secretary, that the first time he wrote this letter to Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Lumsden stated that it was important that he should be in England early next month, that is, he, in his second letter, changed 'England' to 'Ottawa.'

There is a most peculiar thing there. Mr. Lumsden wrote saying he had to be in England early in July and Mr. Grant says on the authority of the secretary that he afterwards changed the word 'England' to 'Ottawa,' meaning that he had to be in Ottawa early next month.

Mr. FOSTER. He said he only changed one word.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Yes, that would mean that he had to be in Ottawa early in July, but as a matter of fact, if he makes any sense out of it at all, he changes the original letter saying he had to be in England early in July, say that he had to be in Ottawa within two days.

Why did he so suddenly change his intention to go across the Atlantic, into an intention to go immediately to Ottawa, unless there was some urgent call. Mr. Grant's letter, while it is fairly well designed to wipe away this peculiar fact, appears only too clearly to show that Mr. Lumsden was called back by the Commission and it supports the position taken by Mr. Chamberlin, that Mr. Lumsden was called off the work of arbitration by peremptory orders from Ottawa.

During the course of his speech, I asked the Minister of Railways a question. I then had in mind the point that even under the original agreement the people were not adequately protected in the matter of over-classification. I may be wrong, but my opinion is that the matter of over-classification and the consequent increased cost was not in the contemplation of this House when that original agreement was entered into, because I think the wording of clause 7 of the original agreement would not necessarily or obviously lead to the conclusion that the matter of cost by over-classification or by any other cause was in contemplation of parliament as a matter to be referred to arbitration. Assuming that the arbitration is empowered under the original agreement to cover the question of over-classification—and we must assume it because all parties have assumed that that shall be within the purview of the arbitration board—then it turns out that the people have practically no protection at all. Even if the arbitration has the tho rough and complete scope that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company contended it should have, and that we contend it should have, even so the people have not adequate protection under that agreement. I asked the Minister of Railways how he could explain where the engineer of the Transcontinental Commission would represent the people in the matter of over-classification, and as the Minister of Railways did not answer at the time, I was in doubt whether to complement him or his sincerity in acknowledging that he could not understand the point or on the skill with which he avoided it. Later on in the evening, he did attempt to answer it, and with I should think about three per cent of success. In so far as the legal liability of the government to charge the 3 per cent interest on the cost of construction was concerned, his explanation had something in it. But what about the 100 per cent principle cost of construction? How in connection with that could that engineer possibly represent the people? Why, Sir, no dispute could arise unless the Grand Trunk Pacific chief engineer takes the position that there is over-classification, and that consequently the cost is too great. It is inconceivable that the Grand Trunk Pacific would take the position that there is under-classification, and the cost estimated at too little. Before any dispute can arise, then the Grand Trunk Pacific must take the position that the cost is too great through over-classification, and then the representative of the Commission must say: 'No, the cost is not too great and I shall not let you reduce it.' Now, in arguing out that position, how can he be said to represent the people of Canada, when he urges that the cost should be as great as it is? How in the world can he represent the people of the country in urging for the increased cost? It may be that he is establishing the right of the people to interest on that increased cost, but the Minister of Railways cannot have studied the position,

seeing that as to the 100 per cent, the principal cost of the construction which the people of Canada had to put up, the engineer of the Transcontinental Commission was acting directly antagonistic to the interests of the people. Therefore, all along there was no protection in the matter of over-classification, except such as might be afforded by the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I say that under the circumstances, in matters of over-classification that did not constitute a sufficient protection for the people of Canada. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company pays the 3 per cent interest, it is true, but it is a well known principle of railway management nowadays that the freight rates are fixed to meet such charges, and that the interest in the end comes out of the people. I do not want to say it is a matter of no concern to the Grand Trunk Pacific to see that the cost is kept down, but it is a matter of comparatively little relative concern to them compared with the concern it is to the people of this country. Consequently I say that even should the arbitration have the thorough powers it was intended to have, it did not constitute in the matter of over-classification a sufficient protection for the people of Canada. The interest of the parties who are only relatively slightly interested was not a sufficient interest to be placed as a bulwark for the protection of the interests of the people, who, to an extent 40 times as great were interested in the cost of the construction.

That being the case, and I think it must be taken as clearly established, surely when we are in that position, surely when we have little enough protection at the best, it is the duty of this House to see that that protection is exercised in the most liberal possible degree. Surely the action of the Transcontinental Commission should have been not antagonistic to the limits of the arbitration, they should have taken a position all along in favour of the widest possible scope for that arbitration board. But when they refuse to take that position, it is the duty of the House to take it for them and to investigate the matter which they refused to investigate. The Transcontinental Commission all through these proceedings should rightly have been looked to by the people of this country as ranging themselves in all matters of dispute in favour of the people as against the contractors, but they have ranged themselves on the opposite side and in every dispute that has occurred have stood up alongside the contractor and fought his battles and the people's interests have been left to take care of themselves. We do not represent the Transcontinental Commission or the government, we represent the people of Canada. They are our clients alone, and unless the light is let into them through the instrumentality of the resolution of the hon. member for South Simcoe it is never going to be let in, absolutely no light can be let in by the resolution of the first minister and no member on either side can show how there is any possibility of the slightest pretense of investigation under it. As this parliament is constituted, the House of Commons should have the interests of the people and no other at heart, the people are their clients and they should have no other clients. It is our duty to see that they know the facts, and they knowing the facts we can rely on their intelligence.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). At this late hour I shall try to be as brief as I possibly can in discussing this question. What are we discussing? A resolution of the right hon. gentleman the leader of the government purporting to make inquiries into certain charges made by one Hugh D. Lumsden, engineer in chief of the Transcontinental railway, in which he uses certain words which I had better read. He says:

> That neither the general specifications nor my instructions regarding classification have been adhered to, but on the contrary large amounts of material have been returned as solid rock, which should only have been classified as loose rock or common excavation, and material has been returned as loose rock which was, or could have been handled by ploughing or scraping.

He goes over a lot of charges in which he accuses his subordinates of not carrying out his instructions. Why does not the right hon. gentleman leave that to the committee to inquire as to whether the allegations of the chief engineer are true or not? He carefully avoids it. Look at his resolution. What is it? It says:

> And whereas, while this House deems it not desirable to take any action which might prejudice the position of either of the parties to the arbitration proceedings now in progress between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company and the said commissioners, yet the said recited allegations of said Hugh D. Lumsden, stated by him as the reasons for his resignation of the said position of chief engineer, are in the opinion of this House of such great public interest.

In the opinion of this House it is of great public interest whether a subordinate carried out his instructions. The gravamen of the charge is that the country is being robbed by over-classification on certain of the work, and that is the charge made by Mr. Lumsden in his letter to the commissioners, yet this House is debarred from inquiring into it. Why? Because an arbitration board was provided under the Act and the question is, as the hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the other side of the House say, sub judice; as we had given powers to this arbitration, or

at least delegated them, we should not inquire into the classification or the question whether there has been over-classification or not. These questions are not to be considered at all. What a farce appointing a committee of this House for the purpose of inquiring whether some subordinates of the chief engineer had performed their duty or not. That is all that the right hon. gentleman is willing to submit to the House for its consideration. A greater farce never was heard of in this House. He could not get past the fact that his chief engineer, the party selected by him to superintend the construction of the Transcontinental railway, was obliged to state that there was over-classification, or, in other words, robbery of the country.

Let us first look at the manner in which an estimate as to the probable cost of a railway is prepared. The hon. gentlemen stated that a specification had been prepared for this work by his deputy minister and by the engineer in charge of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think they put their heads together and consulted some United States works as to what the proper specification should be. I have not the slightest doubt in the world that the specifications provided by them are proper specifications. I am perfectly content, too, that the interpretation in the first instance put on them by Mr. Lumsden, that even his amended interpretation after the opinion of the Minister of Justice had been obtained, was perfectly in accordance with what is correct. If these instructions were carried out, we would have honest construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. An estimate of the cost of the construction of the road is made by engineers. Engineers are employed to locate the road. When the road is located, they say that there may be mistakes in reference to the quantities along the line of road. They examine it most carefully, test pits are sunk at every part of the road, and the variation ought not to be more than the amount the Minister of Railways said, 20 per cent. It never is 20 per cent with true engineers. They ought to know within 20 per cent anyway every piece of rock, every piece of loose rock, and every piece of earth upon the road. That is demanded by the Minister of Railways. Under these estimates of quantity the department lets contracts, and strange to say in this case the same parties who located the road, as I drew from the Minister of Railways, are the engineers who are on the construction. They furnish information to the country stating what the quantities are and from time to time as the work progresses and the measurements come in, the quantities are found to be in some cases three times in excess of what they estimated. Not a word from the Minister of Railways, not a word from the Railway Commissioners who have charge of the construction of this road, saying: How is it, gentlemen, you estimated certain quantities in reference to this particular construction at one time and now by your return you find there in some cases three times the amount? Not an explanation asked, no reason given. I drew the attention of the Minister of Railways a couple of years ago, and a year ago, to the fact that it was notorious that the quantities on this road greatly exceeded the estimates made of them. I asked whether this was by reason of the interpretation put upon the contract by the Minister of Justice. If it were so, I could not understand the position of the chief engineer. These contracts were let on specifications prepared by him. They were changed by the Minister of Justice putting a certain interpretation upon them. But why were not the specifications altered for the new contracts so as to carry out in these what was intended in the first place? I do not see this matter referred to in the correspondence. The simple fact is that the parties who had charge of the work for the government returned quantities largely in excess—as to cost—of the quantities estimated by themselves to be in the work. And no complaint was made by the government or by the commissioners; no report was made by the engineer, nor does any evidence appear as having been given before any commission with a view to exculpating those who were thus proven to be in error.

The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), in their remarks, found it necessary, in order to defend the government, to say: We have done all we possibly could, but powers were delegated to the Railway Commission and board of arbitrators and not to the Minister of Railways. I was careful, when the commission was appointed, to state that the responsibility of the minister to this parliament should not cease, that whatever commissioners or arbitrators were appointed, we would not divest ourselves of authority for this purpose. We may have delegated our authority to a certain extent for our own convenience, but the ministerial responsibility must always continue. The member for Pictou asked us: What has the Minister of Railways or the head of the government to do with the question whether classification is right or wrong?—the matter is referred to the arbitrators to decide the matter according to the law, and by that we are all bound. But the doctrine I laid down is that this House goes to the minister direct. The minister can exculpate himself by justifying the action of his subordinates and showing that the calculations have been correctly made.

The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) dealt with the tender question of the arbitration between the Grand Trunk Paci-

fic and the government in reference to this work. I may be wrong, but in my judgment the arbitrators had nothing to do with deciding any question arising between the contractors and the government. The only questions that the arbitrators can decide, and the only ones intended to be referred to them under the Act, are disputes between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the government in reference to the construction of the road. The power of decision of matters between the government and the arbitrators is entirely with the government. I might read the statute on this subject, but instead I will read from the report brought down a section embodied in the contract which the government have let:

> The engineer shall be the sole judge of work and material in respect of both quantity and quality, and his decisions on questions in dispute with regard to work and material, shall be final.

No arbitration is referred to there.

> No extra additional work or changes shall be deemed to have been executed, nor shall the contractor be entitled to demand payment for the same, unless the same shall have been executed to the satisfaction of the engineer.

Thus, the Railway Department has entire control over any dispute between the contractor and the government, and the only questions the arbitrators have to deal with are questions arising between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government in reference to the construction of this road.

Now, why are we asking this inquiry? It is one of the most important that has come before the House. We were promised the construction of this road for $53,000,000. The Minister of Finance states that, in giving this estimate, he did not speak on his own authority but on that of the engineers. But the minister is responsible to this House and he has no right to hide himself behind the officers of the government. If an officer of the government makes a misstatement to him, it is his duty to correct that officer, to suspend him, or, if necessary, to dismiss him. The statement was prepared by Mr. Schreiber, prepared on certain quantities, furnished to his department by the location engineer. I have looked carefully over the returns, and I find the total prism quantities are less than the amount found by actual construction of the road. I think that in the case of every contract let on the Transcontinental Railway, the locatees of the road made the quantities a little in excess of what has been found. What, then, is the difficulty? It is on the question of classification. If you have a million yards of earth to take out, and, instead of classifying it as earth, you classify 700,000 yards as loose rock at 50 cents, instead of at 25 cents for loose earth, or solid rock at $1.50, the difference is very serious. But where the government is responsible, and what we want to inquire into is as to these changes of classification. We want to inquire whether there has been falsification of the classification or not. That is the only real question. The question before the country is not whether the country has received good work. Why go to the trouble of surveying, and locating a line, taking out the quantities, preparing specifications and letting contracts if we are not allowed to inquire afterwards whether the expenditure has been in accordance with the contracts, and not only whether the country has got good work or not. The question of honour, of proper management of the public works is far above every consideration of money value. Honour should never be linked with dishonour. We ought to have in our public men honour and reputation. No country can exist unless it has the means of knowing that the money entrusted to the care of the government is spent in the interest and to the honour of the country. What we want to investigate is charges that have been rife from one end of the country to the other. It is the duty of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways to assist the opposition in finding out whether there has been a proper and honest spirit, an economical spirit in the expenditure of public moneys, and whether contracts have been carried out properly or not.

That is his duty; we ought to be assisted in that. Do not burk the inquiry. We do not want an inquiry to investigate even the charges made by Mr. Lumsden, we want an inquiry as to whether there has been over-classification or not. But the Prime Minister says we are simply to inquire whether the charge made by Mr. Lumsden against his subordinates is correct, whether they carried out his instructions. You would think that the inquiry should give us the right to look into the question of classification. But no, the right hon. gentleman does not intend anything of that kind, we are to be completely debarred from going into the question of over-classification. Now, I think the House will agree with me that an inquiry should be made into these charges, which are rung from one end of the country to the other. They are self-apparent upon the papers brought down. Is there not a prima facie case when you see 600,000 yards of solid rock in a contract increased to 1,200,000; when you see loose rock multiplied in quantity three or four times; and when, to make up the quantity taken from the prism, they have to reduce earth excavation reduced to the standard of rock? Then the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) made a statement which, if true, bears evidence of fraud committed upon the government. He says that on some portions of the line where there

have been excavations returned as solid rock, the slope upon that excavation is one and a half to one. That very fact shows that there was earth present, they are passing through earth. If that statement is correct, it is evidence sufficient to convict the engineers of having returned clay instead of rock. I shall have another opportunity of discussing these questions. The hour is late now, and I know the House is anxious to have a vote. But for the honour of the House, for the honour of the country, let us not be debarred from making an inquiry into the charges which are specifically made in this House. Mr. Lumsden has made charges of fraud, of overclassification on the part of his engineers, who refused to follow his instructions, which sometimes amounted to two-fold or three-fold actual quantities. Do not prevent the opposition from exercising the right of making this inquiry, in order to justify themselves before the country. If we are refused it will be worse for the government. I state here in the papers brought down the evidence is so conclusive that fraud has been practised upon the government, that the government should hasten to inquire into the matter. The Minister of Railways himself stated that the location of this road was under the charge of a certain class of engineers. They reported the amount of loose rock, the amount of solid rock, and the amount of clay excavated that would require to be taken out; and these same engineers, be it remembered, are now engaged in the construction of that railway. There has not been a proper tab kept upon the excavation, there has not been proper reports made from month to month to the department. The department ought to have known that the payments were largely in excess of the estimates. But no inquiries were made, the chief engineer is not even consulted, even those gentlemen who made the estimate are not asked to explain the difference, and the poor country has been left entirely at their mercy.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin): There are one or two matters in connection with this question which seem to me of considerable importance, and which I have not heard discussed during this debate. Even at this late hour I take the risk of wearying the House for a few minutes to bring these matters to its attention. I read the observations made by the Prime Minister in introducing this motion; I had the advantage of hearing the somewhat lengthy and heated address delivered by the Minister of Railways; I listened to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), and I have endeavoured to find some logical, consistent and bona fide position for gentlemen on the other side of the House to take on this question, and I must confess my inability to reach the conclusion that this motion is presented to the House with any sincere desire to preserve the interest of the people. Gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have given us quite lengthy addresses, all of which are equally applicable to the motion proposed by the Prime Minister and to that which has been proposed by way of amendment. Hon. gentlemen have put up a very plausible argument, I must confess; they tell us that this parliament, in pasing the Transcontinental Railway Act in 1903, provided that a board of arbitrators should be constituted composed of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, the chief engineer of the Board of Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, and, in the event of their being unable to agree, they should choose a third arbitrator. They call your attention to section 7 which provides for that board in these words:

It is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to and approved of by the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to said specifications, and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the company, and in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the question in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph 4 of this agreement.

So in that section of the agreement this parliament has provided a board of arbitrators to determine questions of a certain character that may arise. Gentlemen opposite have told us time and time again that the people are safeguarded by that board of arbitrators; that board, we are told, is composed of an independent, high minded body of experts. Now, Sir, I have just noticed, during the last few minutes, a communication from the commissioners to the members of this board, which is really astounding, and alarming, and startling, if you stop for a moment to look at it. It is contained on pages 28, 29, 30 and 31 of this return. In it the commissioners undertake to criticise, discipline and intimidate this board of arbitrators. One would scarcely believe it possible. Let us see, at the bottom of page 30, what this communication says. It comes from Mr. Parent, chairman of the commission, and P. E. Ryan, secretary.

Resolved, that the secretary be, and is hereby directed to write to the three arbitrators, transmitting a copy of the letters of District Engineer Doucet and notes of Assistant District Engineer Huestes, each dated 23rd June instant; a copy of the letter of Messrs. Macdonell and O'Brien, dated 24th instant; a

copy of the letter of Mr. J. D. McArthur, dated 19th instant, and a copy of report of District Engineer Poulin, dated 22nd instant, all relating to the proceedings of the arbitration tribunal——

Here you find these commissioners forwarding to the arbitrators letters signed by these subordinate engineers and by two or three contractors. What do these commissioners then say?

—and to say that the commissioners object to and protest against the proceedings of the arbitrators as being improper and illegal, for the following reasons, viz.:—

(a) That they were based in whole or in part on the said draft agreement of May 14, 1909, which had been rejected, and which had no existence in fact;

(b) That the examination of the work was of a hasty, insufficient and superficial character.

Fancy a person interested in litigation before a court having the audacity to write a letter of that kind to the court to criticise the conduct of the court. Here they say that the examination made by these arbitrators, this independent tribunal, provided by this parliament for the protection of the people of Canada was hasty, insufficient and superficial, and they undertake to discipline and intimidate it. But, that is not all.

(c) That the engineers on the line who classified the work were not afforded a sufficient hearing and an opportunity of presenting evidence.

Further:

(d) That the contractors were not afforded an opportunity of showing cause; and further to say that the commissioners insist, in the public interest, that the proceedings of the arbitration tribunal shall be exhaustive, final and conclusive; shall cover all the objections filed on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that the report of the arbitrators, when made, shall be supported by substantial evidence, including details of quantities.

There is the communication sent from the commissioners to this board of arbitration, alleged by gentleman after gentleman on the other side of the House to be composed of competent experts, virtuous arbitrators, independent men, and yet intimidated by this board of commissioners. Did anything of the kind ever occur in a civilized community before? I read this because the importance of it warrants it. We find these commissioners appointed by this government, criticising, disciplining and intimidating an independent board, constituted for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the people.

Mr. SPROULE. And by a statute.

Mr. CROTHERS. And by a statute. That communication was brought to the knowledge of the Minister of Railways and Canals by a letter sent to him by the secretary of the commissioners, dated the 26th June. What step did the Minister of Railways and his colleagues take in regard to this? Did they point out to these commissioners that they had drifted outside of their jurisdiction, that they had no legal right and that it was simply an outrage for them to attempt to intimidate an independent board of arbitrators appointed for the protection of the people of the country? Not one word, not one line do we find coming from the Prime Minister to say to these commissioners: You must not interfere with this board, this board has been appointed by the parliament of Canada to safeguard the interests of the people; it must be held to be an independent board and you must not attempt to dictate to it. Did the right hon. gentleman send a single word of that character to this commission? Not a word. Did the Minister of Railways send a single word of that character, reprimanding or rebuking the commissioners for having taken that stand, for having attempted to pervert the judgment of this board of arbitrators, said to be independent, in the interests of the people? Not a single word. Is there any reason why a high minded gentleman like Mr. Lumsden should not resign his position when the government permitted the members of the commission to send him such an insulting letter as that? Could any gentleman having a grain of self-respect submit to any such position as that? You will notice that these commissioners are not writing the arbitrators—they would not be justified in doing that even—in the interest of the people, but they are writing them to influence them in the interests of the contractors. They say that the contractors ' were not afforded an opportunity of showing cause ', that ' the examination of the work was of a hasty, insufficient and superficial character,' and that ' the engineers on the line who classified the work were not afforded a sufficient hearing and an opportunity of presenting evidence.' That is what we get from the commissioners. One of the primary reasons for this is that the commissioners were appointed for political purposes and had no special qualifications for the office. A great deal of this difficulty has arisen from the fact that these commissioners knew nothing of the construction of railways. They were men who had been appointed by reason of political services rendered to the government and there was added to that commission a few weeks ago a very estimable gentleman, a member of this House, but I never heard that he ever had had any experience as an expert engineer or that he knew anything about the construction of railways. Do the railway companies who are striving to get large dividends for their shareholders ap-

point political friends to positions of trust as managers of their companies? No, you will find that the managers of the large railway corporations are men who have come up from the bottom, who know every step in the process of construction and operation of railways. These are the men who are placed in these high positions to manage these great railway corporations and they are men who know something about it. But here we have a commission appointed who know nothing about the positions that they are called upon to fill, but who are appointed by reason of political services rendered to the government which is in accord with most of the appointments made by this government. I submit that it would have been a more proper position for the government to have taken to have said to Mr. Lumsden: We will not accept your resignation, we will dismiss the commissioners who had the audacity to perpetrate this outrage upon the people in attempting to intimidate you in the position which you occupy. But, instead of doing that what do we find the government doing to-day? We have the government saying to this House and to the people of Canada that they have lost confidence in their chief engineer, not that they have lost confidence in the commissioners, not that they have lost confidence in any of the subordinate engineers, but that they have lost confidence in Mr. Lumsden because that is what this motion means, if it means anything. It was said here by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that Mr. Lumsden had made a statement and that the government were going to appoint a committee to ascertain whether Mr. Lumsden was telling the truth or not. At page 2483 of 'Hansard' it will be found that the hon. member for Pictou, in a speech which he made in this House yesterday, used the following words with reference to a statement made by Mr. Lumsden:

> My right hon. friend the leader of the House asks this House to investigate that statement and to ascertain whether it is a fact or not.

That is the position they take. Here was the chief engineer of the largest project that this country has ever undertaken, appointed by this government, making a statement in reference to several of his subordinates. His statement alone should have secured the dismissal of these men instanter. Instead of that we have the government saying: We do not believe Mr. Lumsden; we are going to appoint a committee to ascertain whether the statement he has made is true or not. Is not that the position? They accept his resignation. I have here a copy of this motion proposed by the Prime Minister, and in it he cites portions of two letters written by Mr. Lumsden, in which letters Mr. Lumsden states, speaking of his engineering staff generally, he says:

> In view of the general disregard of my instructions and having lost confidence in the engineering staff I have concluded to resign my position as chief engineer.

Is it possible to conceive that Mr Lumsden sent in that resignation without having been misused not only by the commissioners but by this government. We would like a committee to ascertain what Mr. Lumsden said to the government in regard to the manner in which he had been treated by the commissioners, whether he called the attention of the government to this intimidation practised upon him by the commissioners and if so what answer he got from the government. Did the government tell him: We are going to stand by the commissioners, to stand by the engineers, to stand by the contractors even if you go down. I cannot conceive of his resigning without his having some intimation of that sort from the government. In the second letter he says:

> I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff but applies only to the portion of the staff who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F,' lately gone over by me.

What Mr. Lumsden says is that he has lost confidence in these engineers in respect to their measurement, classification, supervision, and inspection. Now, the Prime Minister proposes a committee to ascertain whether that statement is a fact or not. We are told that the board of arbitrators is the only tribunal properly qualified by expert knowledge to determine questions of measurement, classification and inspection, and yet the Prime Minister proposes to appoint a committee of three partisans to determine whether the statement made by Mr. Lumsden be true or not. I would like any man to explain to us how a committee of five are to investigate and ascertain whether Mr. Lumsden was justified in making that statement or not, without making an inquiry into the measurement, classification, inspection, and supervision. I submit to you Mr. Speaker, that it would be utterly impossible for any committee to make any inquiry with a view to ascertaining whether Mr. Lumsden was justified in saying that these men had made over-classification, without having inquired respecting that classification. That is as plain as two and two are four. And yet we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that this committee will not be permitted to ask any questions respecting the supervision, classification, or inspection. Then, how is the committee to ascertain whether this

classification and inspection was properly or improperly done. Of course it would be utterly impossible. It seems therefore as clear as the noon day sun that the proposition to appoint this committee is not made with a sincere desire in the interests of this country but is suggested for the purpose of making nice reading campaign literature for distribution among the people. Mr. Lumsden was a qualified man, a man of knowledge and experience and capacity and integrity, or he was not. Hon. gentlemen opposite now say in substance: We doubt whether he was or not, because we are going to appoint a committee to ascertain, as the hon. member for Pictou says, whether the statement he made was true or not. Now, if the position taken by the government in that regard be sound, that itself is a very good reason why we should investigate the whole matter, because Mr. Lumsden has been in office for years and if the government had no confidence in him and are not able to accept his word on a statement of that kind, then how are they to expect the members of this House and the people of Canada to accept without question what he has been doing for the last 4 or 5 years? And if he be a man of capacity, experience, and integrity, then his word should have been accepted at once by the government, and his subordinates who were accused of misconduct should have been dismissed at once—one or the other. Therefore I say that all the arguments hon. gentlemen on the other side have presented against the adoption of this amendment are equally applicable against the motion presented by the First Minister. A great many things arouse suspicion about the Transcontinental Railway. It has been iterated and reiterated that the people of this country were deceived by the government—I do not say intentionally—but certain it is that they were deceived and grossly deceived with reference to the cost of this great work. They were told by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Finance that the whole road from Winnipeg to Moncton could be constructed for about $50,000,000. The government were then urged to take more time to become familiar with the project, and to get more information with regard to the character of the country through which the railway would run, but the Prime Minister told us that the archives contained material enough to make any member of this House as familiar with that country as he might be with his own home in the city of Ottawa. He told us he had mountains of information, and that there was no necessity whatever for getting further information with regard to the matter. The Minister of Finance yesterday gave the name of a gentleman upon whom he relied as authority for the statement that it would cost only $51,000,000.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that one of two things must exist with reference to the estimates that were made before this country embarked on this project, and also with reference to the estimates that have been made on the different parts of the road that have been let to contractors—either the engineers who gave that information were incompetent or they lent their hand to deceiving the people of this country. There is only one alternative. Would any one attempt to make you believe, Mr. Speaker, that it was impossible for a competent engineer to get within one-third of the cost of the road, and yet it is admitted now that this road will cost three times as much as we estimated. What do we find with reference to these estimates as detailed to the House yesterday by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). We find that in contract after contract, he took up, the alleged measurement exceeded from 75 to 520 per cent more solid rock than the engineers estimated, and that in every case the amount of solid rock grew enormously while the amount of sand and clay diminished enormously. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in this respect, and I submit it guardedly, one of two things must be admitted: Either the engineer was incompetent or he was dishonest. One could very easily understand that an engineer may make a mistake and over estimate one mile and under estimate the next, but every one knows that if there are such variations they would be found on both sides if the estimate were made by an honest and competent man. But here we have hundreds of miles and in every instance the alleged under estimate of from 200 per cent to 500 per cent varied on the one side only. Go out to the plain, honest people of this country whether Liberals or Conservatives and tell them that, and I submit there is not a sensible man amongst them who will accept it without very strong suspicion. He will likely say if he is a Liberal: I had confidence in the government when they made that statement to me four or five years ago, I have confidence in the government yet, there must be something wrong with the commission appointed to manage the construction of the railroad or there must be something wrong with the engineers who were appointed to carry out the instructions. I have not lost confidence in the government, I believe they were honest at the time they made that statement to us; you cannot blame them much. But they will say further: The cost of the railway is so enormously beyond what they told us; the fact of these commissioners

not being experts, the fact of their being appointed for political purposes the fact that they know nothing about the construction of railways, the fact that they have attempted to intimidate the independent and righteous board of arbitrators that we supposed was standing between us and the contractors, all these things have established in our minds a well grounded suspicion that things are not right, and unless our leader, unless this government which we have been following for many years will give us an impartial, and a fair, and an open, and full investigation of this matter from the top to the bottom we will lose confidnce in the whole outfit. Why, the very first thing I see in this return is a letter dated 7th October, 1907, written by the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, from which I quote:

Let me give you some illustrations.

Take the cutting from station 5818 to 5826, estimated 71 per cent solid rock and 29 per cent loose rock; slopes taken out 1½ to 1.

Showing that this is not solid rock because if it were there would be no such slopes, for even if the solid rock stood up perpendicular it would be safe. But where there is sand and earth they have to slope back 1½ to 1. And the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific says:

Very little ledge in this cut. Some large boulders, but a very large percentage is common excavation.

Then again he says:

Station 5842 to station 5850. Classified 94 per cent solid rock, 6 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Solid rock over classified at least 100 per cent.

Then again he says:

Station 5866 to 5875. Estimated 80 per cent solid rock, 20 per cent loose rock. No rock in place in this cut.

No rock whatever although this classification gave 80 per cent solid rock and 20 per cent loose rock.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that an engineer who says that?

Mr. CROTHERS. Yes, it is an engineer who says that. That letter was written October 7, 1907, and these same engineers are operating on the road to-day; notwithstanding the finding they thus made, they are still in the employ of the government and still giving estimates on the construction of that road. Is it any wonder that the members of this House and the people of this country are demanding an impartial investigation of this whole matter from the beginning to the end.

Station 5882 to 5901. Estimated 78 per cent solid rock, 22 per cent loose rock. A large amount of this cut wasted with slip scrapers and ploughing being done with two horses. There are hundreds of yards of earth here without a stone, large or small.

Station 6030 to 6046. Estimated 40 per cent solid rock, 10 per cent loose rock. This is the large sand cut west of O'Brien's camp. Of the 95,000 yards moved to August 31 in this cut at least 80,000 yards were pure sand.

And yet these engineers are on the work to-day and hon. gentlemen opposite say: 'We boast that we have the same engineers now that we started with, we have kept them all along.' The government got notice of this in October, 1907, that is two years ago last October, and they are there still.

Station 6071 to 6078. Estimated 99 per cent solid rock, 1 per cent loose rock. Very little solid rock in place. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1.

I would have made it 100 per cent. The slope of 1½ to 1 indicates sand. They did put in 1 per cent for loose rock and 99 per cent for solid rock. Yet these engineers are on the work still and the Commissioners are still in the employ of the government, notwithstanding these Commissioners have kept these men at work all this time, notwithstanding that these Commissioners have been intimidating, criticising and stultifying the righteous and independent board of arbitrators appointed by this House for the protection of the people,—they are all there yet, they will stay with us until the end, all of a piece, from the right hon. the Prime Minister down, they all must be kept in order that they may finish their work.

I have another half-page of that letter making similar objections which I might read. But let me give one or two words that are very significant:

As before stated, these over-classifications are not made through error in judgment nor upon the decision of the resident or division engineers, who are fully acquainted with the character of the work, but by arbitrary orders from their superior.

Who were these superiors? This letter was written to Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, and it certainly is not referring to him. Who are the superiors? That statement is made by Mr. Woods, the assistant engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific two years ago last October. They are still with the Commission and yet the right hon. gentleman proposes a resolution here to appoint three partisans—I do not suppose there will be more than two from this side—to ascertain whether this is so or not, whether Mr. Lumsden was telling the truth or not. How can one of us go out on the streets to-morrow and meet a fellow citizen without a blush of shame on his cheek? If this proposition contained in this amendment be defeated this evening, what will it be saying to the people of this country? It will be saying: 'We refuse to investigate charges of this kind, saying that your moneys are being sacrificed by the million,

but we refuse to investigate.' What are we to say? The Minister of Railways was asked two or three times, several others have been asked what this committee suggested by the Prime Minister is to inquire into. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) suggested two or three questions that might be asked of Mr. Lumsden if he were in the box before that committee. One would be: 'Did you find these men honest?' He might answer: 'Yes, or no.' He might be asked: 'What are the names of the men?' He might answer that.' He might be asked: 'In what respect did you find them dishonest?' Then we would hear: 'Hold, you must not answer that question, I object.' They told us so in so many words, this committee would have no right to investigate anything of that kind, they have said: 'This has been relegated to a board of arbitrators.' It has been relegated to a board of arbitrators under the intimidation of the political partisans who constitute that Commission, who are labouring in the interests of the contractor as shown by this letter. What are they to inquire into? We have been told by hon. gentlemen on the other side, in speaking against the amendment, that it is only expert engineers who should inquire into such matters; but you have the statement of the chief engineer of the Commission, in the person of Mr. Lumsden, and the Prime Minister actually proposes to this House and to the country, that he will set aside the statement of that celebrated and distinguished expert and leave it to three of his partisans behind him. I submit that I do not think there is a single hon. gentleman in this House who, if he were left to his head and his heart and his patriotism, would not say that there has been a sufficient case made out to warrant this House in appointing a commission or committee or some independent tribunal, to investigate this matter from the top to the bottom.

Nobody, I say, has been able to tell us what this committee is to investigate, and how they are to carry on their work. I submit that the very recital of the motion proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister shows that this committee could not do this work without inquiring into the matters of classification, supervision and inspection. So that if what has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side in opposition to our proposal to have the whole matter investigated be well taken, it is just as well taken as against the motion proposed by the Prime Minister. I was very much surprised to find in the remarks of the Prime Minister a statement to the effect that he himself doubted Mr. Lumsden. I have never heard that there was a word to be said against Mr. Lumsden. He seems to have had the confidence of this government at the time he was appointed and for many years thereafter. There is no suggestion that I have ever heard that he was a man unworthy of confidence. And yet we have the Prime Minister arising in his place in this House and suggesting that this statement made over his own signature is not to be accepted; the Prime Minster prefers that that statement should be inquired into by the honest, intelligent, independent non-partisan three gentlemen sitting beside him. Did any one ever see such a spectacle?—a man of Mr. Lumsden's ability and experience and standing in the community set aside, his word questioned and the hon. member for Pictou saying: We want to know whether the statement he made is true or not. And we are to have the matter investigated by three gentlemen sitting behind the Prime Minister, all of whom are looking for promotion, which they can get only through the assistance of the Prime Minister himself. I shall not take up more time of the House, but I cannot emphasize too strongly the point I started out with. I want to call the attention of the House, and particulary of the people of this country, to the fact that the tribunal provided by the statute of this parliament in 1903, and section 7 of the agreement to stand as a safeguard between greedy grafters and dishonest contractors and the people, this government has permitted the commissioners to discipline and criticise and intimidate, not in the interest of the people, but in the interest of the contractors who are trying to bleed the people.

Mr. PIERRE EDOUARD BLONDIN (Champlain) (Translation): I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I should be a party to prolong this debate to any extent, and, to use a phrase I have heard many a time at the opening of lengthy addresses, that I should take up the valuable time of the House; but, I would deem it on my part a breach of duty to give a silent vote on such a question.

Viewing the matter in the most unselfish spirit and apart from all sectional or party considerations of any kind, I am satisfied, and thoroughly so, that a general inquiry is desirable, not an inquiry narrowed down to a single district, or dealing merely with quantities, classification, supervision and inspection; but an inquiry concerned with the methods followed in connection with the building of the National Transcontinental, east section, from one end of the line to the other, and I contend that public opinion demands it.

On the above grounds, I ask for an investigation of a general, fair, public, and thorough character, untrammelled by legal technicalities or political bias, as laid down in the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox); and not a summary, curtailed investigation, held behind

closed doors, hide-bound and out-of-date, such as is looked for in the resolution submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister.

Considering the grievious nature of the charge made by Mr. Lumsden, considering the high standing of that gentleman, his unassailable reputation, his ability and prestige which no hon. member is justified in questioning; considering the alarming and inexplicable discrepancy between the estimated cost of the Transcontinental—a mere trifle it was to be, these hon. gentlemen assured us at the outset—and the monstrous amount it actually comes to and will grow to in the end, I say, Mr. Speaker, that a general inquiry is in order; and all that these hon. gentlemen on the other side have said, satisfies one as to the slackness of their principles of political morality and fairness much more than it impairs the force of my statement.

After listening to their expressions of opinion, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, through what perversion of the most elementary principles of logic—not to say honesty—these hon. gentlemen feel an inclination, and apparently rejoice in directing from the bitter shafts of malice and suspicion against the honest and faithful servant who has been courageous enough to fulfil his duty, though the loser by it, in the sole interest of the country; and how is it that their goodly disposition goes wholly to those whom a prima facia case exists, and who should be the object of suspicion. However, my short stay in this House has taught me that this government has tender mercies for their prevaricating political friends, much more so than for honest judges; and whenever, as the result of an inquiry, graft and extortion have been brought to light, the guilty parties have always found in this House ministers willing to discredit and even disgrace tribunals in order to better absolve and clear those whom these tribunals had convicted.

By the way, let me say to these gentlemen on the other side who are so fond of scrutinizing old-time scandals under Conservative governments, that whatever scandals have been unearthed at the time. Conservative governments have never endeavoured to prevent investigation in regard to them. And to the credit of those who then administered public affairs, these verses of an old poet might be appropriately recalled:

Et, quand nos vieux héros avaient du mauvais [sang,
Ils eussent, pour le perdre, ouvert leur pro- [pre flanc.

Now, what other object could there be to this resolution introduced by the right hon. gentleman, if not that of once more throwing into disrepute the man who has brought forward the charges, by questioning the truth of his statements? I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are not justified in questioning the truth of Mr. Lumsden's statements, any more than we are justified in questioning the truth of statements made by a minister occupying a seat on the Treasury benches. I say that, as a matter of mere common sense, we are not justified in questioning the truth of Mr. Lumsden's statements. I say that his charges should be considered true; and, if they are true as regards one district, if graft and over-classification have taken place in one district, we are justified in believing that abuses of a similar kind have been resorted to in other districts; and consequently, a general inquiry should be instituted at once, in order to put a stop to such leakage in the Treasury, to this scourge which is ruining the country.

Will the government contend that they have in hand all the necessary information as regards other districts, and that an investigation would not reveal anything of interest? If their contention be such, I may be allowed to say that they are in error, and here is a proof amongst a thousand. Last year, on the 12th of May, I put the following question to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals; it will be found on page 6603 of Hansard:

What is the total amount of damages inflicted yearly up to date by floods to the works of the National Transcontinental railway below La Tuque, and between the latter place and Ludger Noel's creek?

The answer, in no way candid, was as follows:

No damage whatever.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have personally gone over the grounds and seen for myself, I have questioned people on the spot, and I state that the hon. minister has been shamefully deceived, and, as a result, has himself deceived the House; damages for a very large amount have been inflicted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a condition of things which a general investigation would bring to light. But is not the government rather anxious to prevent any light being shed on the subject? I am inclined to believe it, and if such be the case, it is in order to congratulate it on its wisdom, its fears as to the result of an inquiry which would enlighten public opinion are indeed very well grounded.

Apart from the charges which come in from all sides, apart from those mountains of information—to make use of a term of which the right hon. gentleman is fond—an inquiry would enable me to show up, for the enlightenment of public opinion—which is becoming anxious and suspicious, and rightly so—what justification there was to selecting a swamp, absolutely a swamp, as a yard for the Transcontinental, in pre-

ference to the magnificent site of La Tuque, which was in every way from the first designated as the most suitable location for that purpose.

The hon. chairman of the Transcontinental Commission, in the course of a journey to La Tuque, had not conceded his admiration for this last spot and he could not explain to himself how another might be chosen.

The chief engineer of the Quebec section, Mr. Doucet, had also been inclined, at first, to prefer this last spot, and the hand of the one or of the other of these gentlemen had drawn the circuit plan on a map of La Tuque.

Why have they suddenly changed their opinion, against the laws of common sense, of economy and of civil engineering? That is another point which might be made clear by the means of a general inquiry.

But, Mr. Speaker, I understand that, owing to the nature of this discussion, I am precluded from entering into the details of those questions. I venture to think however, that those few facts, added to the facts already mentioned by the hon. members who spoke before me, will, at least, show the country, if not the government, that an inquiry must be had and that the conclusions of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Simcoe, should be adopted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The subject has been so thoroughly debated that I do not intend to detain the House for more than a minute or two. It does seem rather remarkable that six months after the letter of Mr. Lumsden announcing his resignation and the causes for it had been written, it should have occurred to the commission and the government for the first time that an investigation was necessary. The tenor of Mr. Parent's leter, which was read by the Prime Minister in introducing his motion, indicates that the nature of the charges made by Mr. Lumsden absolutely necessitated some investigation. But it also seemed to indicate that the necessity for an investigation first occurred to the minds of the members of this commission, and to the mind of the Prime Minister, about the 30th of December, 1909. Well, that seems a somewhat curious circumstance, but it is absolutely consistent with the course which the government has since taken, because the motion which the Prime Minister has introduced might more properly be styled a motion for the purpose of preventing any investigation into the charges that have been made.

The whole case that has been presented to the House by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) with a great deal of ability, and by other members who have followed him with similar ability, that case up to the present time remains absolutely unanswered by any hon. gentleman on the government side of the House. Does the Prime Minister realize, does the Minister of Railways and Canals realize for a moment the position in which they are placed before this country? Here were estimates made by men whom they still retain in their employ, estimates made according to the manner of engineers, by going upon the ground, surveying it, making borings, sinking drills, by ascertaining in every way that is known to them, just what the nature of that ground was. Now, there is no question about that. Does the Prime Minister deny that? Does the Minister of Railways deny that? There is no question about it, no question has been raised in the House about that up to the present time. What is the result? When the returns are made by the same engineers, or some of them, who made these original estimates, what is the result when the work actually done comes to be placed before the government, or before this commission, and paid for out of the public treasury, with the approval of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission? The result shows that the estimates thus made by these men, or under the direction of those for whom they are responsible, were so absolutely absurd and misleading as to justify the dismissal of every one of those men. What more, Mr. Speaker? The position further is that charges of the gravest possible character have been made against some of those men by no less a person that Mr. H. A. Woods, the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This letter has been read in part, I do not know that it has been placed upon the 'Hansard' in full; and although the hour is late, I propose to place every word of it upon the 'Hansard' in order that the people may see what has been before the government of this country for more than two years. It is dated Montreal, October 7, 1907.

Classification of Material, District B.

Mr. Hugh D. Lumsden,
Chief Engineer, Eastern Division, National Transcontinental Railway,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—At the request of District Engineer Armstrong, he was furnished recently with a statement of classification for the heavier work on the above mentioned section which were, when given in detail so different from his expectation that he requested the writer to visit the work.

During the past week we passed over portions of the work from the Batiscan river west for 15 or 20 miles, and later, from miles 115 to 132.

With reference to the former portion, the classification was given in distances of from 3 to 5 miles, and as we did not have total quantities of graduation, could not judge with reference to any particular cutting, although

percentages for entire distances seemed excessively heavy in both loose and solid rock.

With the latter portion we have detailed percentages for each cut and were greatly surprised at the allowances made for solid and loose rock. In nearly every case where the cuttings were not entirely all ledge, the estimate given for solid rock is double or more than double what it should be. In fact, the specifications had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made, not by reason of any error in judgment but, as I understand, by special instructions fron the assistant district engineer.

For two years they had under their eyes the statement of a reputable man, placed upon the work to guard the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway, with their assent, and who tells them that, by the direction of their own officer, that their specifications had been absolutely ignored and departed from. The Minister of Railways has met our arguments by saying that the specifications were good, by deigning no other answer whatever, because he could give no answer to the statements put forward by the hon. member for South Simcoe. Why, if the government had no answer ready, if they required time to investigate the truth of what the member for South Simcoe put forward upon his reputation as a member of parliament, they should have adjourned this debate until they were ready to give some answer one way or the other. We have heard something from geologists as to the way in which, in the by-gone history of the earth, through enormous pressure, or through the action of fire, sediment or other material was converted into rock of various kinds, but there is nothing in geological history which will account for the extraordinary speed with which pure sand and gravel have been converted into solid rock in this district. Does any man in this House, does the Prime Minister of Canada, venture to stand upon his feet and say that any adequate explanation has been given up to the present time of those statements which, if they are at all justified by the facts, indicate that the whole operation connected with the building of this National Transcontinental railway reek with corruption and mismanagement? One would think that the government would have instantly ordered a searching investigation as soon as that letter was made public. Let me tell hon. gentlemen in this House who were not here in 1907 that the whole of that letter was then produced, read and commented upon in this House, and an investigation demanded. The answer of the government was that there would be an immediate investigation to be carried out by experts under the provisions of the Act in 1903. Up to the present time no such investigation has taken place. I would like to read the rest of the letter, because it is important that it should be placed upon the records of this House. The letter of Mr. Woods proceeds as follows:

Let me give you some illustrations:

Take the cutting from stations 5818 to 5826, estimated 71 per cent solid rock and 29 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Very little ledge in this cut. Some large boulders but a very large percentage is common excavation.

Station 5842 to 5860. Classified 94 per cent solid rock, 6 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Solid rock over-classified at least 100 per cent.

Station 5866 to 5875. Estimated 80 per cent solid rock, 20 per cent loose rock. No rock in place in this cut. Many large boulders but a large amount of earth.

Station 5882 to 5901. Estimated 78 per cent solid rock, 22 per cent loose rock. A large amount of this cut wasted with slip scrapers, and ploughing being done with two horses. There are hundreds of yards of earth here without a stone large or small.

Station 6030 to 6046. Estimated 40 per cent solid rock, 10 per cent loose rock. This is the large sand cut west of O'Brien's camp. Of the 95,000 yards moved to August 31 in this cut, at least 80,000 yards were pure sand.

Station 6071 to 6078. Estimated 99 per cent solid rock, 1 per cent loose rock. Very little solid rock in place. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1.

West of the St. Maurice river.

Station 6391 to 6394. Estimated 46 per cent solid rock, 33 per cent loose rock. Sand cut with few boulders and possibly 1,500 yards ledge in bottom of cut not yet taken out.

Station 6493 to 6504. Estimated 20 per cent solid rock, 49 per cent loose rock. No evidence of any ledge and very large boulders. Nearly all sand.

Stations 6506 to 6512. Estimated 16 per cent solid rock, 44 per cent loose rock. This is purely a sand cut, with very few boulders. Upper slope nearly 100 feet high, material wasted into river. Certainly not 10 per cent of this should be classified.

Station 6522 to 6548. Estimated 26 per cent solid rock, 49 per cent loose rock. This is borrowed material from the side. Very little solid rock shown except what was used for blind drains but some large boulders not placed in embankment.

On account of heavy rains we were not able to go west of station 6600, but we understand that classification is made about as noted above.

In every case where cuttings are not entirely in ledge we find the material overclassified very largely. Mr. Armstrong has been able to visit this work at different times, perhaps quite as often as the assistant district engineer. His estimates and my own are not very different as to the amount of classified material and until he received detailed quantities he had no intimation that such heavy classification had been given. In many cases, particularly in sand and gravel cuts, he had supposed that no classification would be given, except perhaps for a few boulders as loose rock.

I am informed also that on the work east of St. Lawrence river heavy classification is being made in borrowed material where

ploughing is done with one team and material moved in slip scrappers.

As before stated, these over-classifications are not made through error in judgment nor upon the decision of the resident or division engineers, who are fully acquainted with the character of the work, but by arbitrary orders from their superior. To such classification as mentioned above, increasing the cost of the work to such an alarming extent we most seriously protest and respectfully request that either yourself or the assistant chief engineer visit the work and pass judgment upon the classification as made. Please note that the percentages given indicate the work done to August 31. We are not advised what the September estimate will be.

(Sgd.) H. A. WOODS.

Mr. Speaker, this return brought down from beginning to end fairly reeks with statements of that kind over signatures of reputable men, and although that was going on for nearly two years and a half the men who sit upon the treasury benches of Canada have been content to let that letter pass without any investigation. Sir, that is putting it altogether too mildly. Two years ago, when that letter was first brought to the attention of parliament and of the government, the Prime Minister of Canada and the men who sit on the treasury benches beside him, and the followers who support them in this House, had the audacity to vote down any investigation by parliament into these charges which are as serious as can be expressed in the English language in regard to this work. I think it will remain to the everlasting discredit of this government that these charges made in October, 1907, have been permitted to go until this 27th day of January, 1910, without an attempt on the part of this government to give them any investigation worthy of the name. All these men were retained in the employment of the government, and the only man dismissed is the man who dared to call attention to this state of affairs.

There is a great deal of force in the statement of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Crothers) although I am inclined, if possible, to put it in stronger terms than he did, that the moment that extraordinary resolution of this board, passed on the 25th day of June, 1909, was brought to the attention of this government, the government would have done no more than its duty next day, on the 26th day of June, if it had dismissed every one of these commissioners. A more extraordinary performance by men supposed to be acting in the public interest I never heard of, and I do not think any hon. member of this House ever heard of, than to undertake, while this tribunal was dealing with this matter, to interfere, not on behalf of the public but on behalf of the contractors, to call the action of these arbitrators in question, and to do that apparently without giving them any right to be heard. If they were going to be tried, surely they had the right to be heard. That the engineers on the line classifying the work were not afforded a sufficient hearing and an opportunity of presenting evidence was one of the grounds of indictment against these arbitrators, and yet these arbitrators were tried, condemned and almost executed by these commissioners without apparently consulting them at all, or giving them an opportunity to place their statement against the statement of the district engineers as to the character of the work these arbitrators had done.

I would like to take up just one or two little matters in connection with the defence that was attempted by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. That hon. gentleman has told us, in answer to the well-grounded argument of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) as to the estimates, that railways in South Australia cost $37,250 per mile, in New South Wales, $64,765, and in Germany, $102,272, &c. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals whether or not that information was in the possession of the government in 1903 or 1904. Would my hon. friend deign to answer that question?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend knows that I was not a member of the government then, so I cannot tell.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All right, my hon. friend pleads ignorance.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend think that is fair?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend pleads ignorance of what was in the knowledge of the government at that time,

Mr. GRAHAM. That is all right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, we shall go to headquarters. Would the Prime Minister tell us whether or not that information was included in the mountains of information which were possessed by the government in 1903 and 1904?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let my hon. friend make his speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am very glad, indeed, to have the permission of the Prime Minister to make my speech. I intended to have done that even if he had not given me that gracious permission. I would have thought it might be a fair question and that it might be fairly answered, having regard to the argument which has been made, whether this was included in the Prime Minister's mountains of information. Did, or did not the government, when they

came down to the House in 1903 and 1904 and told us that this road could be built for $25,000 or $28,000 a mile, know what the Minister of Railways and Canals has just told us? Had they taken the trouble to obtain and collate this information, or did they plunge into this enterprise absolutely regardless of its cost. Did they not even take the trouble to ask one of their officers to look up this information in one of the returns to be found in the library? I am not going to accuse them of that. Surely they took that precaution. The Prime Minister will not deny that he took that precaution. He does not seem to be anxious to answer questions; so, I shall not put any more to him, but I am going to assume that he did know that. I am not going to assume ignorance on his part, because my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals is rather disposed to resent any imputation of ignorance. I will assume knowledge on the part of the government that these figures, which are matters of common knowledge, I suppose, to the experts of the Department of Railways and Canals, were fully before the government when they made this statement. And yet, notwithstanding that, they came down to the parliament of Canada and told us that the road could be built for $25,000 to $28,000 a mile. I would leave it to my right hon. friend himself as to what would be a fair inference for the House and the country to draw from those two circumstances which I have just brought to his attention, and I think if he was as keen to draw an inference as he sometimes is, there would not be very much doubt as to what his answer would be.

Some attempt has been made to contend that any investigation into this matter is prevented by the Act of 1903 and the so-called arbitration proceedings which are or should have been going on under it. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that if that is a good argument, and it has been made by some of his supporters, it would lead those supporters to vote against his own motion, because if it cuts one way it cuts the other way or else this investigation which the Prime Minister has moved for is intended to be an absolute farce. Either it is intended that no evidence shall be called which could by any possibility be regarded as relevant or else the argument which these gentlemen have made is not worthy of the name. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the argument at all. The fact that proceedings were taken, whether in the Court of Exchequer or before arbitrators, would not make it necessary or even desirable that this House should inquire; the House would exercise its judgment in that case if there was a dispute either before arbitrators or before the Exchequer Court. It would not necessarily interfere because there were such proceedings, and the mere fact that there were no such proceedings, that there was no difference between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, would not make it necessary or desirable that the House should stay its hand; the two things are altogether apart. The question of a dispute between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, or a dispute between a contractor and the government has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the question whether the House shall investigate the administrative proceedings of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, which after all, is only a sub-department of this government. That depends altogether upon whether facts and circumstances are brought before the House to make it evident that that road is costing altogether too much, that some misappropriation of public moneys is taking place there, or some corruption or improper dealing is suggested or may have taken place. The House is absolutely free to go on and deal with such matters and circumstances, and the circumstances that there are arbitration proceedings or a suit in the Exchequer Court by the Grand Trunk Pacific or a contractor, has absolutely nothing to do with this case. Yet the matters I have mentioned are the only matters that have been urged upon the government up to the present time.

What do we ask? That a real, thorough investigation shall take place. It has been said that it could not be done this session. Well, we can do as much as we are able this session and we can go on next session or perhaps some arrangement might be found by which that investigation could go on between the close of this session and the commencement of the next. I think some means could be easily devised. But whether that is done or not, we can easily go on this session, make some beginning and devote the attention of parliament to ascertaining whether or not the outrageous charges which have been made against the National Transcontinental railway and the government of this country, who are responsible for the acts of that commission, are founded on fact or are pure scandalous libels without the slightest foundation whatever.

The question between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government is one thing, the question between the government of this country and the people of this country is another thing. This is a matter which the people of this country have a right to expect parliament to investigate. It is not open to investigation upon the proposals of the Prime Minister, as interpreted by him in his motion and by his followers in support of it. I say that under the circumstances I shall support, and I think every fair-minded man in this House ought to support, the thorough investi-

gation of these charges. They are not made by any member of the opposition, no member of the opposition has the requisite knowledge to have made these charges. He might very well have founded charges upon these statements of reputable men, but it has not been necessary because the charges are there in black and white upon the pages of the return brought down by this government. The charges are there and they will not down, they must be investigated at some time or other. The government of this country might as well take the matter up first as last and I would say to hon. gentlemen on the other side: How can you reasonably now, in the interests of the people of this country, vote against that investigation? Can you say that the public interest of this country can possibly be prejudiced by any such investigation. How can it be prejudiced? Can you say that the public interest of this country may not be benefited by such an investigation? If you say that, you must decide in advance, without any knowledge and without any evidence whatever, that statements made by reputable men over their own signatures have absolutely no value whatever in your eyes. If you deny investigation, you also deny that Mr. H. A. Woods, the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, is a man whose word you may accept on a matter where his professional reputation is at stake, you must say that every word by that man under these conditions is to be regarded as a false and malicious libel. You cannot take that stand surely, and yet, unless you take that stand, you cannot very well vote against the most thorough and searching investigation of this matter from beginning to end. So I say, there should be that thorough and searching investigation and without it the people of this country, the fair-minded, honest and thinking people of this country, whether Conservatives or Liberals, will not be satisfied and will hold the government responsible to the bitter end for adopting any other course.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Crothers) is in his seat. I call at once his attention to an observation he made with regard to the speech with which I introduced this motion, to the effect that I had attacked the character of Mr. Lumsden. My hon. friend would be much embarrassed to point out to me and to the House what language I had made use of, which he could criticise as having been in any manner derogatory to the character of Mr. Lumsden. I am not conscious that I said a word which by implication, still less directly, could be construed as having been making any charge at all against the character of Mr. Lumsden. The only thing I said with reference to the action of Mr. Lumsden is simply in those words:

> One perhaps might question the judgment of Mr. Lumsden as to whether he was well advised, if he thought there had been bad faith on the part of his engineers, in tendering his resignation.

If my hon. friend has anything to say different from what I say now, I think he owes it to himself to point it out at some time. But, Sir, I appeal to the House that in offering this resolution, I did not say a word—I would not have been justified in saying a word—against Mr. Lumsden. I know nothing against him, I do not know him personally, I met him once or twice, but I do not know that I have ever conversed with him. But I take his action as it is. On June 25 last, Mr. Lumsden took on himself to resign and he was within his rights in doing so, but it seems to me, as I said, his judgment was very deficient. The reason he gave for resigning was that he had reason to believe the engineers to whom he had entrusted the work were not acting fairly towards him, not acting on his instructions, and that some of them had been guilty of a thing which was reprehensible.

I pass now to another matter, I pass to the very dramatic manner in which the hon. the leader of the opposition introduced his speech. He commenced by reciting the letter of Mr. Woods, of the date of October 7, 1907, in which grave charges are made against the engineer entrusted with the work of the construction of the eastern section of the Transcontinental Railway. My hon. friend would be perfectly right to recite this, if he had thought this matter had not been investigated. He would have been perfectly right to have spoken as he did, if indeed, his charges were true. But my hon. friend ought to know that he was labouring under a strange misconception when he spoke as he did. In the first place, my hon. friend was very unfair and very unjust to the Minister of Railways. He said in so many words, that the Minister of Railways, having this letter in his hand, had ignored every syllable of it. True it is, that in the admirable speech which the Minister of Railways delivered a few days ago, not less than one page of 'Hansard' is devoted to a discussion of this very letter of October 7, 1907, but, Sir, is it to be supposed that such a letter as that was written to the commissioners without Mr. Lumsden himself,—a man of honour as he is said to be, a man of honour as he is represented to be on the present occasion by members on the other side of the House, a man of honour so far as I know him to be also—I have nothing to say against him—is it to be supposed that Mr. Lumsden, the man in charge of the contruction work, would have allowed such a

grave charge to be brought against his officers, without himself taking the precaution to know whether or not such a charge was justified. When he saw in that letter, a statement to the effect:—

As before stated, these over-classifications are not made through error in judgment nor upon the decision of the resident or division engineer, who are fully acquainted with the character of the work, but by arbitrary orders from their superior.

Is it to be supposed that Mr. Lumsden would have allowed such a charge to go unchallenged, in view of the character which has been given him by gentlemen on the other side, a character, which I will not dispute? No, Sir. What we have reason to suppose, was that Mr. Lumsden would look into it, that he would find whether or not, the charges against his officers were true or not true. And if Mr. Lumsden was satisfied that the charge made by Mr. Woods was not true, what have my hon. friends opposite to say? My hon. friends say, that to this date there has been no investigation. Why should there be investigation, if Mr. Lumsden was satisfied that the charge was not true? I am informed that Mr. Lumsden looked into the matter, and October 29, 1907, he wrote as follows, to the Commissioners:—

Sirs,—In regard to the statement made by Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, in a letter to me dated the 7th of October, that 'the specifications had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made not by reason, of an error in judgment, but, as I understand, by special instructions from the assistant district engineer.' Mr. Woods must evidently have been in error as to this, as Messrs. Grant, Huestes and Harvey, assistant engineers, all positively deny having given any such instructions, and this is confirmed by Messrs. Burgeois, division engineer and Mathews and Girdwood, resident engineers, on the works specially referred to by Mr. Woods.

Now, Sir, that is why the matter was not investigated. Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, was satisfied that there was not a shadow of foundation for the assertion that had been made, and therefore there was no necessity on that account to investigate. My hon. friend afterwards directed his censure to the action that was taken by the commissioners in protesting the arbitrators. Well, it is perhaps a matter of judgment whether the commissioners acted wisely or not, but I think there was good reason for their action. First of all why does this arbitration take place? This arbitration takes place to determine what the cost of the road is upon which interest has to be finally paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific. I think it was the hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who said that the Grand Trunk Pacific had nothing to do at all between the government and its contractors, and that is true. But it is very important to the government that the exact amount of the cost of the road should be determined and that it should be done at the time so that the interest will be paid upon it afterwards. If it turns out for instance that all the contracts are terminated and paid for, and that afterwards on an arbitration between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government it should be found that there have been over-classifications and over-payments, the country would lose the amount. That is the reason why the arbitration should go on promptly and that is the reason also why the contractors and the engineers should be heard on that arbitration, because after all if the classification established by the engineer is later on found to be excessive the government would lose, whereas if the arbitration proceeds immediately before and the contractor is finally disposed of and while we still have a deposit in our hands to refund what has been paid in excess, the country would lose nothing. I therefore think the commissioners were well advised when they said to the arbitrators that they should hear the engineers and that they should hear the contractors. If they found in the course of their investigation reason to suppose that there had been over-classification, I think it was perfectly right that they should say: You should not conclude this matter until you hear all the parties interested. Surely nothing could be fairer than that.

But, these remarks are only preliminary —I come to the position taken by gentlemen on the other side of the House, which is, that there should be an investigation extending over the whole work. And why? I will take the reason given by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and by the way I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his seat because he appealed to me with some warmth to give him this investigation, and he did so in these words:

The Prime Minister can well disregard the humble source from which the request comes in his desire to discharge a great public duty.

I would like to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox), were he in his seat, that I do not consider the source whence the request came as an humble source by any means. On the contrary, I have nothing but respect for my hon. friend from Simcoe. I do not always agree with him, indeed it is very seldom it is my privilege to agree with him, but I bear testimony as every one has been happy to do, to his intense industry and to the labour he has brought to bear upon this question, even though on this particular occasion as well

as upon others I cannot agree with his conclusion. He went on to say:

> And, whether rightly or wrongly, whether by mistake or by dishonesty, whether blunderingly or criminally, the expenditure is vastly, enormously—outrageous, I might say—in excess of the estimates presented to the House.

And he concludes:

> And whereas the cost of the eastern division of the said railway, according to the latest estimates of the government, will be so enormously in excess of the estimates submitted to parliament in 1904 and 1905 as to arouse the most serious alarm and to call for the fullest inquiry.

The inquiry is therefore asked because the cost of the road is largely in excess of the estimates which were presented to the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) says there is such an excessive cost over the estimate that it must be the result either of a blunder or of a criminality. May I not suggest to the hon. gentleman and to the House that there might be a third alternative. May I not suggest that if the cost has been far larger than was anticipated by the estimates of 1903-4 it may have arisen from the physical difficulties which were encountered in the construction of the road. Is it not at least as natural to suppose that the increased cost has arisen from that fact as from either of the others. But gentlemen opposite are the same as they always are, they are always ready to suspect criminality. They will not give us credit for honest intentions or honest acts; they are ready to protest on all occasions, that if anything does not go as they wish it to go there has been criminality. But, Sir, I think it is just and natural to suppose that if the cost has exceeded the estimates that fact has arisen from honest causes which are to be found upon the ground itself. It is extraordinary, Sir, how these gentlemen opposite forget their own history; they forget what they themselves said in 1903 and 1904. When we proposed this scheme to build the National Transcontinental railway in 1903 we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that our estimate was altogether too low, that it was impossible to build the road for $53,000,000, and my hon. friend from Lanark told us that the road would cost $125,000,000 at least.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good, let us say if you like that we were wrong and that he was right, and if we were wrong and if hon. gentlemen opposite were right, it follows that the increased cost of the road has not arisen from any criminality but simply because of the circumstances which the hon. member for Lanark knew of better than did we. Credit was given to my hon. friend from Lanark that he was a good prophet on that occasion; the road has cost more than we expected. But while they say that my hon. friend knew that the road cost more than we said it would, still they will persist that if the road costs as much as it does it must be because of criminality. They will have to choose as to whether it was through criminality or through some other cause. For my part, I prefer to believe that the road has been costly because the character of it is difficult.

Now, I pass to another consideration, the only important consideration brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). He asks us: Why do not you grant this investigation?—you say you can't grant it at this time because the matter is under investigation. That is the very reason we do not grant it. I do not dispute that parliament can do anything it pleases in this as in all other matters. Parliament can take a case from the courts, bring it here and try it. But would he advise that we should do so in this case? The reason, the peremptory reason, why the investigation is not advisable at this moment is, not because there should never be an investigation, but because under the present circumstances, it would be unwise for parliament to have an investigation where an investigation is already going on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) going to withdraw his motion, then?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) thinks that a clever remark, he is very much mistaken. The point that my motion proposes to have investigated is not at all what is in dispute before the commissioners at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us what it is then. Tell us just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend does not know that?

Mr. FOSTER. No, and no one on the other side has told us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell him in a moment,—it will not be difficult.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we come.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My. hon. friend is not as bright as he is usually. I gave him credit for greater keenness of intellect than he displays at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Never mind the jollying; give us the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Lumsden in his letter says:

In view of the general disregard of my instructions, and having lost confidence in the engineering staff, I have concluded to resign my position as chief engineer.

There Mr. Lumsden makes a direct charge against his engineers. However, on the following day he qualifies it. In another letter which he addresses to the commissioners, he says:—

Referring to my letter of yesterday wherein I stated that I have lost confidence in the engineering staff, I beg to state that this does not apply to the whole staff, but applies only to a portion of the staff who were responsible for the measurement, classification, supervision and inspection of considerable portions in district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F' lately gone over by me.

Thus he says that he has reason to suspect the honesty of the engineers who were in charge of a considerable portion of the road in district 'B' and east of Rennie crossing in district 'F.' There are many districts on this railway—some 1,800 miles of road were to be constructed. And, the districts 'B' and 'F' cover about 400 miles. Mr. Lumsden confines his charge to the engineers in charge of district 'F' and district 'B.' I think that Mr. Lumsden did not do himself justice as I said a moment ago. Certainly, he did not do his staff justice when he did not designate more clearly the engineers against whom he made his charge. I think he would have acted more wisely if either he had not spoken at all or had not made direct charges. But he says that it is engineers in district 'F' and district 'B' that he has reason to suspect. Therefore I think we have every reason to inquire who are these engineers and what are the reasons that he has made this charge against them. That is the subject to be investigated. That is not hard to understand and appreciate. Does my hon. friend believe that dishonesty is a proper subject of investigation? If not, he can vote against the motion. But we on this side believe that it is not fair to the House or to the government, or to the Commission—it is not fair to Mr. Lumsden himself—that this matter should be left where it is. We believe that it is a proper subject of investigation. And I say more, this investigation will not in any way interfere with the investigation which is now going on by the arbitrators appointed by the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It is altogether outside the scope of their investigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I may be allowed to ask a question: The matter is much more in particular in Mr. Lumsden's letter than the right hon. gentleman has just expressed. It is alleged the particular character of the wrong-doing by these engineers. Does the Prime Minister understand that the particular character of the wrongdoing—over-classification and so on—should be investigated, or does he propose that it should not be investigated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The letter of Mr. Lumsden charges that there has been over-classification. I stated, in introducing this motion, that this over-classification might be the result of incompetence, of blundering, or of criminality. So far as the result to the country is concerned—which is the matter now being investigated by the commission—it matters not what is the cause; the point is to ascertain whether there has or has not been over-classification. It is the opinion of Mr. Lumsden that there has been over-classification. But that is an opinion, it is not a fact or a judgment. It is to be observed that Mr. Lumsden never was on the road, that he never saw a single inch of it, so far as my memory goes——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, the Prime Minister is away off.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon friend is altogether off himself. Mr. Lumsden never was on the road before last spring, when he went with the commissioners. When he made the charge of over-classification he had never made a personal inspection of the road, but had taken the judgment of his engineers. I do not know that he did himself justice. But that was his way of doing his work, and he had full trust in his engineers. Mr. Lumsden now gives his opinion that there was over-classification. Perhaps he was right; perhaps he was wrong. That is to be investigated by the commission. In this you have the answer of my hon. friend. The leader of the opposition, very dramatically——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister has forgotten to answer my question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think so. My hon. friend asked me what there is to investigate? There is the charge made by Mr. Lumsden that he has been deceived by the engineers of certain districts. As to how it should be investigated, of course that will depend upon the answers given by Mr. Lumsden himself. I do not know what reasons he may have, and the only way to ascertain what reasons he has for coming to the conclusion he does is to investigate. It is premature to say what course the investigation shall take. The leader of the opposition began his speech very dramatically by asking: 'Can you say that the public interest will be prejudiced by this investigation?' Certainly, I do say so. An investigation here on the back of the investigation now going on would certainly prejudice the public in-

terest. I do not say at this moment that the door is to be closed against investigation—nothing of the kind. Parliament can exercise supreme power. I think the hon. gentleman put the case better when he said that parliament in its wisdom would determine whether there was to be an investigation. I agree with that. But I say that parliament in its wisdom will not feel called upon to investigate the matter, but will investigate the facts covered by this motion and will reserve its judgment for a future occasion.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take a very long time in making a very short reply to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and to note two or three things of a more general nature. My right hon. friend undertook to discipline the hon. member for West Elgin for the statement made by him inferring that the Prime Minister had lost confidence in Mr. Lumsden——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That's not what he said.

Mr. FOSTER. —or had said something which reflected upon the judgment of Mr. Lumsden.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Upon the character.

Mr. FOSTER. Or upon the character of Mr. Lumsden; and he has read the statement which he did make in his speech. The statement which he made involves an inference which, while I will not say it goes so far as to touch the moral character of Mr. Lumsden, certainly goes so far as to touch the stand he took, and his judgment, because the Prime Minister as the head of the government says that he questions his judgment. Well, if he questions his judgment, he has gone a long way to losing confidence in Mr. Lumsden, and he has taken the opportunity of letting the world as well as this House know that he no longer has confidence in Mr. Lumsden's judgment.

Well, let that go. He then took up the letter of Mr. Woods, and the statement of the leader of the opposition, a very strong statement, which consisted in putting the letter of Mr. Woods on record. Nothing could be stronger than Mr. Woods' letter. Now, who is Mr. Woods? Is Mr. Woods a nonentity? Is he a scrub engineer? Is he a man of no standing in his profession? How often have we heard the greatness and the grandeur of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway described to us, and Mr. Woods is a trusted servant, a picked engineer, a trusted employee in engineering matters of that great Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which knows how to employ the best, and, which so far as I know, always does employ the best. That is what Mr. Woods is. When he speaks, he speaks with authority, the authority of a man who is trained in his profession, and he places at the bottom of that the observation and experience of a man who has gone over every foot of the ground he is talking about. Now, is no credence to be given, is no weight to be attached to the judgment, to the statement, to the repeated statements of Mr. Woods in that respect? In 1907 Mr. Woods wrote that letter. In 1909, two years afterwards, he is writing exactly similar letters and along the same line, and from 1907 to the present time Mr. Woods has never ceased writing letters, and no letter of his can be quoted in which he does not reiterate the same broad, strong and specific statements with reference to over-classification, giving the mile, giving the section, and giving the quailty of the over-classification. I think that is something that cannot be explained away.

But that is not all. Mr. Woods has the backing of his district engineers. Amongst them is Mr. Armstrong, who called the attention of Mr. Woods to what was going on, and who gave him the basis of the information upon which Mr. Woods acted, and upon which, after he had acted, he wrote these repeated letters. More than that, in this stand of Mr. Woods on behalf of his company first, which is a stand, so far as it goes, on behalf of the people of this country, in the second place—because every dollar that Mr. Woods and the Grand Trunk Pacific get taken off on the cost of that road is a dollar taken off from what the people of this country have to contribute, that is what it means. Alongside Mr. Woods stands his district engineer and his sub-engineers. Alongside of Mr. Woods stands Mr. Kelliher, and alongside of Mr. Woods stands Mr. Chamberlin, who is the vice-president of the road; alongside Mr. Woods, in his charges, there is ranged up the whole line of the Grand Trunk Pacific engineering staff, and, there is not one of them but backs him, not one of them but will substantiate his statements. Now that means something.

The Prime Minister asks: If it were true, would Mr. Lumsden have done nothing? And he demolishes the leader of the opposition in saying that an investigation has been held. What was the investigation? Mr. Lumsden writes a letter, or he has a personal conference with the engineers on that part of the road which was the subject of Mr. Woods' letters. The letter was read here to-night, and what did the letter say? Mr. Lumsden says that he questioned them upon it, and they denied it was so. That is the investigation. What a lovely kind of an investigation that is, Merwin likes an investigation like that, Lodge likes an investigation like that, Pearson delights in that kind of an investigation,

the saw-dust wharf heroes love that kind of an investigation. Just ask whether it is so or not, and when they deny it, give it all up, and three years afterwards when you are taunted with it say: But there was an investigation; we asked the chap if it was true and he said it was not. But what an example that would be for our judges. Why, all you have to do when any one does something criminal is to call the chap up and say: Did you do that? He denies it, the judge immediately throws off his robes, his work is done; and when you ask him what was the result of the trial, he says: I could do nothing further, the chap denies it.

Now I put another question to the Prime Minister and the government. The government cannot get out of their responsibility in this matter. When the commission bullyrags an independent tribunal, the arbitrators appointed, it is the government that is bullyragging them. But we do not need to labour that. The Prime Minister takes the whole glory of doing it. When an independent tribunal of judges is appointed to decide upon great issues between two opposing forces, between the government of this country and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, when that independent and scientific tribunal is arranged for and constituted, the government commences to say: You are hasty, you have no judgment, you have acted like school children, dont do it again. And so they intimidate them for carrying on all work that they have to do afterwards. I put it to the Prime Minister if, two years and some months ago, a statement like that from a reputable engineer whom the Prime Minister dares not impugn, either as to his character or his ability, if two years ago that statement came to the notice of the government, if two years ago their engineer did not take proper action upon it, and they waited for two years and some months, and yet no proper action has been taken upon it, whose fault is it? It is the government's fault? You were erecting a building with another man's money, you appointed the foreman, the man came and told you that the foreman was not doing his duty, that the workmen were stealing, that they were putting in material below the specifications, and charging high prices for it. You got that information, you did not compel your foreman to investigate it. The first thing a business man would have done would be to bring up his foreman and say: Here, this is what is said of you, is the statement true?—Well, I do not know.—Have you investigated it?—No.—Well, do something. The foreman goes down and asks the men that are putting in bad lumber and charging high prices, is it true that you are doing that? They say, no. Your foreman comes back to you. Have you investigated this?—Yes—How far?—I asked the men whether they were putting in bad stuff and charging high prices, and they said, no.—Quite satisfactory, quite satisfactory. After two long years of spending the other man's money, under the same foreman, under the same contractors and under the same workmen. That is the astoundingly adequate idea that the Prime Minister has of his duties as leader of a government. Why, when you translate it into ordinary business, does not every man see what it means? I charge the Prime Minister to-night with full knowledge of this thing two years ago, and I charge him, the trustee for the people, with having spent since then more than $58,000,000 of the peoples' money, and during all that 24 months he has never seen fit to investigate allegations like that, involving such outrageous, such tremendously costly violations of the spirit and of the letter of the contract.

The Prime Minister then takes the full responsibility of the bullyragging that the commissioners have given the tribunal. He stands at the back of his creatures. Who were they? Take Mr. Woods, take Mr. Chamberlin, take the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific, men of experience, knowing their business, and put them against the three men who call themselves the commissioners. Who are the men, who, acting for the government, undertake to whip and lash these independent, scientific members of the tribunal?—a box-maker, a grain dealer and a promoter. These are the high and mighty, the scientific, who, standing for the government, whip men like Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Kelliher and Mr. Lumsden, who know more than these men one hundred times over. The government, instead of dismissing these box-makers, grain dealers and promoters, who transgress so abominably against the interest of the people, comes and apologizes for them. Well, you may say that to a certain extent, they were his creatars. Mr. Parent, Mr. Young and Mr. Reid did yeoman's work—and some of it was not very well thought of, if I have read the history of the last few years correctly—to put him and his party in. Why should not they, as having created him, keep the whip hand of him? But the Prime Minister says, in trying to refute the argument of my hon. friend from South Simcoe, that the cost has been greatly in excess and that is the reason my hon. friend asks for a fuller investigation. I will repay to the Prime Minister and send him back without charge a little of the taffy that he was good enough to give me, and I will say that I think he is too bright to have ever conceived such an idea as that that was the reason given by my hon. friend from South Simcoe for desiring a fuller investigation. It was not, Mr. Speaker, that the

cost was greatly over the estimate, but that the reason of this increased cost was because sand was transformed into loose rock and loose rock was made into solid granite by processes unknown, but to such an extent that millions of dollars were put into the pockets of contractors more than were supposed to go there when the contracts were let upon the information of the government's engineers appointed by themselves. I put it to the Prime Minister, who knows it well enough. It is impossible for mysteries like this to exist in open day; this is not an age of miracles by any manner of means. Once before we had an example of something like this in the devious course of this government's history. I remember that there was a section of country in the Northwest which, at a certain time in a certain month and in a certain year, was arid sands and desert, worth little, sold for a dollar an acre, fifty cents in scrip, and I remember that in less than three years that whole section of country was a garden of Eden selling at from $8 to $15 per acre. That was another example of those mysterious processes of nature which, through the alliance which existed between them and the right hon. gentleman, worked these wonders. The same mysterious alliance, the same occult influences have been kept at work on sundry nights and days along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which was no more a wilderness than the streets of Ottawa, and which suddenly and wonderfully, but most effectively, turned nature into an object of ridicule, smiled defiance and scorn at the slow work of Providence for millions of years, turned loose sand, all at once, in a jiffy, into cemented rock and turned cemented rock into solid rock by some strange twentieth century processes. That is why my hon. friend from South Simcoe asked for an investigation.

Now, it has been put here a hundred times in this debate but my hon. friends on the other side of the House do not seem to get it in their minds and I will put it to my right hon. friend again. I will ask the right hon. gentleman one question: Why did the government go to the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, nay, millions of dollars, in order to have engineers travel the route, have engineers make borings, have engineers dig test pits, have engineers take advantage of every device that was known to their science? They did this in order to do what?—to locate the line and to measure up the kind of soil and rock which were within the limits of that road bed and put the result in the shape of cubic yards. Was that all done for fun? It was all done for one purpose and one purpose only and that was that the government might be able to give an enlightened and reasonable contract for the excavation of the roadbed and not allow the people's money to go for what it should not. Your engineers, the same that you have got now—minus the best one because that one you have taken care to get rid of, whom your commission followed as a sleuth hound follows a scent and whom they treated in such a way that no man of honour could hold that position for a single moment—made these surveys, they took out these quantities, they handed them to the government and upon these the government gave us the cost of the road. I do not need to go over it all again. Suddenly sand grew into rock, rock grew from loose to solid and the expenditures therefore grew and it is because that could only take place through gross incompetence or gross dishonesty, because one or the other is the necesary reason for it, and because of the waste of the people's money thereby that my hon. friend from South Simcoe asks for a full investigation. Oh, says the Prime Minister, it may not be dishonesty or incompetence; it may be that there are physical reasons. What were the enginers for and what did the engineers do? The engineers were for the purpose of finding just what the physical configuration and physical properties of the road and you could not let a single mile of contract until these men scoured every foot of it, found that out and reported. It was not until they had found out the physical properties and qualities of the whole line that they could give you the amount to be taken out and make that the basis for giving contracts and asking for tenders. The right hon. gentleman, in his quick grasping at a reason to get himself out of that dilemma, never thought that the physical difficulties were the very things that the engineers first had to overcome and find out before a single measurement could be made and before a single contract could be let. After all that was done, then the extra cost arose because there was a displacement of quantities—sand, found out by these engineers of yours and reported by those engineers of yours and upon which you founded the terms of the contract, sand which when the excavations were made and the quantities taken out did not happen to be there. Somebody or something had come down and taken the loose rock and put solid rock in its place. That is the charge; that is the charge that Mr. Lumsden makes; that is the charge that Mr. Wood makes; that is the charge that the Grand Trunk Pacific gives all through the series of complaints. But of all the arguments one of the flimsiest was the attempt of the Prime Minister in this House of Commons in the 20th century, to fortify this gross displacement of quantities and this consequent transfer of millions of money from the peoples pockets to the contractors pockets, to buttress up his position by saying: Oh, it did'nt cost any

too much because some of you people on the other side of the House prophesied that it would cost a great deal more. That needs only to be mentioned for any one to be ashamed of having attempted an argument like that on a serious question. My right hon. friend is asked why he does not grant an investigation and he sees and he knows the weakness of his position and so he is not like Winston Churchill, he has not banged, bolted. and barred the door entirely; he says the door is not banged yet and that parliament has it in its power. Parliament has it in its power to-night, but will parliament give an investigation? Sir, we know, and the country is learning to know, that parliament of to-day means Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He does not give it now, and Mr. Parent will have lost his power and his cunning if he allows him to give it at any time. He holds out the hope to us—not to us for it is no hope to us—but he puts the glittering lure before the people: Oh, some time or other when I get good and ready there may be an investigation of these things. but at present: No, no, it would interfere. Yes, it would interfere. Why does it interfere? Because he says there are two investigations on. Which two does he refer to, if I have got my notes correctly I have pencilled here ' which one of the investigations is it.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Your note is not right; I said there would be two.

Mr. FOSTER. What are they? One is that which the Prime Minister provides for in his resolution, and I suppose the other is the tribunal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is the arbitration and there would be the investigation asked for by my hon. friend from Simcoe.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand that the right hon. gentleman was going to grant the investigation asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox). If he does, I will sit down at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is too thin.

Mr. FOSTER. If there are to be two, the only two we have in sight is the one proposed by the Prime Minister, and the inquiry by the three arbitrators. And it seems to me there is a clear and distinct difference between the two subjects. I have read section 7 very carefully, and what it provides for is in short this: A road is being built which the Grand Trunk Pacific is to take over; the road is being built, not by the Grand Trunk Pacific, but by the government, and specifications are agreed upon between the two as to what should be the character of the road; if a disagreement arises between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific authorities as to whether any section of the road comes up to or falls below these specifications, the three arbitrators are to arbitrate under section 7. That is one thing. But there is another branch of the subject equally strong and equally imperative, and it is that this government is building a railway in various sections by its own engineers and by contractors who are absolutely subject to these engineers. These contractors put in progress estimates month by month, which on certification by the engineer are paid by the government from time to time, and there is no cause, no right, no power in the Grand Trunk Pacific to interfere between this government and its contractors. The contractors are building the railroad for the government, the payments are made by the government, and they are certified to by the government employees. And, the very moment it comes out that there have been displacements in the classification greatly increasing the cost over and above what should have been paid according to the estimates, that very moment it is the duty of the government and of the Minister of Railways to settle that point then and there before the contractors get their pay. The Grand Trunk Pacific had nothing to do with that; that is a matter between the government and its employees and its contractors. But here we have the odd spectacle of a government professing to be strenuous in getting the people's money into the right channels, living for two long years under accusations and documentary evidence that their contractors have been getting more than they ought to, and yet they don't seem to have taken the first step to get these matters straightened out between themselves and their contractors. That is the singular thing about it. Now, it seems to me that that must be done from month to month and from year to year as between the government and its contractors, whatever may be done by arbitrators between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific looking to the road coming up to the specifications which have been agreed to by both. I asked the right hon. gentleman, as I asked the Minister of Railways, as I asked the member for Carleton, and I do not know that I slighted the member for Pictou; every man on that side who has spoken, tried to get from these gentlemen, not what this proposed committee is not to examine but what it is to investigate. My first question elicited the illuminating answer given in the last paragraph of the resolution of the Prime Minister. My repeated question elicited no answer that went beyond that, and when I came back to the metropolis and put the question to my right hon. friend as I have done just now I got no

more information that I got at first. The member for Carleton was very explicit. His answer was: 'That this committee would investigate the matter in this way;' they would say to Mr. Lumsden: 'Have you lost confidence in your staff,' and Mr. Lumsden would say: 'Yes.' The next question would be: 'Mr. Lumsden, have you lost confidence in all your staff,' and Mr. Lumsden would say: 'No.' The next question would be: 'Mr. Lumsden, would you give us the names of those in whom you have lost confidence,' and Mr. Lumsden would give the names. Then the question which would follow, would naturally be: 'Now, Mr. Lumsden, how was it that you lost confidence in these gentlemen,' and Mr. Lumsden would begin to say: 'Because there was displacement of materials in the classification, over-payments, loose rock substituted for sand, solid rock substituted for loose rock and for sand, and these engineers, contrary to my instruction, passed that and therefore I have lost confidence in them.' Well, he would not get out ten words of that sentence before he would be objected to. And why do I say that? I say it, because the Prime Minister has said so; and every speaker on that side of the House has said so. They have said that the whole matter of classification is now before the arbitrators, that it must remain there and that it cannot be investigated elsewhere. Now, I ask my right hon. friend: How far is he going to get with his investigation? Why have this debate? Why have this committee appointed to waste its time? My right hon. friend could get all the information he professes to wish from this committee by simply asking Mr. Lumsden:

Mr. Lumsden, you told me in your letter you have lost faith in some of your staff. Will you please tell the names of those persons? Mr. Lumsden will give the names in two minutes. Why have you lost faith? Why, Mr. Premier, I have lost faith in them for the reason I gave in my letter—and the Premier has those reasons. I have no greater fault to find with the First Minister than this, that when rumours came to his ears that the members of the opposition proposed to probe the reasons for Mr. Lumsden's resignation, and when he felt that there was looming up in parliament a motion and a demand for an investigation, true to his instinct which has led him on other occasions to do the same thing, he thought he would be cute enough if he possibly could to forestall it with this kind of a resolution. The fault I have to find with the Prime Minister is not that he tried to forestall it, but that he has not been honest with the country in his attempt at forestalling it. Mr. Lumsden gave the Prime Minister his reasons in a letter and the Prime Minister selected from that letter two sentences which excluded the reasons entirely. If the Prime Minister wished to deal honestly and fairly with the people of this country, why did not he put in his resolution the identical reasons that Mr. Lumsden gave him for his resignation? What were those reasons? I will read what they are so it may go on 'Hansard' with this part of the discussion. He says that certain things

Have led me to the conclusion that neither the general specifications nor my instructions regarding classification have been adhered to.

That is strong, but it is not so strong as what follows. What follows is this:

But on the contrary large amounts of material have been returned as solid rock, which should only have been classified as loose rock or common excavation, and material has been returned as loose rock which was or could have been handled by ploughing or scraping, and should have been returned as common excavation.

There is the statement the engineer gives as to the reasons for his lost of confidence. Would it not have been fair to the people of this country, would it not have been more in accordance with the honest treatment both of Mr. Lumsden and the people of this country, if those reasons of Mr. Lumsden had been quoted as well as the two excerpts from the letter put in by the minister to the exclusion of everything else. Further:

On several residencies there seems to have been no attempt by the engineers to carry out my instructions and measure rock returned, either by showing the same on cross sections, or by measurements of individual pieces, but they simply appear to have guessed at the amount by taking percentages of the total cutting. In some cases where cross sections were prepared showing ledge rock, they prove to be erroneous, resulting in a very much larger amount of the solid rock being returned than actually existed. What is known as overbreak has also been returned in many places where it was caused by excessive use of explosives, and where the material was wasted this should not have been done.

You could not get an engineer to be more explicit with all the faults in the catalogue that can be urged against a resident or supervising engineer or a set of them than the statements made by Mr. Lumsden in that letter. Do the people of the country know anything of these reasons insofar as the motion of my hon. friend is concerned? He purports to give Mr. Lumsden's reasons, he absolutely conceals Mr. Lumsden's reasons, and yet he and his followers and his newspapers will be distributing all over this country the startling and wonderful statement that this government is so honest, so desirous to protect the people, that before a motion is made the Prime Minister comes down and orders a full, free and impartial

investigation. I say that is about the gravest charge that can be made against the Prime Minister; he is not attempting to deal fairly and straightly with the people of the country. He has concealed Mr. Lumsden's reasons and so far as he is concerned in his resolution he has not given Mr. Lumsden's reasons. He avoided giving them. There is not a man on that side, from the Prime Minister down, who has read to the full the reasons given by Mr. Lumsden for his resignation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I read the letter.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, my right hon. friend did. I was wrong in that, but he studiously kept the real reasons from going into his resolution. When my right hon. friend, through his committee, gets the fact that Mr. Lumsden reiterates that he has lost confidence, gets the names of the persons in whom he has lost confidence, how much farther is this investigation going to go? I would like my right hon. friend to answer that, how much farther is he to go? We are all in the dark, nobody knows and before we vote for his motion we would like to know. Having been successful in getting these two facts established, how much farther would he go? That is an answer my right hon. friend ought to give, he ought to enlighten the House. My hon. friend will not enlighten the House?

Sir WILRID LAURIER. It is no use trying to enlighten my hon. friend when he will not be enlightened. I have given the reasons twice or three times.

Mr. FOSTER. If he will cite me any portion of his speech in which he has given me an answer to this question of mine, a fair question, I will acknowledge he has done it. The fair question I put is, the Premier has stated that such a question will be asked, No. 1——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. But such information will be got, first as to whether he has lost confidence; then another bit of information will be got, as to the persons in whom he has lost confidence. Now will he please tell the House and the country what will be the next piece of information that the committee will be empowered to get?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not state statement No. 1 or No. 2. I did not pretend to catechise the committee or to instruct it, it is the House that does that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend proposes a committee to do a thing, but he does not propose to instruct the committee as to what it is to do? Does he expect the House of Commons to do a thing like that? He knows we could not support it, even if it were reasonable, if he does not tell what it is. He does, however, have implicit confidence in his own side of the House, that they will support it with or without reasons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And you will oppose it, with or without reasons.

Mr. FOSTER. I have puzzled my ingenuity to find out what the next question would be. I have imagined it would be this: You have lost confidence in certain men, why did you lose confidence in them? Then we come back to the reasons in that letter. But my right hon. friend says he will not be allowed before this committee to prosecute his reasons and give them to the committee, because wrongful classification is the reason why he lost confidence as he says and all matters of classification are already before another tribunal and will not be allowed to be taken up by this tribunal. Then where are we to get? It is a blind, it is an attempt to throw dust into the eyes of this country. It throws no dust into the eyes of the members of the House of Commons on either side, they are all clear-sighted as to just what this means. They know, but the country that looks to the Prime Minister as the first commoner in the land, as its leader, is treated in that way, dust is thrown into its eyes and that, I think, is not fair.

My right hon. friend had a little jerk-up on me. He said I made a very great mistake when I stated he had said that Mr. Lumsden had not been over a portion of that line himself. The statement my right hon. friend made was that Mr. Lumsden had never been over a foot of the line in his life. In his own mind the Prime Minister may have made a reservation 'until a certain day,' but he did not make that reservation in his first statement, as 'Hansard' will show and it was upon that first statement, not conditioned in any way, that I told the Prime Minister he was mistaken and so he was as far as that statement was concerned. Mr. Lumsden did go over many miles, but not perhaps at the date my hon. friend contemplated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What I said, was that he had not gone over the line to revise the classification of the line; he took the classification from his engineers. I know he went over some of the line.

Mr. FOSTER. The point I wish to bring out is that Mr. Lumsden, the chosen engineer of standing, of character, of ability, makes his charges on the 25th day of June, 1909, and Mr. Lumsden's charges on the 25th day of June, 1909, are an exact fac simile of the charges made by Mr. Woods in October, 1907, two years ago. With singular unanimity, every man, who has

the interest of the country at heart, every man who has at heart the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which is to a certain extent the interest of the country in keeping down expenditures, every man is a unit, and altogether consistent and persistent in his statement, that this sort of thing is going on. Mr. Lumsden, the government's engineer, states it as his last message to this government, when he resigns. He makes that charge. Not two years ago, nor at any time since, nor now, will this government and the Prime Minister, as its leader, allow the people to see what has become of their money in the face of these great allegations of fraud, misconduct and incompetence.

Now, Sir, I say that the people of this country have that right. We ought to get out of the idea that this is not the people's money that we are dispensing, it is the people's money. Who stands for the people, if we cannot get such an investigation as that? The government's motion does not stand for the people, the government's commission is throwing itself with all its length and all its strength against the people's getting a chance to look into these expenditures from month to month and year to year. They have not only thrown their length against getting at once all the information they can, but they seek to narrow instead of widening the investigation. The government have introduced this motion against the interests of the people. The Grand Trunk Pacific stands for its own interests and not primarily for the interests of the people. There is nobody to-day looking after the interests of the people. The government's motion is looking after the interests of the contractors and of the sub-engineers who disobeyed orders. The Grand Trunk Pacific is looking after it own interest, and when we come and ask the Prime Minister for a chance to let the people see the truth, he refuses. It is better for the Prime Minister himself, if anything is wrong, it will redound to the strength of the government and of the Prime Minister, to let the people know it. The people ought to know it. If there is a suspicion of wrong there ought to be an investigation full and free in order that that suspicion may be removed from the administration.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,
Barker,
Barnard,
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Clare,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lortie,
McCall,
McCarthy,
Maddin,
Magrath,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nantel,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox (Essex),
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright.—65.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Béland,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chew,
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
McColl,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Oliver,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,

Lanctot (Richelieu),	Todd,
Lapointe,	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir W.),	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lavergne,	Turcotte
LeBlanc,	(Quebec County),
Lemieux,	Turgeon,
Loggie,	Verville,
Macdonald,	Warburton,
MacNutt,	White (Victoria,
McAllister,	Alta.),
McCoig,	Wilson (Laval).—109.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Low,	Smyth,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Paterson,	Price,
Harris,	Beattie,
Robb,	Doherty,
Aylesworth,	Porter,
German,	Lancaster,
Brodeur,	Lennox,
Neely,	Arthurs,
Gordon (Kent),	Macdonell,
Chisholm (Antigonish)	Worthington,
Douglas,	Hughes,
Sifton,	Haggart (Lanark),
Roy (Dorchester),	Maclean,
Lovell,	Osler,
Allen,	Monk,
Gladu,	Ames,
Beauparlant,	Bristol,
Ecrément,	Forget,
Turriff,	Chisholm (Huron),
Law,	Lewis,
Martin (St. Mary's),	Russell,

Amendment negatived.

Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agreed to on the same division reversed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILRID LAURIER. We will take up the Bill to prevent the introduction of insects, pests and diseases destructive to vegitation; also the Bill to amend the Seed Control Act, both in charge of Mr. Fisher. After that, we will go into Supply, taking up the estimates of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.09 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 28, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Mr. FOSTER.

PRODUCTION OP PAPERS—THE SPEAKER'S RULING.

Mr. SPEAKER. I promised the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) yesterday, that I would look into the question raised by him in reference to an answer to a question, on the order paper, of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The answer referred to stated that a certain company declined to tender for certain work and that the said company gave as a reason for declining that they found certain difficulties attending upon the work. The hon. member for York asked the hon. minister to lay the papers referred to on the table. As a matter of fact, the answer of the hon. minister did not refer to any papers, and the hon. minister himself stated to the House that he was not sure there was any correspondence on the subject. The hon. member for York asked if he was not entitled to demand that the correspondence, if any, be laid upon the table without an order of the House.

The rule of parliament in respect to the production of papers is that no documents can be laid before the House unless in pursuance of some parliamentary authority. The proper parliamentary authority is, of course, an order of the House, which must be moved for under the rules of the House as to notice. There is, however, a rule of debate, which the hon. member for York probably had in his mind, to the effect that when a minister of the Crown quotes a public document in the House and founds upon it an argument or assertion, the document quoted from should be produced. This rule does not apply to the case in question, as I do not find that the hon. minister quoted from any public document; in fact, he stated that he was not sure there was any correspondence on the subject. I am of opinion, therefore, that the hon. member for York is not entitled to the production of any correspondence or papers, if any, without following the rule of the House as to papers, on motion after notice.

CURRENCY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER—for Hon. W. S. Fielding—moved that the House go into committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for a revision and amendment of the Currency Act, chapter 25, of the Revised Statutes.

Further resolved, that the standard for gold coins of the currency of Canada be such that of one thousand parts by weight, nine hundred shall be of fine gold and one hundred of alloy; and the standard for silver coin shall be such that of one thousand parts by weight nine hundred and twenty-five shall be of fine silver and seventy-five of alloy; that the

standard weight for gold coin of the denomination of ten dollars in the currency of Canada be two hundred and fifty-eight grains, and the standard weight for a silver coin of the denomination of fifty cents be one hundred and eighty grains, and for other gold coins and silver coins proportionate weights respectively; that the Minister of Finance be authorized to issue out of the consolidated revenue fund such sums as may be necessary for the purchase of bullion in order to provide supplies of coins for the public service; and that the cost, charges and expenses incident to carrying out the provisions of any Act founded upon these resolutions be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the House go into committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Militia Pension Act, chapter 42 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as follows:—

By inserting the following section immediately after section 6 thereof:—

6A. Time served in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police may also be included in the term of service of an officer for the purposes of this Act.

2. In such case the yearly deduction of five per cent upon average pay under this Act from any pension shall be reduced by the average yearly deduction from the officer's salary or pay as a police officer made under and for the purposes of Part II. of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, or made under and for the purposes of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or under Part I. of the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act.

6B. The following times may also be included in the term of service of an officer for the purposes of this Act:

(a) Time served with the military forces in South Africa in any one or more of the years 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1902, and the time during which the officer was invalided but remained on full pay on account of wounds, injuries or disease suffered or contracted on such service;

(b) Time served by an officer of the Canadian militia with the South African Constabulary;

(c) Time served with the third (special service) battalion of the Royal Canadian regiment of infantry at Halifax;

(d) Time served with the Yukon field force in any one or more of the years 1898, 1899 and 1900; and

(2) Time served in the employment of the government of Canada in connection with the militia stores prior to the organization of the Ordnance Stores Corps.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the House do on Tuesday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Royal Military College Act, chapter 43 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by repealing section 7 and substituting therefor the following:—

7. The salaries, pay and allowances of the commandant and of the superior and subordinate staffs of the college shall be as fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

SALE OF BABY FARM.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved that the House do on Tuesday next go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council: (a) to sell and dispose of the Baby Farm, situate in the township of York, in the county of York, and province of Ontario, the acquisition of which was ratified by chapter 51 of the statutes of 1908. The purchase money received from the construction of barracks and buildings thereon for the housing of the militia and other military purposes in or in the vicinity of, the city of Toronto. (b)) to sell and dispose of that parcel of land in the municipality of Assiniboia, in the province of Manitoba, and now used and known as the Winnipeg Rifle Range. The purchase moneys received from the purchaser of the said range to be appropriated and used for the purchase of land for a rifle range in, or in the vicinity of, the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the attention of the Minister of Railways to a return ordered on December 1, as to passes on the Intercolonial railway. That motion includes another for the production of the papers in reference to the purchase of ties on the Windsor branch. If the former papers could be brought down the later papers might remain for the present. I wish to ask the Prime Minister about a return passed on November 24, for papers with reference to the secretariat of the imperial conference. I would like to have them as soon as possible. I would like also to have the return to an order passed on December 1 for a return of the United States war vessels, or what we call war vessels, on the Great Lakes. A return was brought down last year answering a series of questions as to the Transcontinental Railway Commission's appointments. That return did not give the post office address or the location from which the appointees were appointed, and without that it does not answer my purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. A similar return was asked this year and we are trying to complete what was brought down last year, making an addition to it. If I remember correctly, the commissioners said last year that it was impossible to give those particulars.

Mr. FOSTER. I think they can give them if they wish.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to draw the attention of the government to an article which appears in the New York 'Herald' of yesterday. The title of which is 'Dominion government refuses to accept German concession for the removal of the surtax.' I wish to ask the government whether it is true that they have received a communication from the German government in regard to the removal of the surtax and whether they have decided to take any action in the matter. The article goes on to say that Italy and Belgium, both of whom will be hurt by the Franco-Canadian treaty which goes into effect January 1, are pressing the government for as favourable concessions as France secures and are prepared to retaliate if they are not accorded. I would ask the government whether Italy and Belgium have also pressed on the government the necessity for better trade relations and whether they have been refused in the same manner as, according to this article, Germany has been. This is an important article, we have the privilege of having a member in the press gallery who represents this paper and whose presence, I am sure, we all appreciate and if the Prime Minister will be good enough to answer those two questions I would appreciate it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been no official negotiation of that character going on. There may have been some informal negotiations.

MR. ALLARD AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. CROTHERS. I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a question of mine which he answered yesterday. I asked whether Mr. Allard had been connected with the government contracts directly or indirectly on January 22. The Prime Minister gave an answer in the present tense, that the government is not aware that Mr. Allard is interested in any contract directly or indirectly. Of course he might have been interested last Saturday and not yesterday. I would like my right hon. friend to answer the question as it is worded, if he is prepared to do so. I would like to have the answer a little more definite if possible. Was he interested on January 22 and has the Prime Minister sufficient information to enable him to say unequivocally that he had not on that day any such interest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information whatever. It is quite possible, I do not know, that Mr. Allard or any body else may have had contracts with different branches of the government, but it would take some time for the government to find out. If my hon. friend (Mr. Crothers) will tell me he has reason to believe that Mr. Allard has a contract with a particular department I would have investigations made immediately, so as to satisfy what I suppose is a very legitimate curiosity.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have some information, but it is not sufficiently definite in my mind for me to state it as a fact to the right hon. gentleman. If I get in a position to do so, I will give my right hon. friend the information and we will get the answer unequivocally.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When my hon. friend has it sufficiently definite in his own mind, if he will let me know I will try and give a definite answer.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have asked several times for the instructions to Chief Justice Howell with reference to the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve. A return was brought down yesterday and I presume the Minister of the Interior thought that included the instructions to Mr. Judge Howell. It does not and I would like to know if the minister has those instructions.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman asked for the instructions to Mr. Howell some time ago, and why they were not included in a return asked for from the Interior Department. The instructions were not issued from the Interior Department, but from the Governor in Council. However, the instructions were placed on the table by myself yesterday, and I stated to the House that they were the instructions and were in response to the hon. gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. BRADBURY. Am I to understand that these are the only instructions which Chief Justice Howell received?

Mr. OLIVER. The instructions laid upon the table yesterday are the only instructions that the chief justice received.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the minister to the fact that about two weeks ago an order of the House was

issued for a return showing some accounts of George Tracy in relation to St. Peter's Indian reserve. That has not been brought down. I understand that it is a small return and will take only about a day to copy.

Mr. OLIVER. That will be laid upon the table on Monday.

INTERCOLONIAL AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' BENEFIT FUND.

On the order:

Third reading of Bill (No. 19) to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways employees' provident fund Act.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM. Since the introduction of this Bill I had a conference with the men interested, who are still in the employ of the railway, and who, as representatives of the association, meet to discuss its affairs periodically. They had several amendments to suggest; and, after discussing all these propositions for some days, it was decided that those propositions, together with the provisions of this Bill, should be referred to competent authorities to see what would be the result to the fund before further action should be taken. I agreed to that. Under these circumstances, I move that the order for the third reading of this Bill be discharged, and the Bill withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it proposed to withdraw the Bill altogether, and, when the decision of the competent authority to which it has been referred is received, to introduce it again? Generally speaking, how will the matter stand after the withdrawal?

Mr. GRAHAM. If I get the information and it will warrant me in introducing the Bill suggested, it might be possible to do it this session. The difficulty arises from the many intricacies that were developed as we discussed the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is quite uncertain at present what will be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Motion agreed to and Bill withdrawn.

SEED CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FISHER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 55) to amend the Seed Control Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has there been an explanation of this Bill?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I explained the Bill on its introduction. But, should an explanation be desired now, I may say that, in the course of the operation of the Seed Control Act, some slight difficulties—very few, I am happy to say—have arisen, and this Bill is intended to obviate those difficulties. In addition, the Bill adopts a new principle in seed control. Hitherto we have dealt only with the purity of seeds; now we propose to deal with the vitality of seeds. The clauses relating to purity have helped to protect the farmers against the purchase of weed seeds or of seeds of a different variety from that which they desire to purchase. Now it is proposed to protect the farmers from having seed palmed off on them the percentage of whose vitality is not up to a fair standard. This has not been embodied in the Act heretofore, but we have found in some instances that the loss of the farmers in consequence of this inferior quality of the seed has been very considerable, and we wish to take the necessary means to protect them. The first clause of the Bill simply authorizes the making of regulations for this purpose, and the last clause provides that labels on packages of seeds must state the percentage capable of germination. The third section brings under the operation of the Act alfalfa, now a very important farm crop, to be dealt with as grass and clover seeds have been dealt with heretofore. The Bill also adds wild radish to the list of prohibited seeds and introduces some explanatory names of seeds mentioned in the seventh section of the Act.

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

On section 1,

1. Subsection 1 of section 2 of the Seed Control Act, chapter 128, of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by adding the following paragraph immediately after paragraph (a) thereof:—

(aa) regulations determining the percentage standards of vitality for good seed of the various kinds of cereals, grasses, clovers, forage plants, field root and garden vegetable crops; and,

Mr. FISHER. I have just explained that section 2 of the Act as it stands authorizes the making of regulations determining the maximum proportion of the seed of weeds named in the Act that may be tolerated in other seeds, and also such regulations as are necessary to secure the due enforcement of the Act. Under this proposed section, we shall also make regulations to provide standards of vitality.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister be good enough to give us some idea of what success is being met with in carrying out the Act.

Mr. FISHER. I am not sure that that is a subject I should take up on this section, but, as I wish to give all the information possible, I will say in general terms that it has been very successful in improving the

quality of seeds supplied to our farmers. In the first place, it has attracted the attention of farmers to the quality of the seed, and, in the second place, has required seed merchants and sellers throughout the country to live up to the law. And, with their desire to do so—which I may say is general—they have the knowledge that if they do not do so they are called to account. This is not always by prosecution necessarily, although a number of prosecutions have been entered. We try wherever possible, where apparently the dereliction of duty has not been intentional, to admonish rather than punish. But where the lack of proper supervision is apparently due, either to gross carelessness or deliberate intention, we do not hesitate to put the Act into force. I am glad to say that even in respect of those who have violated the Act, the course we have adopted, and the existence of the Act itself, have tended greatly to raise the quality of the seeds supplied to our farmers. I am also glad to say that the farmers who buy seeds, knowing of the existence of this Act and of the machinery which is provided to enable them to get good seeds, are firstly, paying more attention to the quality and character of their seeds, and secondly, are taking the trouble to send samples to the laboratory here, where they are tested, and where information is given to the farmers of the character of the seeds which they are purchasing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The reason I ask the question is that I understand there are quite a number of farmers who take advantage of the privilege of sending their seeds here to be tested, but nothing like the extent that the minister would perhaps lead us to believe. Do the farmers generally know that this Act is in existence, and do they take the trouble to purchase pure seeds from the local dealer, or are they allowed, as the old Act, if I remember rightly, gave them the privilege, to dispose of their seed to the retail man, and the retail man, instead of buying from the wholesaler, is buying from the farmers? Then, would the minister be good enough to tell us about how many inspectors he has looking after the Seeds Mark Act, and about how many prosecutions there are per annum?

Mr. FISHER. There are seven inspectors whose special business it is, in that period of the year when seeds are bought and sold, to look after this business, and they take samples amongst those who are selling seeds. The Act empowers them to go in and buy a sample and make a test of it for themselves, without the intervention of the purchaser or the farmer. At the same time, the farmer can also send samples to be tested. The seed men themselves frequently send samples; nearly half the seeds that are tested here come from the seed sellers. They desire that the seeds they are selling should be up to the standard of the Act, showing, as I have already said, their desire to do what is right. The machinery of the department in the seed laboratory is a great assistance to them; without it, each of them would have to have a testing machinery of his own, which would be almost impossible for them to get. We have a staff of experts here who have been trained in that work for a long time, and who are able to do it. Some of the large seed houses do this for themselves, but the smaller ones and the retailers do not. In this way we are fully aware of the improvement that has been made, and that improvement is far greater than the number of prosecutions undertaken, whether successful or not, would indicate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been conversing with some of the western men, and I find, as the minister may be well aware, that hundreds and thousands of acres of grain are burned every year, for instance, in the province of Manitoba, by the weed inspector. Of course the land has a good deal to do with that, the land has been permeated to a certain extent with these seeds. Does the minister mean to say that farmers in general throughout the northwest, as well as eastern provinces, are conversant to any extent with the clauses in the Seeds Marks Act? I cannot help but think that they are not in touch with the operation of the Act to a large extent, or they are paying very little attention to it.

Mr. FISHER. The power to burn up foul seeds in the field is taken under a provincial law and not under this Act. I regret that the fields of the west, as well as the fields of the eastern part of Canada, are very foul. It is very regrettable, and one of the chief objects of the Seeds Commissioners branch is to try and assist the farmers to improve that condition of things. But it is a slow process, it can only be carried out with the co-operation of the owners of the land themselves. All we can do in that regard is to urge upon them the necessity of improvement, and to suggest methods by which they can effect an improvement, and save the vast loss which is entailed upon them year by year by neglecting to clean their land. As to the knowledge of the farmers of this Act, I think it is pretty widespread. My hon. friend will remember that two years ago, about the time this Act was passed, we sent through the northwest a special train carrying samples of seeds and grains, and a staff of expert officers. They held about 200 meetings in the three prairie provinces, mostly in Manitoba and Sask-

atchewan. They were very largely advertised, and commented upon, and discussed, even by those who were not able to attend the meetings. It was a very graphic and effective way of calling the attention of the public to this evil, and to methods of remedy. Since that time we have had, with the co-operation of the seed growers, local associations, or branches established, and a very large number of meetings have been held, dealing almost entirely with the question of the purity of the seeds. In addition to that, the various institute meetings in the several provinces, this question has been frequently discussed, and the farmers have taken a great interest in it. I may say that the grain farmers, especially of the west, have been thoroughly aroused to the necessity of action. I grant that a great many of the farmers of Canada, perhaps the larger number, do not carry out the advice that is given to them. It is perhaps too much to expect at present, although we think that they will do more. Farmers are like the rest of us, they probably do not do quite as well as they know how. There are hundreds and thousands of farmers in Canada who have been made acquainted with the information supplied by the department on this subject, they are advised to do certain things to clean their land, and yet many of them, for lack of time or energy, fail to act upon our advice. We can only hope that as time goes on our farmers will more generally take advantage of the machinery provided in the Act, and I think we are gradually overcoming the apathy which has existed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help feeling that altogether a more aggressive policy ought to be adopted in the eastern provinces in carrying out the policy of the government in this regard. When you take into consideration there are 23,000,000 acres under crop, if you could increase the production by a bushel or two per acre per annum, see the millions of dollars it would bring back to the farmers. If merely a few copies of this Act, or the instructions go out to a small number of farmers it is not likely that the aggressive policy is being pursued that should be carried on. I think it would be well if the minister could devise some means whereby he could undertake a more aggressive policy upon this subject.

Mr. HERRON. When this movement began the government sent a car through our part of the country to show the advantages of the use of pure seed. But, unfortunately, that policy of the government, has not as far as I know been continued, and nothing further has been done in that direction. I do not think there is one man in a thousand among merchants or farmers, or the men who handle seed grain, in our part of the country, who knows anything about the Pure Seed Act. It is a very important question. Our western country is subject to foul seeds of every kind. They grow very luxuriantly and very rapidly. They seem to take the place of almost any useful crop. That is one of the evils that we will have to contend with in that country, and I think the government should continue the propaganda and the policy of distributing more information in that direction.

Mr. FISHER. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that we are doing nothing in the neighbourhood in which he lives?

Mr. HERRON. I do not believe that one man in a thousand knows anything in particular about your pure seed Bill. I do not think that very much has been done in the last two or three years in the direction of educating the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. Well, we have regularly, for several years, conducted field crop competitions in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, and there were thirteen seed fairs held last year in Alberta for the special purpose of explaining to the farmers the advantages of good seed and of getting them to buy good seed. I think I am within the mark when I say that from 40,000 to 50,000 copies of our special seed bulletins and the Seed Act have been distributed each year by my department. I think that my hon. friend a little underrates the intelligence and knowledge of his own people. He will find that a good many of his farmers know about this, about these seed fairs, about the field crop competitions and about the work of the seed growers associations which are working locally, as our department is working for the whole country. We are aiding and co-operating with these associations, stimulating and helping them on. I sympathize with the feelings of the hon. gentleman when he says that enough is not being done, but at the same time, I have learned by long experience that you have to exercise some patience before seeing plainly the results of work of this kind which is done in agriculture. You do not get the results all at once. The spread of information, the improvement of methods, and all that is very slow and it is especially a case where, in our western country, a great many of the men who own and work the land were not brought up as farmers. It is a great deal harder to teach these people than it is to teach young men who have grown up with and been accustomed to agricultural work from their childhood,

and especially people who have come from abroad and who are not familiar with our conditions. I am just as eager as any one to do all that can be done profitably and advantageously, and I must confess to my hon. friend that nearly every year I am asking for a little more money to expend in this way. But I would like to have a thorough scheme of organization and of work to ensure that the money spent will give a good return. I do not want to ask parliament for money to spend uselessly for the purpose of making a show of spending money and of being able to say that so much money has been spent. I have never done that in connection with any of the work of my department, and I do not like to do it now. If any suggestion is made, and occasionally I get valuable suggestions from members of the House, farmers, and leading men of the country, I am only too happy to take it up and see whether it will work into practical organization or operation for the benefit of the farmers. I think we have done that about as much as we could. We are doing a a great deal of work at the present time in connection with the improvement of seed. My seed commissioner gives his whole time to it and we have the further satisfaction of knowing that other countries, notably the United States, are looking to us and to this very Seed Control Act for models upon which to base their legislation and work.

Mr. HERRON. The minister stated that several seed fairs have been held.

Mr. FISHER. Thirteen in the province of Alberta.

Mr. HERRON. Were they in my constituency?

Mr. FISHER. No; I said thirteen in the province of Alberta, but I also said that there were field crop competitions held in the hon. gentleman's own county. That is another thing.

Mr. HERRON. Where would they be in my own constituency?

Mr. FISHER. The Fishburn Agricultural Society has been co-operating with the department and carrying on that work.

Mr. HERRON. I am very glad to hear it, but I would like to say a further word in reference to this seed train that passed through our country a few years ago exhibiting pure seed. I think that it gave a splendid education to the farmers and did a great deal of good to the country. I am sorry that something of the kind could not be undertaken again. I believe that is one of the best ways of educating the farmers that I have ever seen, and from that day to the present I have not seen anything that has impressed me as being of such value in that direction. It may have been costly, but I think it was of great value to the country.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with my hon. friend that such a work as that seed train did is very effective. In waking up the people to a certain line of work we find, first, that we have to do something that is very striking, something that will attract public attention, something that will awaken and arouse them, and then we have to take it up more in detail by instructive and helpful co-operation with the people individually. The results of that are not as conspicuous and a great deal of the work is being done silently without its attracting the interest or observation of the people at large. But it is just as necessary to go through that second stage or phase of the work as it is to do the more conspicuous or the more brilliant work at the commencement. I can assure my hon. friend that while we have not been doing anything quite so brilliant as that train, we have been doing just as effective work in the present stage of the education of the people. I am not afraid of the expense, and if it is necessary to arouse the people again to do something of that kind, I would not hesitate because it costs money, and I am sure, judging from experience, that parliament will be good enough to grant me the necessary funds. I am glad the suggestion has been made as to whether we should not repeat the experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman have any co-operation between the government and the provincial authorities or between the government and the railway companies, or did he simply engage in this enterprise alone? In the United States the railways would seem to be very generous in the contribution of car facilities, and of course it is to their advantage because every good bushel of grain, instead of a bad bushel, brings them more trade. It is just as much the duty of the up to date provincial agricultural authorities as it is ours that such work should be done, and co-operation would make the work more effective and more economical.

Mr. FISHER. The provincial authorities were invited to co-operate, and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan did. The railways supplied the rolling stock and hauled the train free.

Mr. CROTHERS. I sympathize with all reasonable efforts to prevent the spreading of foul seeds, but I think this Act provides for a penalty on the man who sells foul seed whether he has knowledge that the seed is foul or not. That may prove to be rather harsh. For instance, a farmer might not know there was foul seed in the clover

seed he sells and it would be going very far to impose a penalty on him.

Mr. FISHER. If I require to show every time a prosecution is entered that the person selling impure seed knew he was doing so, I would practically have to give up all attempt to enforce the Act. If persons offer for sale seed as pure, it should be pure, and we must trust to them taking the necessary precautions.

Mr. CROTHERS. I do not think a penalty should be imposed unless the man had knowledge he was selling impure seed.

Mr. FISHER. I take direct issue with my hon. friend there.

Mr. CROTHERS. Surely guilty knowledge must be the essence of an offence of that sort.

Mr. FISHER. If a man engaged in business sells me seed as pure, it is his business to know. In subsection 2 of section 9 if the man can prove he bought the seed in good faith from a wholesale merchant, the onus is thrown on the wholesale merchant.

Mr. CROTHERS. But suppose the man grew the seed?

Mr. FISHER. Then he would have to take the consequences.

Mr. CROTHERS. I think that would be harsh treatment.

Mr. SEXSMITH. There has been a good deal done by the provincial and Dominion governments to prevent the distribution of wild seeds through the sale of seed grain and grass and clover seeds, but there is another mode of distributing these wild seeds to which I would direct attention. The milling companies grind their screenings, but they do not grind them fine enough in some cases, and the most dangerous weeds in the section of the country I live in, as well as in other parts of Ontario, have been introduced through the importation of ground feed. We have no knowledge in the world when we buy that feed that we are going to pollute our farms, but nevertheless that has been the result. While the distribution of wild seeds is met in the Bill in some aspects, something should be done to take precautions in the direction I have mentioned.

Mr. FISHER. That is a pretty difficult problem to deal with. The provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba have provincial statutes which cover that point, and which if they are enforced would seem to be calculated to meet the difficulty pretty successfully. I do not think the province of Ontario has any such law, or, if so, it is entirely obsolete. The situation is a little different in the different provinces, and their laws have practically to be different. I am advised that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for us to draw a general law applicable to the whole Dominion which would cover the ground as well as the provincial laws. In each of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta there is a provincial law on the subject. This question has been considered pretty carefully by us, but there is nothing in this Act which deals with that.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am well aware that noxious seeds exported from the west have been distributed through the province of Ontario, especially in the vicinity where I live. I am glad to learn that the western provinces have laws to prevent this; but during the last five years I myself have received the seeds of foul plants that have never existed in our part of the country before, through the buying of western feed, many of the farmers in Ontario have come to the conclusion that it would be better to buy no western feed at all than to take the chances of polluting their farms with these noxious plants.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize with my hon. friend on that point. I believe the tailings of screenings that come from the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur are the principal media for the distribution of these foul weeds. These tailings or screenings are bought by the millers of Ontario, mixed with other grains, ground, and sold as feed, but they are not ground sufficiently fine to destroy all the weed seeds. It is a problem worthy of consideration whether something ought not to be done to restrain the distribution of these screenings. It is a matter which is under my consideration and which will have to be discussed in dealing with the terminal elevator question.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I do not see that there could be any objection to amending the Act to prevent the milling companies disposing of these screenings unless they are ground so fine that the seeds will not germinate, and to prevent them mixing them with other grains and selling the mixture as pure feed.

Mr. FISHER. The farmers frequently prefer feed that is not ground too fine; and to grind these western tailings so fine as to kill some of the smallest seeds would be a pretty difficult process. I have had some investigation made into that question, but perhaps not sufficient to make me very positive.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Perhaps it would be wise for the minister to make further investigation, and to compel the people grinding these screenings to sell them separately and not to mix them with other grains.

Mr. SPROULE. My experience is that the farmers are discarding the mills run with wind-power or horse-power because they do not grind fine enough, and are sending their grain to the large mills to get it ground finer. They believe that the finer the grain is ground, up to a certain standard, the better feed it is. My information in regard to this Seed Act is that while it provides for a certain standard of purity, and while the seedsmen generally comply with it and label their seeds No. 1, the complaint is that you find, some months or a year after you have bought the seed, that you have introduced a lot of noxious weeds into your farm. For instance, you cannot buy turnip seed without getting with it a great deal of wild mustard, and the same thing is true of much of the clover seed that is sold. It is difficult to say what remedy could be applied to prevent this, but I know that there are a large number of complaints of that character.

Mr. FISHER. If the farmers would purchase their seeds a little early and send a sample to be tested at the laboratory here they would get a reply in two or three weeks or perhaps less, and would know whether the seeds were what they had bought or not. It is hardly possible to tell the difference between mustard and turnip seed by the eye, but by testing them here they can easily be distinguished.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is the seed is usually brought in just before seeding time.

Mr. FISHER. The farmer has the other remedy of buying only seed marked No. 1, which, from our experience with a large number of samples, almost invariably fulfils the condition of No. 1.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you to do when you find they are not No. 1?

Mr. FISHER. We have found very few samples of No. 1 that did not fulfil the conditions. I think the trouble is the farmers will not insist on buying No. 1.

Mr. SPROULE. From my experience and knowledge I am satisfied that in many cases they do not fulfil the conditions. On my own farm I have sowed seeds marked No. 1 that contained a great number of weeds.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry my hon. friend did not report that to the department. We have occasionally had reports sent, and we have traced them up. Even after the seeds are sown the purchaser is liable to a penalty.

Mr. SPROULE. You have difficulty in the enforcement of the Act when you have to go into court.

Mr. FISHER. Keep a sample of the seed and send it to be tested.

Mr. SPROULE. Most farmers do not do that. When they sow No. 1 they do not retain a sample. I think that the common law should give damages in such a case, but owing to the difficulty of proving that the weeds came from the seed no farmer would go to the trouble of undertaking a prosecution. The Act is not as valuable in its working out to the farmers as they anticipated, because of these difficulties.

Mr. FISHER. If a farmer will not take the trouble to protect himself, we cannot protect him. The farmer can test the seed before he sows it.

Mr. SPROULE. He cannot get it from the seedsman until a day or two before he wishes to use it.

Mr. FISHER. As a rule he can get it earlier.

Mr. SPROULE. My office is right at a seed store, and I have seen the seed brought in hundreds of times after seeding was partly or principally over, even telegraph orders being sent to supply the demand.

Mr. FISHER. Having failed to protect himself in that way, the farmer has the further protection of reserving a small package of seed, sufficient to make a test. When he has this proof, not only can he prosecute, but if he will let us know we will prosecute for him. We have had very few failures of prosecutions under this Act, and in many instances, without absolutely prosecuting, we have been able to change the whole current of the seed business in a locality by pointing out the truth in regard to the quality of these seeds. It is a physical inability, though, to protect people who will not protect themselves.

Mr. STAPLES. How many inspectors are there under this Act and what salaries do they receive?

Mr. FISHER. I think seven altogether, and they are moving around the country. Some of them work in particular regions most of the time, and are backwards and forwards, but most of them are not located in any particular place.

Mr. STAPLES. How many of them are in the west?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Murray, of the Experimental Farm, Brandon; Mr. Eddy, Mr. Reid and Mr. Mackillican.

Mr. STAPLES. Are they on the road all the time?

Mr. FISHER. Just during the busy season. Mr. Murray gets his salary as manager of the Experimental Farm, and does

not get additional pay for seed inspection work. They are in a certain division of the Civil Service, subdivision 'A' of the second division. I could not give, offhand, the exact salary of each, but the salaries of that subdivision run from $1,600 to $2,100.

Mr. STAPLES. How many prosecutions have there been during last year throughout the Dominion?

Mr. FISHER. Thirty-seven.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I appreciate the efforts of the minister (Mr. Fisher) to deal with this very important question. But there is a difficulty still existing that, it seems to me, is hard to get over. A farmer goes into a seed store and the merchant shows him perhaps half a dozen samples of seeds at different prices. And I have known instances where farmers are inclined to buy—like many other people—a cheap article. Taking that seed home and sowing it, of course, may be said to be the farmer's own business. But the difficulty is that he is sowing weed seeds, and his neighbour, no matter how cautious he may be with regard to the seed that goes into his own land, has to share in the difficulty that follows. The foul seed is apt to spread all over the locality. I do not think that any dealer should be allowed to put on the market a low grade of seed, even at a low price; such seed should not be put on the market at all. There should be a standard, and no seed should be allowed to be sold below that standard.

Mr. FISHER. We have a standard below which no seed may be sold with a mark to indicate that it is No. 1. We have no definition of lower standards.

Mr. STAPLES. How do you make the grade?

Mr. FISHER. No. 1 seed is described in the Act, and nothing below the standard there fixed can be sold as No. 1.

Mr. STAPLES. How do you make the test?

Mr. FISHER. It has to be made in the laboratory. Of course, you cannot make it in a store. But if a man sells as No. 1 seed which is below the standard here fixed, he is liable to a prosecution for a misdemeanour under the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that standard test made by actual count?—not more than so many weed seeds to be found in one hundred. With reference to the viability, that would be matter of growth, of course.

Mr. FISHER. Section 7 fixes the standard, and provides that the seed must be free from the seeds of the weed named in the preceding section.

Mr. SPROULE. And that, as I understand, is determined by actual count. But I understood the minister to say that it was determined in the chemical laboratory.

Mr. FISHER. In the seed laboratory. We have nothing to do with the chemical laboratory.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister does not seem to be in good temper.

Mr. FISHER. I was explaining an answer to a question, and the very fact that the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) speaks of a 'chemical laboratory' shows that he misunderstood and I wish to set him right.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) asked the question how it was determined, and when the minister said it was in a laboratory, he asked how it was done. I said I understood that it was by actual count of the seed.

Mr. FISHER. I did not understand the question to be put in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. I drew attention to the fact that the Act provided a standard, as I understood, of the number of noxious weed seeds permitted, this to be determined by actual count. As to the viability, of course, a certain percentage must germinate, and that must be tested in the laboratory. Thus, there must be two methods of reaching a standard of the seed that must be sold as No. 1. I thought the hon. member (Mr. Staples) was not getting the information he asked for.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. member wishes to answer the question instead of me, I suppose that is all right. The clause defines the character of the seed to be sold as No. 1. Whether the seed sold is of this character can only be determined in a seed laboratory. The large firms dealing in seeds have their own laboratories, and can determine whether the seeds they are selling are up to the mark or not. The consumer or small dealer who has bought from the wholesaler can, if he wishes, send samples to the seed laboratory of the department and these will be tested and a report furnished as rapidly as possible. Now, with regard to the point raised by the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith), in section 6 of the Act there is a list of what we call noxious weeds. We are adding one to the list by the present Bill. No seeds can be sold in Canada which contain seeds of any of these noxious weeds, unless the package is marked with the full name and address of the seller, and the common name of this kind or kinds of noxious weed seeds contained. Thus, if the farmer buys No. 1 seed, he knows it cannot contain any of these noxious weeds, or the merchant who

sells it is liable to prosecution and punishment. If the merchant chooses to sell seed which contains these noxious weed seeds, he must give his name and the name of the weed seed contained in the package. I do not think that any farmer with common sense would buy that kind of seed. We, therefore, have provided practically against the selling of seeds in Canada with any of these noxious weeds intermixed. From time to time we add to the list of prohibited noxious weed seeds, as we are doing to-day. These seeds are the particularly noxious ones. Of course, there are other injurious seeds, but not so bad as those included in the list. Then, section 7 of the Bill defines what No. 1 seed is to be. We are not attempting—I hope we shall come to that by and by—to define No. 2 and No. 3 seed, or, perhaps 'rejected,' and let the farmers know what they are buying. However, we have not yet determined a safe definition of second or third class seed that we would like to put before the purchasing public. At present we think it safer —in fact the only safe way—for the farmer to buy No. 1 seed. I suppose the difference varies in different parts of the country. I am told that, the difference in price of a bushel of clover seed between No. 1 and other seed that does not come up to that standard, is not more than $1. We do not guarantee that these seeds shall not be found in seed that is sold as No. 1. But I can say that, roughly speaking, we make a test of something over 1,000 samples a year of the seeds which are marked No. 1, and not one half of one per cent has failed to come up to the standard. We get samples everywhere during the summer season, it is the duty of our inspectors to go about and buy samples and send them in to be tested, and especially do we aim at testing these No. 1 seeds, because they are the seeds that we want the farmers to buy. I think I am correct in saying that the No. 1 seed as marketed by the people of this country according to the laboratory test, is up to the standard.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I would like to inquire whether it is the intention of this Bill to increase the standard so as to provide for a less percentage of weeds than formerly existed. I have had some complaint from farmers in my riding that the standard is not sufficiently high to warrant them in getting pure seed. I recollect that when the Bill was brought in, there was a good deal of opposition to it, even by farmers, who complained that it was impossible to get a less percentage of weeds than the Bill provided for, and some considered it as a great hardship to the seed merchants to have so low a percentage, they said it was impossible, with the machinery available, for seedsmen to produce seed of the proper standard. I have had complaints from different sources that the standard is not sufficient to ensure the farmers getting good seed. Is it possible to get a less percentage of weed seed?

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will look at the Act, not the Bill, section 2 says:

> The Governor in Council may make regulations to determine the maximum proportion of seeds of the weeds named in this Act that may be tolerated in any other seeds without affecting their character as being free from the seeds of the said weeds within the meaning of this Act.

That is the toleration clause. It is a little difficult to ensure absolute purity. In grains like oats and wheat we permit one in a pound. That means, roughly speaking, that there may be possibly one to the 1,500. The limit of toleration in grass seed and clover; is one in 1,500 by count. So if there is more than that, if there is one in 1,200 or 1,400, that seed would be regarded as impure, according to the Act. If there was only 1 in 1,600 or 1,700, that seed would be allowed to pass. I think the test is already pretty severe. Toleration is allowed chiefly for the purpose of permitting the accidental presence of these noxious weed seeds.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Even that proportion would be dangerous in the dissemination of bad weeds.

Mr. FISHER. We could require one in 2,000 instead of 1,500. Our object is to make the law just as strict as the trade can possibly bear.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I agree that the standard now is fairly high in regard to No. 1 seed. But there is No. 2 and No. 3. Does the minister think it would be impracticable to place a standard below which no seed should be sold? I think there should be some standard.

Mr. FISHER. I would refer my hon. friend to section 8 of the Act:

> No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, for the purpose of seeding in Canada, any seeds of timothy, alsike or red clover or any mixture containing the said seeds, if the seeds of the weeds named in this Act are present in greater proportion than 5 to 1,000 of the seed sold.

That is a statute, we cannot change it by regulation. The seeds named in this section are those I refer to in clauses 6 and 7, the noxious weeds. I do not think the trade could supply the farmers of Canada to-day if that clause was made more severe. We must improve the quality of seeds produced, so that the seedsmen may be able to buy seeds of that kind and quality.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I am pleased to learn that there is no practical standard below No. 1. But, would the minister not think it wise to go a little farther and prohibit any of those dangerous seeds, such as are named in No. 1 quality from being included in No. 2, and thus create a better standard?

Mr. FISHER. We have no standard in No. 2 at all. We have fixed the standard at No. 1, and we have practically told the farmers that they ought to buy No. 1. As far as the Act is concerned there is no No. 2 or No. 3. No. 1 is called the government standard.

Mr. SPROULE. But you provide them with authority to sell another class of seed.

Mr. FISHER. I am just informed that some of the seedsmen are selling a certain lower grade as government standard. If they are I will have to look after them and try and prevent it. I do not know just what the trick is or how I will prevent it, but I do not wish to have the standard below No. 1 ticketed with the name of the government. I shall have to look after these people, and if it is necessary I would like to amend the Act for the purpose of preventing them from doing that.

Mr. WRIGHT. When this seed Bill was before the House two or three years ago, I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that the largest seed firms in Canada did not number their seeds at all. I have been in this business, not of late, but for many years, I have sold thousands of dollars worth of grass and clover seed; I have bought an equal amount from the big wholesale houses, but I have never bought a bushel of seed that was numbered. It was designated by a certain name. Grass and clover seed bore the names of certain animals, etc. These made it perfectly clear what the grade was, but it was never sold as No. 1. I do not know if there has been any change or not. If there has not been any change these men may continue to sell their seed under the names under which they sold it in the past and it would not be brought under the scope of the original Bill or the Bill before the House. I would like to know just how the minister deals with cases of that kind.

Mr. FISHER. Since this Act came into force there has been much more temptation on the part of dealers to mark their seeds as No. 1. If my hon. friend will look at clause 7 of the Act he will see that that designation is not required, but that the clause includes No. 1 or any other designation which represents seed of first quality. For instance, if a man were to call seed 'prime' or 'extra' we would apply section 7 to it as well and haul him up if the seed did not come up to the standard. Before this Act came into force and there was no standard at all for seeds, seedsmen offered their seeds under any name they chose, and there was nothing illegal about it. But since the Act has come into force, there is this standard, and we deal with the seed according to the names they apply. If they affix a name which may be included in that class, we deal with it accordingly.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is there any clause in the Bill that compels a wholesale seedsman to designate his seed, 1, 2 or 3?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. WRIGHT. He can call it 'wolf', 'fox', 'lynx', or any other name he likes, sell the seed under such name and not come under this section of the Act?

Mr. FISHER. He will come under the Act if he sells seed under a name that would come under the designation of clause 7.

Mr. WRIGHT. Suppose he calls it 'wolf' or 'fox' or 'lynx'?

Mr. FISHER. No, but successful farmers would not buy it under that name.

Mr. WRIGHT. Well. they do buy it. I have bought and sold hundreds of thousands of bushels under names of that kind.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The farmers buy No. 1 as they are reasonably protected, and I think they get a fair quality of seed, or as good as they could reasonably expect. But, without a No. 2 or a No. 3 grade, if we so designate it by numbers, we could not supply the trade. A great many farmers are compelled to buy No. 2 or No. 3 because we cannot supply the trade with No. 1. I think it would not be going too far to ask the minister to have these very dangerous seeds extended to the other grades as well and prohibit the sale of them altogether. What are the names of the seeds which are prohibited in No. 1?

Mr. FISHER. They are named in clause 6. They are prohibited in all seeds, and in clause 7 are those prohibited ones which are prohibited in No. 1. In regard to a second grade, when we were discussing the arrangement of this Bill, we examined into that, but we did not wish to encourage the sale of any seeds except No. 1. We did not wish therefore to fix a standard which would be pretty dangerous and very low. If we were making a standard of No. 2 slightly below No. 1, the relief that farmers and seedsmen must have would be very slight. If we made the difference very considerable, there would be a great temptation for many people to say: Well, No. 2 cannot be very bad, because there are a lot of numbers below No. 1, and I will buy it because it is cheaper. My hon. friend may

contend that the trade could not supply the whole demand for No. 1. If that is largely true, it may be found to be a good sound argument in favour of creating a No. 2 grade, and I will look into that with the greatest care. If I find the facts such as will justify it and my officers can make a satisfactory description of a second grade, I would be rather disposed to introduce it into this Bill.

Mr. BEST. I think that the farmers should sow the best class of seed they can get, but the great difficulty we find is that when we buy No. 1 seed and it turns out to be of an inferior quality we cannot get back at the man who sells it. Last spring a dealer in our town sold what was supposed to be first-class seed to a farmer, but which proved to be not nearly up to the standard. The dealer was fined $2. He had bought it from a wholesale dealer in Toronto, but nothing further came of the matter and it was dropped. We find that this is the greatest trouble we have. Farmers are trying to use the very best seeds they can get, but we are often deceived in the seed we buy, and it is not worth while to go after the seller for all the fine that is imposed.

Mr. FISHER. Did the farmer buy it for No. 1?

Mr. BEST. Yes, he bought it for No. 1 seed.

Mr. FISHER. And the man was liable to a fine?

Mr. BEST. He was fined $2.

Mr. FISHER. That brings up the question whether the fines are sufficiently severe. We publish the names of those who are fined, and that has a more deterrent effect than the actual amount of the penalty.

Mr. FOSTER. That would have more effect on the wholesalers than on the small retailers.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. If the fines are not sufficient to deter, I have no hesitation in saying we will have to increase them.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I believe that the more dangerous seeds should be prohibited altogether. The sow-thistle is one of the most obnoxious weeds we have, and I regret to say that it is spreading through the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a very common thing to sell two or three grades of seed, and while the good farmer will take nothing but the best grade, others are not so careful. Now, clause 6 provides that the package must have the full name and address of the seller with the name and kind of seeds and the common names of the weed contained in the seeds. I do not think that law is complied with, because if it were nobody would buy the weeds if he knew they were in the seed.

Mr. FISHER. The very fact that the name of these weeds is on the package is an open warning to the farmers not to buy, and they don't buy.

Mr. SPROULE. But I do not think it is put on the package.

Mr. FISHER. Then it is sold in contravention of the law. If a man has a quantity of seeds which contain these weeds, he can sell them legally by putting the names of the weeds on the package, but if he does, of course nobody will buy them.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a common practice to offer for sale different grades of seed, and people buy them.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I repeat that the sale of wild mustard and sow-thistle seed by the dealer or the farmer or any one else should be absolutely prohibited.

Mr. FISHER. Wild mustard is prohibited in clause 6 of the Bill.

Mr. SEXSMITH. That is a good thing.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that every year you get wild mustard in your sugar beet and turnip seed?

Mr. FISHER. Because, unfortunately, the Act is violated.

Mr. SEXSMITH. If a farmer goes to a store and wants half a bushel of seed, and it is taken out of a bin and put in a bag, there is nothing to indicate that it contains weeds.

Mr. FISHER. The seller would have to put the name of the weed on the package in which he sells, as on the bin.

Mr. STAPLES. Now that the different sections of the Bill have been carried, I want to have a little talk with the Minister of Agriculture about the destruction of noxious weeds throughout this Dominion. This Bill prohibits the sale of seeds that contain noxious seeds, which is in the right direction; but, unfortunately, with all the care that may be taken under this Bill, they will still be sold. The country, generally speaking, is becoming very much polluted with noxious weeds, and there is no question which is giving the farmers of this country more anxiety at the present time. The government of Manitoba has been exercising the greatest care on this subject; it has placed on the statute-book the most drastic law it could think out; but I believe that the Dominion government, which has a greater revenue at its command, a revenue gathered especially from the agriculturists of this country, could well afford to spend some of that

money in enforcing a law that would start at the very root of this unfortunate condition of affairs. It takes an enormous amount of money to enforce a law of this kind. Those who have their farms polluted with these noxious weeds suffer great loss, perhaps through their own fault, or through not knowing at first how injurious certain seeds would be. For instance, in the section of the country which I have the honour to represent, and in which the sow thistle prevails, the farmers did not realize for a number of years that it was as injurious as it has turned out to be. If the Minister of Agriculture is alive to the interests of the farmers, he should follow up this legislation with a law for the eradication of noxious weeds throughout this country. To my mind, this is one of the biggest questions the farmers of the west have to deal with. I do not know whether the minister has such intentions or not. If he has not, I would like to do my utmost to start him thinking along that line. The government of Manitoba has expended enormous sums of money in the attempt to destroy noxious weeds in that province; but a little province like that, without a stick of timber or a foot of land to derive a revenue from, cannot do much compared with this government, and I think it should use some of the money which it collects from the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta as well as those of the other provinces, and give it back to them in the way of administering a law that would eradicate these weeds from the farms of the country.

Mr FISHER The subject which my hon. friend has brought up is one of the vastest importance and has a very wide bearing. The destruction of weeds on the land has been dealt with by the various provincial legislatures, including that of his own province of Manitoba.

Mr. STAPLES. I know that; I have the law before me; but it takes an enormous amount of money to enforce that law.

Mr. FISHER. But it is not enforced, unfortunately.

Mr. STAPLES. I will venture to say that there is not another government in this Dominion making the efforts the government of Manitoba is to enforce the law.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear it, but that is only a reflection on the other governments. This is a matter almost entirely of municipal control. I doubt very much if we could enforce a law in regard to it.

Mr. STAPLES. That is the unfortunate part of it. When a municipality appoints an officer to deal with the law, and that officer goes on to his neighbour's farm and orders him to cut down a field of grain and destroy it, that is where the trouble begins. If we had a general law, enforced by the officers of this government, it would have a better effect, and would not probably cause ill feeling among neighbours.

Mr. FISHER. It does not require a Dominion law for that. The government of Manitoba could amend that feature of its law and provide efficient inspectors as well as the Dominion government could. As a matter of fact, that question has been dealt with by municipal regulation, which is a purely provincial matter, and which the Dominion government cannot interefere with. I am very dubious whether we could frame an Act which would enable us to enter upon a man's land and deal with noxious weeds on that land; and we certainly could not frame an Act which would cover the public highways, as the provincial and municipal authorities could. Any Act we framed would be very much restricted, even if it were not declared ultra vires of this parliament. I am not going to give a legal opinion on that point, but I can well understand the practical difficulties the Dominion government would have in enforcing such a law; and when we find that most of the provinces of the Dominion have such laws, which, according to my hon. friend, are not enforced, and which apparently are not enforced because they are not right——

Mr. STAPLES. It takes too much money to enforce them. Why should not this government lend some aid in that respect?

Mr. FISHER. I am perfectly willing to lend any aid within my power; but in this case, as in many others, where the provincial authorities are derelict in their duty, people appeal to us to do what the provincial authorities should do. The proper course is to keep their own provincial authorities up to the mark. My hon. friend had better deal with the authorities of the province he comes from.

Mr. THORNTON. I would like to ask what means are taken under this law to ascertain what seeds will germinate?

Mr. FISHER. We have a germinating test. The seeds are put into a germinating plant or machine which shows at once or very shortly what seeds will germinate.

Mr. THORNTON. How are the dealers or farmers to know what seeds will germinate?

Mr. FISHER. They can make the test themselves if they choose, or they can send samples here and have them tested.

Mr. BEST. I appreciate very much what the department has been doing in the last

three years. We must admit that the farmers are improving greatly and still we can acknowledge that weeds are increasing. That is natural and I am afraid it will continue. We have new seeds and probably worse seeds coming all the time and I think the government should try to help the farmers to eradicate the weeds and keep them out. My hon. friend here seems to think the law should be very stringent. I claim it should not and I ask my hon. friend from Manitoba how it worked in the west when the law said that you could go out and mow down a farmer's field of grain if it contained many weeds. That is beneficial to the farmer with the clean farm, but we must also look after the poor man. They had to amend the law which allowed the elevator men to retain the screenings.

Mr. STAPLES. Where was the law amended?

Mr. BEST. The principal of the agricultural college in Manitoba was sent out by the premier to ascertain if the farmers were content to take chances and get the screenings. He found that the great majority of the farmers were and they got the screenings back, I think it was an injustice to the farmers to have to leave their screenings at the elevators or mills for no doubt the elevator men kept a great amount of the screenings. While we are helping ourselves in some ways we may be injuring the country in others. I believe the government are doing all they can at the present time and I think they should try and increase the help they give to the farmers as the country increases. Let us give credit where credit is due. Ten or twenty or thirty years ago, we had not the seed tests we have to-day and I admit we did not need such tests, but, we have as much need now for the improved tests as for any other aid to agriculture. I, as a farmer, would ask the government to try to do everything possible to eradicate the weeds and keep the farms clear of them. They should encourage the farmers to sow nothing but No. 1, or the best seed. The farmers in too many cases do not properly clean the seeds which they raise, many seeds are resowed from improper cleaning. If the farmers are educated to sow the best and none but the best we will improve very much.

Mr. FISHER. I assure my hon. friend I appreciate his views. We are watching very closely any opportunity to increase the stringency of these laws without unduly or unnecessarily interfering with the private business of the people. Before this Act was passed, there was nothing to prevent the refuse seeds of other countries being dumped on Canada and sold here. Since this Act has been in force the provisions of the Act apply to seeds imported into Canada and any one selling seeds not coming up to the requirements of this Act, is mulcted and punished. The result is that the quality of the seeds imported into Canada from other countries has vastly improved, and we are, I think, safe in that way from the introduction of seeds from abroad which sometimes were brought into the country. It is well known that some of the worst and most noxious weeds we have in Canada were imported from abroad in seeds. That kind of thing can hardly occur under the operations of this Act and we are watching all the time where we can improve our legislation and its administration so as to take advantage of every opportunity of increasing the safeguards.

Mr. KIDD. Is it not a fact that in many cases retail merchants would keep a good tested sample in the store, but would sell another grade to the farmer?

Mr. FISHER. The inspectors inspect the seeds being sold, and any farmer can at once send a sample of the seed he has bought to the department and get it tested, without cost.

Mr. KIDD. As a rule the farmers do not take much pains in getting the seed tested. I do not see anything in the Act that will protect the farmers or prevent the merchants from selling that inferior seed.

Mr. FISHER. If the merchant sells seed that does not come up to the quality established by the Act he is liable to a penalty.

Mr. KIDD. For some time I have been watching the seed sold in our section and I do not think there is any improvement. I do not know where the leak is, but the Act does not seem to have the effect people anticipated.

Mr. FISHER. Our inspectors have taken samples of all kinds of seeds in every part of the country, and the result of testing those samples has been to show very marked improvements in the quality of the seeds offered; but of course if farmers will not take the trouble to give us an opportunity to protect them, we cannot protect them against their will.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. I think there is a very important omission in the Act. Farmers are not botanists. Very often, even with the aid of books sent out from the department, they can scarcely recognize and name the weeds which they see growing. I would like to know how many retail merchants or farmers are able to take a handful of grain and name the seeds mixed with it. I suggested on a former occasion that any person who retailed seed under this Act should be compelled to have in his place of business, one of those

cards of small bottles containing the different weed seeds, so that when a farmer buys seed he can compare it with the sample and know what he is really buying. This question of weeds in the west is very important. I think the yield has been reduced nearly one quarter in some cases, owing to noxious weeds. That matter should be looked into very carefully and every attempt made to check the increase of weeds.

Mr. FISHER. The samples of seeds of the different weeds are available not only for seed merchants, but for anybody else. I understand that. But I do not know that we could very well say that everybody who sells seeds should be compelled to have such a cabinet. We supply them at a mere nominal figure. But a man may sell seeds this year and not next year. The farmer has a protection that is far better; he need not trust to his eyesight or his knowledge of seeds; he can send a sample to the seed laboratory here, and it will be tested and a report sent to him immediately, so that he will know absolutely, by the official record, the character of the seed he is buying.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. It may be that a farmer has to go twenty miles to town to buy seed, and buys it, perhaps, to sow next day. How can he wait to send a sample to the department? I think that it would be a very small license fee—if you put it that way—to ask of a man who is selling seeds under such peculiar circumstances, and where there is a very great list, to have one of these cabinets in his place of business. It might keep out those who would go into the business in an irregular way. It would be a great educational influence, so that it would not be long until every farmer would be able to recognize these seeds by sight.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many farmers have sent samples of seed to the laboratory for test within the past year?

Mr. FISHER. Last year, there were about 13,000 samples tested. Of these, probably 5,000 came from seed merchants or sellers, and the other 8,000 from farmers.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. FISHER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has been waiting for an opportunity to say a few words on a subject of importance. He is not in his place at the moment, but will be here at once and ready to go on.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not wish to interfere with any arrangement that has been made, but I would like, at this time, to call the attention of the government to order 35 in Public Bills and Orders. This is the partially-discussed motion on technical education. As hon. members will recall, the debate was adjourned at the instance of the government, for the purpose as I understood at the time of gaining further information as to the constitutional right of this parliament to deal with the question and, I believe, of consulting the various provinces. I would like to inquire of the government, and particularly of the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), whether any conclusion has been reached in the matter, and, if so, whether it will be necessary or possible to have a day fixed for a further discussion of the question.

Mr. KING. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) is right in saying that the debate was adjourned with a view to giving the government an opportunity to look further into the question and, in particular, to communicate with the several provinces to see how any action on the part of the Dominion on the subject of technical education would be viewed by them. I have here a copy of the communication which was sent by the government to the premiers of the several provinces, and of the replies which have been received. Perhaps I could not answer the question asked by the hon. member in a more satisfactory way than by reading these communications. I may say, first of all, that the government is of opinion that it is very much in the national interest that a commission on technical education should be appointed. In the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Wellington, it is declared to be advisable 'that a commission of inquiry be forthwith appointed to investigate the needs of Canada in respect to technical education, and to report on ways and means by which these needs may be best met.' If the government has any exception to take to that resolution, it would be that the resolution does not go far enough considering the importance of the subject. Any commission appointed should in the view of the government have an opportunity of visiting other countries especially Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States and of ascertaining the systems and methods of technical instruction obtaining in those countries with a view of giving to Canada the benefit of the experience of these other nations. The government having come to this decision, the following communication was sent by myself to the premiers of the several provinces, with a view to ascertaining whether action of that

nature on the part of the government would be favourably viewed by them, and in particular—since the question is one that has been raised at different times in this House—whether any exception would be taken on the ground of jurisdiction to the action of the Dominion government in appointing a commission for the purpose.

Ottawa, Dec. 13, 1909.

Dear Sir,—The Dominion government is considering the advisability of appointing a royal commission to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education, and into the system and methods of technical instruction obtaining in other countries——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I interrupt for a moment? Are we to have a discussion of the whole subject?

Mr. SPEAKER. No discussion of the subject can take place now, because the matter is covered by an item on the order paper. I understood the hon. member for South Wellington merely asked the privilege of putting a question to the government as to whether progress had been made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. No debate can take place.

Mr. KING. It is not my intention to discuss the matter; but I thought the question put by the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) could be best answered by giving the House the communication sent by the government to the several provinces in regard to this matter and the replies which have been received from the premiers of the several provinces. I think the House will consider the subject of sufficient interest to have the answer given as fully as that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is quite proper. But it seems to me that all this ought to take place on the discussion of the motion itself; and the government can facilitate that at any time by forwarding the order on which the discussion should properly take place and the announcement properly be made.

Mr. KING. I am not anxious to press the answer, but I should think that the subject having occupied the attention it has in the press, the public would be interested in getting, at as early a day as possible, as full information as can be given of what the government has been doing. I am prepared to give the answer at present if that is the wish of the House. If not, I shall be glad——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am anxious to get any possible information in regard to the matter. But that information might very naturally provoke discussion, possibly even criticism. Then we shall be in this situation—either there is to be no discussion of it and no criticism, or we shall engage at the present time in a discussion which, seems to me, would be very much out of order.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I asked the question, because the question was asked me by members of the Manufacturers' Association who met here yesterday; and I have had other communications from persons desiring to know whether the motion is ever to go on again, whether the government has ever decided. My question is: Has the government come to a conclusion on the question of jurisdiction, which they intimated was the cause of adjourning the motion?—and I understand my hon. friend is answering the question.

Mr. SPROULE. The answers are all ready before the government.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I never knew of them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman going on and giving the information to the House, provided he will undertake that the motion shall be forwarded so that there will be an opportunity, at an early day, of discussing the information which he now affords to the House. But I do decidedly object to his communicating to the House matters which might legitimately be the subject of discussion, without any understanding that we shall have an opportunity of discussing them. It is obviously not the time now to discuss them, it would be against the rules of the House. The course which is proposed would have a very unfortunate result. The communication would be made to the House, and no opportunity would be afforded to discuss it. If the government will say that an early day will be appointed for a further discussion of this motion, I have not the slightest objection to my hon. friend going on and making his communication to the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I think I have as good a right as my hon. friend in this matter. I desire an answer to my question, and I understood that the proper time to ask it was on going into Supply. I also would like to have some day appointed for a further discussion of the matter. The motion happened to be called up on the 19th, unexpectedly. I was prepared to go ahead with it, but the Minister of Labour was out of the House that afternoon. It is unlikely it will be called up again unless a special day is fixed. But I simply ask the question whether the government has given that consideration that they promised, and what is the result. I think as a matter of right, I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has a certain right to ask a question, and I have also a certain right, I suppose, to make my views understood; and I propose, with all respect and deference to my hon. friend, to make them understood. I say I have no objection at all to the communication being made to the House, provided the government will give us an early opportunity of renewing the debate, so that this communication may properly be the subject of discussion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I want an answer to my question, without any conditions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that my hon. friend possesses any special right above the rest of us. I have raised a legitimate objection, and I propose to persevere in it.

Mr. FISHER. The government do propose to give an early opportunity, as early as we can, consistently with other pressing business before the House, of discussing this motion and carrying the discussion to a conclusion. I appreciate that the motion before the House dealing with this particular subject can only be brought up, on going into Supply, by the courtesy of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The assurance of the minister is absolutely satisfactory.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand there is to be no debate. It is under Rule 30, and I would not like this case to serve as a precedent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) will be obliged to me for obtaining this assurance for him from the government.

Mr. KING. Considering the importance of the subject, I think the government will be glad to afford an opportunity for a full discussion, as full as the importance of the subject deserves.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that, with the consent of the House, the Minister of Labour will be allowed to answer the question on the understanding that there shall be no debate.

Mr. SPROULE. The member for South Wellington asks if there will be an opportunity of discussing, and the Minister of Agriculture says there will.

Mr. KING. He gave the assurance that was asked for by the leader of the opposition, and the leader of the opposition said that if that assurance were given, he would be pleased to have the communication which I hold in my hand, read to the House, and it is now my purpose to read this communication.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the hon. member then out of order in discussing an order that is not on the paper, and is not before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. The moment objection is taken, there can be no debate. But I understand the House is willing to waive the objection, on the understanding that there should be no debate. If objection is taken, I should have to sustain it.

Mr. KING. The communications answer the question of the hon. gentleman. The letter sent by the government to the premiers of the several provinces was as follows:

Ottawa, Dec. 13, 1909.

Dear Sir,—The Dominion government is considering the advisability of appointing a Royal Commssion to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education, and into the system and methods of technical instruction obtaining in other countries, particularly in Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States. It is intended that the commission shall be solely for the purpose of gathering information——

Mr. BOYCE. What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. KING. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not hear my statement. I am reading a copy of a letter sent by myself as a member of the government to the premiers of the several provinces, informing them of the intention of the Dominion government, should they acquiesce in the same, to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into industrial training and technical education.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the minister propose to read all that correspondence to the House, in answer to the question of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)?

Mr. KING. That is what I propose.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I strongly object to that course, and I invite the application of the rule.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The consent of the House has already been given.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 30 says:

All items standing on the orders of the day (except government orders) should be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the order paper.

This question being now on the order paper, I cannot allow it unless with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I may be wrong in my understanding of the rule, but as I understand the procedure, on going into Supply I am entitled to ask a question of the government, whether it be concerning a matter which stands on the order paper or in re-

gard to any other question. I am not entitled to discuss the question standing on the order paper, but I am entitled to receive an answer to my question, and that is all I ask.

Mr. BOYCE. But the minister himself is causing discussion.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I submit that the minister is not causing a discussion. The minister is answering a question.

Mr. BOYCE. That is the injustice of the whole thing. My hon. friend asks a question, the result of which produces a speech from the minister, which immediately raises a discussion, which discussion is out of order; therefore, I take objection to the minister making a speech in answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I was asking for no speech from the minister at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Agriculture answered the question of the hon. member for Wellington.

Mr. SPEAKER. Except by unanimous consent it cannot be discussed. Bourinot says that no member can debate a motion that is on the notice paper. The question is on the notice paper and it cannot be discussed now unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Has it been objected to? I understood it was consented to.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that objection is taken by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, I desire for a few moments to call the attention of the House to a report which was laid on the table a few days ago of the fishery commission which was appointed to investigate the fisheries in Manitoba. I regret very much that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in his place. I regret to have to discuss this matter in his absence, but the question is of such importance that I feel justified in asking the House to bear with me for a few moments while I review this report. During the holidays there was an interview published in one of the Montreal papers, given, I presume, by one of the officials. If it had not been for that interview, I do not think I would have asked the House to have listened to any remarks of mine just at the present time, but, in justice to myself, however, I feel that I must ask the House to listen to what I have to say in regard to this report. An interview was published in the Montreal 'Star' of December 22, 1909, as follows:

Mr. GUTHRIE.

Ottawa, December 22.—The commission appointed some months ago to inquire into the question of Manitoba fisheries and to investigate allegations as to undue advantages being possessed by the Fish Trust, has completed an interim report. The appointment to the bench of one of the commissioners, Mr. Metcalfe, somewhat disorganized the inquiry, which is by no means completed, but it will be resumed next summer.

It is learned that the evidence so far taken, and which is embodied in the interim report is not of a character justifying some of the allegations made. The commission, however, is not in a position to make any recommendations till the inquiry is completed.

I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that every allegation, every charge that was made on the floor of this House last year by myself has been borne out by the report brought in by the commission, which I hold in my hand. More than that, the commission not only has corroborated everything I said here, but it has brought in recommendations far more drastic than anything I suggested. This is a question that has agitated the people of Manitoba during the last twelve or fourteen years. I was perhaps more conversant with this matter than many others, and I have repeatedly petitioned and had personal interviews with the Fishery Department, both with its minister and officials, but up to the time that this commission was appointed I have failed to secure any redress of or any consideration for the grievances and complaints of the fishermen and residents of Manitoba. I want to say in justice to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this is a matter in which he has taken considerable interest. I believe, Sir, that he has done what was possible to secure a fair and honest report, and I want to do justice to that hon. gentleman in this regard. The report was laid on the table by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few days ago, and I intend placing it on 'Hansard' that the people of the west may know exactly what has taken place. This report is not in printed form and cannot be circulated in any other way.

Interim Report.

To the honourable
The Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Sir,—We, the commissioners appointed by order in council to investigate the waters of Manitoba and the west, have completed our first investigation of the waters of the province of Manitoba and have the honour to present an interim report, consisting of two parts:

1st. Certain important conclusions, based on the evidence received at the series of sittings held during the past summer.

2nd. Recommendations, with a view to such changes in the regulations governing the Manitoba Fisheries as appear necessary from the facts brought before the commission in the evidence.

Conclusions of the Commission.

1. We have reached the conclusion that all the lakes of Manitoba have been over-fished, and that some of the more valuable species such as the whitefish and the yellow pickerel have decreased very seriously in size and in abundance, and that the sturgeon—the most valuable fish found in these water—is on the point of extinction and can only be preserved by stringent measures.

I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that during my remarks last session I pointed out the very facts that have been so strongly supported in this report. The Minister of Marine, through the promptings of one of the officials who sat at his side, denied that there was any fear of the depletion of the waters of Lake Winnipeg. I took the opportunity of asking the minister at that time to hold a searching investigation into these matters. The investigation was held and has justified what I said on that occasion. The report goes on to say:

2. The evidence shows that the fishery laws have not been generally observed, both in regard to quantity of net used, size of mesh, &c., although the close seasons have in our opinion been observed by the majority.

3. We have abundant evidence that the Manitoba fisheries have been unduly controlled by foreign fish operators, who have dictated the prices of fish and have secured the major portion of the profits.

That is also a matter that I have pressed upon the Fishery Department during the last ten or twelve years. I have proven beyond a doubt that the fisheries in Manitoba were controlled absolutely by the American Fish Trust, or the Booth Fish Packing Company of Chicago. But in face of the evidence that I have submitted from time to time to the Fishery Department I have failed to receive any redress for the fishermen through any regulations which would have prevented these men from ruining our great fisheries. The consequence is that to-day we find this great fishery, once the greatest whitefish fishery on this continent, in a depleted condition, depleted to the detriment of our own settlers, while American citizens have made fortunes out of these fisheries. The investigation which has been made corroborates everything that I have stated year after year and which I stated to this House last year. The report goes on to say:

The people of Manitoba have benefited little from these great lake fisheries. Moreover inferior grades of fish have been sold in the Canadian market, while the better grades, including the larger size of fish, have been exported to the United States markets.

That is another point that I have emphasized time after time. The best fish that were taken out of Lake Winnipeg and our other lakes were exported to the American markets and the Canadians had to be satisfied with the culls. We had to pay a very much increased price even for the cull fish on account of the quantity that was exported to the American market out of our own country. It goes on to say:

It cannot be denied that the main market has been hitherto in the United States and the home market has been limited. With the wonderful development of Canada and the rapid growth of new towns in the west, the demand for fish is rapidly increasing. It is imperative that every effort should be made to restore these fisheries to their former plenitude, in order to provide a great staple food for the future population of the Dominion.

What a reflection this report is upon the foresight and wisdom of the Marine and Fisheries Department. The idea that this once great fishery has been allowed to be depleted, and now the commissioners come and recommend that this country must spend tens of thousands of dollars in an effort to replenish this lake after allowing the Americans to take the fish from it and send them to the American market. The report goes on:

We are convinced that a minimum size limit for the more important food fishes is absolutely necessary. We therefore recommend that certain sizes of fish should be specified in the regulations, below which no fish can be legally captured. We also recommend that the legal mesh of various nets should be increased.

It is essential, in our opinion, that fish, whether caught in Manitoba waters or elsewhere, should not be possessed, bought, sold or handled during the close season, provided by the regulations; but dealers having legally-caught fish in storage might, in our view, be allowed to hold them in storage under authority of a written permit issued by the inspector of fisheries.

We have found that the existing regulations regarding the possession and the sale of fish in close season have been openly and universally violated.

This, Mr. Speaker, is another matter that has been called to the attention of the Fisheries Department year after year by myself and others, and we have always failed to gain support or sympathy from that department. It has seemed impossible to get the Fisheries Department to take hold of this question in a business way and to protect the fisheries in the interest of the Canadian consumer and the Canadian fisherman, while on the other hand everything possible seems to have been done in the interest of the great American trust, who, one would imagine, had control of the Fishery Department here at Ottawa.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company—Mr. R. Smith.

Bill (No. 63) respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada—Mr. Cash.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company—Mr. R. Smith.

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 89) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company—Mr. Douglas.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Act was apparently passed in 1890, and the time has been extended several times, and there does not seem to be in this Bill any section repealing the former extension sections. It might be as well, therefore, to let the Bill stand for the third reading, when it can be referred back in order that such a section may be inserted.

Bill reported.

BURRARD INLET TUNNEL AND BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. COWAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 118), to incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I shall not likely be in attendance on the Railway Committee when this Bill comes up for consideration, I would like to point out the fact that there is no provision for the plans of the proposed tunnel or bridge being submitted to the Minister of Public Works, or to the Governor in Council for approval.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Railway Act provides that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this Bill provides that the plans shall be submitted to the Board of Railway Commissioners. My own view is that as the Department of Public Works is especially charged with the duty of attending to the interests of navigation, no power should be given to erect a bridge over a navigable water unless it is provided that plans shall be submitted to and approved of by the Minister of Public Works. I think that is a proper provision and mention it now so that possibly some gentleman who is a member of the committee might bring the matter before the committee when the Bill is under consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS CANAL AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company.—Mr. Conmee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel it my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that I have received a communication from the city of Edmonton urging that this Bill should not be allowed to pass in any form, which I think would mean its present form, which would give to the company any exclusive right or any right of control over the river Saskatchwan. The Bill is very broad in its terms. It gives power not only to build a canal from Lake Superior, or from the Pigeon river to Rainy river, but it seeks to give control of the waters of the Rainy lake and the Rainy river and then to make a connection between the Lake of the Woods and the Winnipeg river, so connecting with Lake Winnipeg. Then it seems to give control, and I think it does by its terms give control over the waters of Cedar lake and Cross lake, which are parts of the Saskatchewan river, and also over the Saskatchewan river, the Assiniboine river and I think possibly Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg with power to exact tolls on goods transported over these waterways. I think my hon. friend will, on consideration, see that while it might be quite proper and perhaps desirable in the public interest that a company should be given power to build canals which should connect these waterways, it would not be proper to give to a private company any control of any kind or description over these great navigable waters in the western part of the province of Ontario and in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. I therefore feel it my duty to oppose the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the minister is entirely mistaken as to the purport of the Bill. I see nothing in the Bill that asks for any control more than the usual powers granted to canal companies and I think if there is anybody responsible for the Bill it is the minister himself. This is a Bill to create a navigable waterway from Lake Superior by way of Rainy river, Rainy lake, Lake of the Woods, to Lake Winnipeg, and into the Saskatchewan river. This Bill was introduced two years ago. At that time an appropriation was made and it was believed by those interested and the public generally that the government would build

a lock on the Rainy river, at a point known as the Long Sault Rapids. I am sure that the minister's intentions were good but the lock has not been constructed. Owing to the international complications that has not been carried out and it was suggested that the only way to get over the difficulty was to incorporate a company that would have similar powers in both Canada and the United States. That step was taken for the purpose, in part, of overcoming that particular difficulty. The Bill gives no special powers, no control over——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Look at section 8, subsection (c).

Mr. CONMEE. That is merely part of the power of the company to 'construct, excavate, erect and make all channels, locks,' and so on. What control is there in that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And it closes 'and in and along the Saskatchewan river.'

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, or along any other river. But it does not give one iota of control. Look, for instance, at section 12:

Before the company breaks ground or commences the construction of any of the canals or other works incidental or necessary to the carrying out of the company's undertaking, authorized by this Act, the plans, locations, dimensions and all necessary particulars of such canals and other works, so authorized, shall be submitted to and receive the approval of the Governor in Council.

If that is not enough control, let us name some other body or provide other control. Again, if the minister will look at section 14, he will see that it provides as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall be held to give the company a prior or exclusive right to any water privilege not developed or in course of development by the company; all water privileges upon any stream affected by this Act, and not developed or in course of development by the company, shall remain in the same position in every respect as if this Act had not been passed.

If the minister can suggest some better safeguard, or any preferable safeguard, to be embodied in the Bill, well and good. The promoters, I assume, will have no objection. As having charge of the Bill, I am only too anxious to have any one suggest improvements. I have tried in every way I can to put in such provisions as will protect the public interest, and make the measure one that I can defend in my constituency, for my constituency is the one particularly affected, though it may affect others also. But, surely it is not giving control of waters to say that the company shall have power to make a channel deep enough to navigate. Every one else is free to navigate, and the company can fix tolls only as authorized by the Governor in Council, or the Minister of Public Works. I submit that the Bill ought to have its second reading, and, if there are any dangers in it, if the minister or any one else will be kind enough to draft a clause that will put them at rest, it will be gladly adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) says he does not see anything unusual in the Bill. I guess not, for we have been in the hbait of giving him everything he asked for. But it happens that there is a change in the policy of the government in regard to waterways and water-power. The hon. member had a Bill in this House last year to give control over one of these rivers to the Ontario and Michigan Power Company, which, in the judgment of this House, could not be granted, and therefore he was obliged to relinquish it for the time being.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken. The Bill was granted.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. member did not get all the rights and powers he desired.

Mr. CONMEE. So far as the waters affected by this Bill are concerned, he did.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that, in view of the change of policy of the provinces and the Dominion in regard to water-powers and water highways to keep them as much as possible under the control of the government, and not give them over to the control of private individuals, we should be doing something not in the best interests of the Dominion, or of the provinces, if we granted the powers proposed in this Bill. I agree with the Minister of Public Works that such a Bill should not pass this House. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) says that any safeguards necessary can be added. But the object of the incorporators is to get the right to build and then they will take chances of afterwards being able to secure the privileges under the plea that the charter gives the right to build these dams and therefore they are entitled to avail themselves of the powers of their charter. A corporation is given certain corporate rights, and I think it is generally held that they must be allowed to avail themselves of the powers given in their charter and go on with the undertaking. Thus it may have the effect of forcing the hand of a province or of a municipality where otherwise they would refrain from giving the power asked for by the company. Hence, I think this Bill is wrong, radically wrong. Then, as I understand it, this is an international affair. Why should a private

corporation control an international stream or any portion of it? The two countries might do it by agreement, but to give the power to a private corporation, I think, is radically wrong. This is a portion of the country that we know very little about; we do not know what is to be taken possession of up there. We have a commission appointed to look after these things—water-powers, streams, timber and other natural resources, and we should refrain from tying their hands more than has already been done until they have developed a policy that will be suitable and that will be assented to by the provincial and federal governments.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understood the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to say that this Bill would affect the province of Alberta. I have read the Bill, and I would be glad if he would point out in what way it affects that province.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Section 8, subsection (c) gives power to improve the Saskatchewan river, and, under another section, I should think gives certain rights where the river is being improved. With the permission of the House, I would like to make a few further remarks, particularly in consequence of what my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee), who promotes this Bill, has stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would the minister be kind enough to point out first how this will affect Alberta?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would refer the hon. member to section 8:

8. The company may,—

(a) lay out, excavate, construct, erect, maintain and operate a canal and connecting channels from some point on Thunder bay, in Lake Superior, or from a point at or near the Pigeon river, by the most feasible route to Rainy lake, thence by way of Rainy river to the Lake of the Woods, thence from a point on the western boundary of the Lake of the Woods by the most feasible route to the Red river and Lake Winnipeg; or from the Lake of the Woods by way of the Winnipeg river and thence by the said Winnipeg river to Lake Winnipeg; thence by way of Cross lake, Grand rapids, Cedar lake to the Saskatchewan river, and also to Lakes Winnipegosis and Manitoba;

(b) dredge, deepen and widen the Assiniboine river——

Mr. CONMEE. That is struck out.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

—and make all other necessary improvements upon the said river to the city of Brandon;

(c) construct, excavate, erect and make all channels, locks, dams, diversions and watercourses necessary for the efficient operation of a ship canal, maintain and operate all works necessary to create and maintain a navigable waterway by the said points from Lake Superior to Lakes Winnipegosis and Manitoba, and in and along the Saskatchewan river.

That gives power to divert any part of the Saskatchewan river, to straighten it, to make works which are regarded as necessary for the improvement of the navigation of the Saskatchewan river. Now, if it were proposed to vest in a private company that control, which I think ought only to be in the Dominion government——

Mr. CONMEE. So it is. What about the approval of the plan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is another matter. If parliament were to sanction this by incorporating the company, I take it that it would be the duty of the Governor in Council, upon proper plans being presented, to approve of those plans, because it would not be proper for the Governor in Council to refuse to recognize what parliament had done. Now, my hon. friend, the promoter of the Bill, has mentioned the case of a lock at the Long Sault Rapids upon the Rainy river. I quite agree with my hon. friend that that is a work which is very desirable, and if the Bill were limited to that work, or if, when it comes before the committee, it were understood that it would be limited to that work, I would be very happy indeed to support the Bill, and I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. The year before last, and I think also in previous years, parliament passed an appropriation for the erection of a lock at the Long Sault rapids in the Rainy river. That work is very essential for the navigation of that very important inland waterway. My department had plans prepared and made application to the International Waterways Commission for approval of those plans. The commission, for some reason or other, felt they could not deal with it, and suggested that application should be made to the United States government. Application was made to the United States government for permission to this government to build the necessary lock in the Rainy river, but the United States government, or those who professed to speak for them, were of the opinion that it would not be a desirable thing to do, and it was something which they could not do, that is, to authorize a foreign government to construct a work which would be partly upon United States territory; and the permission was not granted. Those who were advising as to the work thought the better way would be to get incorporation from the Canadian parliament and also from the state of Minnesota. Now, I can say to my hon. friend that if the object of this Bill is to promote that work, to enable a company to be incorporated by the parliaments of both countries. I should be very happy to give the Bill all the assistance I can. But, I would point out to my hon. friend that this Bill is much wider in its scope, and I am sure that if it were passed and went into operation, it would greatly hamper the

work of improving these waterways, particularly the Saskatchewan river, which the government has now in contemplation. Parliament is being asked this very session for an appropriation for the purpose of improving the Saskatchewan river by building wing dams, and there is an appropriation for the building of one or more dredges. We have had a preliminary survey made of the bed of the river, and it is the intention of the government to proceed with reasonable diligence in making the necessary improvements on that most important waterway. I think it would be a great mistake to give to a private company any control whatever over the navigable waters of the Saskatchewan river, as by this Bill such control is sought to be given. Upon the assurance of my hon. friend that his sole desire is to develop or to build a lock at the Long Sault rapids in the Rainy river, I would withdraw my objection to the second reading, with the understanding that my hon. friend will consent to the curtailing of the powers sought by this Bill when it comes before the committee. I would be very sorry indeed to do anything which would prevent the building of a lock at the Long Sault rapids.

Mr. BOYCE. In reading the very modest powers asked for in section 8 of this Bill, it occurs to me to ask my hon. friend from Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) whether there is not something left out. On the other hand, I think a great deal is put in that ought not to have been put in. I think that, for several reasons beyond those stated by the Minister of Public Works, the Bill ought not to be read the second time. Last session we had a great deal of discussion over another Bill introduced by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River, a Bill involving a great deal that is involved in this Bill; that was a Bill to incorporate the Ontario and Michigan Power Company. It occurs to me, in view of what has taken place since that Bill was introduced, and the effort that is being made now by the hon. member to utilize the powers given under that Bill at the present moment, after he met with refusal at the hands of the people in endeavouring to thrust that Bill upon them, that this Bill calls for some consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would call my hon. friend to order. I do not think it is proper, upon the discussion of the merits of this Bill, to discuss some other Bill.

Mr. BOYCE. I submit I am in order. I propose to contrast this Bill with, and to link it with, a Bill that was passed this session, and to show that that which the hon. member was not able to do under the powers of the Ontario and Michigan Power Company, he proposes to ask parliament to enable him to do under this Bill to incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company. That is as far as I intend to go. Well, under the Act of the Ontario and Michigan Power Company, my hon. friend took power, under section 7 of that Act:

> To acquire, develop, improve, maintain and operate water-powers, use, supply and sell water-power for any purpose, by any means of application, generate, by means of water-power or otherwise, electricity, heat, light and any other form of energy, and transmit the same by any means to, and subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, supply and sell the same for use in any manner, at any place, in Canada and the United States, and subject to the provisions of the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act.

That is subsection (a) of section 7 of chapter 115 of last session. That company is to supply that power from the Pigeon river, in the district of Thunder Bay, amongst other streams, to supply electricity, water-power and so on, from, amongst others, the Pigeon river, which flows into Thunder Bay. Here is the same river under section 8, here are the same powers asked for in another Bill, because by section 8 of this Bill (subsection h) the promoters of this Bill ask for power to:

> Use, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of water brought by or for the said canals, channels or other works, if at any time such water may be utilized for purposes other than those of navigation, and subject to the provisions of this Act, produce, lease or supply, or otherwise dispose of hydraulic, electric and other kinds of power or energy created or made available or obtained by or from any canal, lock, channel or other work hereby authorized.

In the Ontario and Michigan Power Company Act the powers are circumscribed by two things, the Governor in Council, and, with regard to the towns of Port Arthur and Fort William, the consent, by by-law, of those towns. Now, my hon. friend, the promoter of this Bill, endeavoured to obtain the consent of the town of Port Arthur under the Ontario and Michigan Power Company's enactment, to a Bill providing for the use of their power, and I think there was a rather spirited campaign, and the result was that the town of Port Arthur did not accept the proposals which were contained in the By-law, and the By-law was defeated. Under the Act which is now proposed, and having regard to that portion I have read, and to other portions of the Bill, for instance section 13, it seems it is quite possible for my hon. friend to get into a similar position as he would have been had that By-law passed, because no consent of the municipalities, so far as I can see, is required under the present Bill. Therefore, I submit that my

hon. friend is asking altogether too much in this Bill, and that he is trespassing, with regard at any rate to these portions of water-ways lying between Thunder bay and the Lake of the Woods, upon provincial jurisdiction, that the Bill is open to objection in that respect, and that the second reading ought not to be proceeded with.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. Under rule 21 the hon. gentleman is entitled to reply as the mover of the second reading of the Bill, but I wish to ask if any other hon. member desires to speak on this motion before he closes the debate.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I observe, by the Michigan and Ontario Power Bill passed last session, that a number of restrictions were placed in the Bill that do not appear to be contained in this Bill. This Bill, in a rather silent manner, gives the same power to develop electricity which the Michigan and Ontario Power Bill did when first introduced into the House last session. For instance, while ample power is given in this Bill to generate electrical power, there is no provision for making the sale or exportation of power subject to the restrictions contained in the Act of the Michigan and Ontario Power Company. There are five or six sections omitted from this Bill which were inserted in the other Bill. Take, for instance, section 13 of the Michigan and Ontario Power Bill:

> Except as in this Act otherwise expressly provided the provisions of the Electricity Inspection Act, 1907, and of the Electricity and Fluid Exportation Act shall apply to the company and its undertaking.

One of the most strenuous objections to the Act of last session was that the Bill gave the company power to export electricity unrestrictedly against the prevailing policy of the Ontario government in reference to the generation of electrical energy. I think we should have the same clauses inserted in this Bill; otherwise the promoters will be getting exactly the same privileges as were embodied in the Bill of last session. I think that there should also be a clause inserted providing that they shall not enter a municipality without the consent of the municipality. There was such a clause in the Bill passed last session. Before that company can enter a municipality they must obtain its consent. I notice in the interpretation clause that the word 'land' is made to include 'land covered by water'; so that the word 'land' covers everything on the face of the earth. It says that this company may expropriate land covered by water. They will have absolute powers of expropriation, not only as far as land itself is concerned, but as far as land covered by water is concerned, and I would submit that it would prevent the Minister of Public Works from interfering if this company desired to place docks or dams across navigable rivers. The power is so large that they can place a dock or a dam across any navigable river if they wish to do so by virtue of the section that says that land includes land covered by water. I do not think it was intended to give any such large power as that. I have only had a few minutes in which to look at this Bill, and I think that hon. members ought to have a sufficient opportunity to look more carefully into it, and to see exactly what powers the Bill gives. It appears to me that this Bill is intended to give to these promoters what the Bill of last year did not give them.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the hon. member is not justified in making that insinuation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I have already pointed out a number of things which this Bill does give the promoters which we did not give last year and which we expressly struck out. I notice that Pigeon river was mentioned in the Bill of last year and that it is also mentioned in this Bill. Hon. gentlemen will remember the big fight that we had last year was over this power that the company asked with respect to the development of electrical energy on the Pigeon river and now this company comes back and asks for power to develop electrical energy on the very same river without the restrictive clauses that were inserted in the Bill of last year.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman is entirely without justification in making the insinuation that the Bill is intended to give any such powers as those which he describes. How does he know? Who has told him?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. You can only judge by the intention from the Bill itself.

Mr. CONMEE. If the Bill gave the powers which the hon. member imagines it does, perhaps he might think them large powers. Take, for instance, the power to expropriate land covered by water. How can a canal be built unless they can get land covered by water? Is there any other way to get a canal except to utilize land covered by water?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There is no water at all in the Newmarket canal.

Mr. CONMEE. Well, I am not joking about the matter. This is a matter of very great importance. When the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) contends that this Bill is intended to give the powers that were given last year in the other Bill he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. BOYCE. I did not say that.

Mr. CONMEE. You left that impression upon my mind.

Mr. BOYCE. What I said was that the Bill was not circumscribed by the same restrictions that we imposed by the Bill of last year, but that at the same time it gave much the same powers, or rather larger powers without the restrictions.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. One was a Bill for the development and distribution of electrical power pure and simple; this is a Bill for the building of a canal.

Mr. BOYCE. You do not ask that power in this Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all. If you look at section 13 you will see that if in the execution of a work the company create any electrical or hydraulic power in excess of what they may require for their own use, they may supply such portion of it as they can without prejudice to navigation.

Mr. BOYCE. What does subsection 8 mean?

Mr. CONMEE. Subsection 8 is a part of the Bill. It merely provides that they may do it.

Mr. BOYCE. Do what?

Mr. CONMEE. But if they do it the control lies in section 13. Section 13 goes on to say:

In the event of the company at any time creating hydraulic or electrical power,

That section brings them under the control of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and it does not provide for the sale and distribution of electrical power at all. It does not give the company power to sell or distribute it to any municipality or over a transmission line or do any of the things which my hon. friend imagines the Bill enables them to do in order to bolster up some other theory. There is no other purpose behind this Bill than the purpose of building a canal.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What do the words 'supply electrical power' mean?

Mr. CONMEE. Where does the hon. gentleman find that?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In subsection 8 of clause (a).

Mr. CONMEE. That clause provides that the company will have electric power to operate its locks.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It says it may supply electrical power.

Mr. CONMEE. Exactly. All canals when built create water-power or hydraulic pressure and the gates and locks of modern canals are operated by electricity.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There is no power on this earth that can prevent a man generating electrical power for himself, it is only when he wants to sell it to other people that he requires an enabling legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. I am glad my hon. friend holds that view, and that being so, he need not alarm himself about the wording of subsection 8.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman will not misunderstand me. I mean that the hon. gentleman may go to his backyard and generate electricity to his heart's content for his own use, but when you talk about supplying electricity it means that you are going to supply it to some one else.

Mr. CONMEE. That is quite correct. This Bill gives the company power to utilize hydraulic or electrical pressure for its own use——

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I doubt that construction.

Mr. CONMEE. Wait till I am finished. I will do my best to enlighten the hon. gentleman, and if he is not enlightened it will not be my fault. The Bill provides further that having built the locks and got the hydraulic head, if there is more water than is needed for navigation the company may utilize that for power in the immediate vicinity of the works, but not transmit it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Sell it?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, for industrial purposes if any one wants it in the immediate vicinity. Would the hon. gentleman think it a proper thing to tie the investors up and to say that if they have more power than they need for their own purposes they cannot supply it to any one else? That is not utilizing our natural resources.

Mr. BOYCE. Is there anything in the Act which would prevent the selling of electricity or power to Port Arthur or Fort William or any other municipality——

Mr. CONMEE. There is no power in this Act to transmit.

Mr. BOYCE. Let me finish my question. Is there anything to prevent the selling of this power in Port Arthur or Fort William without the consent of the municipality by by-law?

Mr. CONMEE. There is no provision for a transmission line and no power to distribute electricity in the Bill. The Bill would not permit the company to sell electric power to any municipality or in any municipality without the consent of the municipalipy, because the general law would cover that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Where is that restriction?

Mr. CONMEE. Section 13 confines the use of the power to the vicinity of the works. The hon. member (Mr. Boyce) says there are a great many things in this Act that ought not to be put in, I agree with him, and I believe further that there are lots of things in all legislation that are not necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to section 1, paragraph (a) which defines canals and it includes rivers and lakes.

Mr. CONMEE. I would ask the Minister of Public Works how else he could build a canal in that country without including rivers and lakes and channels. My hon. friend says that if this Bill is confined to the building of a single lock on the Rainy river at the Soo he will support it, but the hon. gentleman should know that if the company is confined to one single lock and cannot use the water stretches, and cannot through lakes and channels make connections, they could not make the enterprise pay. If their hands are to be tied, of course they will have to drop their Bill. This canal contemplates a waterway from Lake Superior to the Saskatchewan river, and the Minister of Public Works tells us that the government intend to improve the Saskatchewan. Then, the Bill has done some good in that it has drawn out that declaration from the minister, and so far as the Saskatchewan river is concerned I presume the promoters would have no objection to drop that part of the Bill. These conditions in the Bill are put in by lawyers and not by me; I did not draft the Bill. I am merely the promoter of it in the House.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman's eloquence, but I call attention to the fact that the hour for private Bills has expired.

Mr. CONMEE. I merely wanted to point out that at present more than one thousand miles of this route is navigable.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can conclude his remarks when the Bill is again called.

Mr. CONMEE. Very well.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BRADBURY. When the House rose at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the report brought down by the Fisheries Commission, signed by Prof. Prince, Mr. D. F. Reed and Mr. Hugg. I do not intend to read this report to the House to-night, because I dealt with the matter to some extent last session. However, I wish again to emphasize the recommendations and the findings of this report so that the House may be seized to some extent of the situation so far as our Manitoba fisheries are concerned. At one time Lake Winnipeg was probably the greatest whitefish lake on this continent, and when you realize that to-day it is almost depleted you will understand what has taken place during the last fifteen years, notwithstanding the innumerable protests, private and public, made to the government against the operation of the American fish trust in these waters. For the information of the House, I may say that the Booth Fish Packing Company of Chicago, the great octopus that has fastened its tentacles on every lake and on every sheet of fish-producing water in Canada, has done more to destroy these great fisheries of Manitoba than all other influences combined. And, Mr. Speaker, the Booth Company has been able to accomplish this through the agency and influence of some of our Canadian citizens. The law was such that Americans could not obtain licenses in these waters, but they used Canadians for their purpose and they formed what was then called the Dominion Fish Company, which was presided over by Capt. Wm. Robinson, of Selkirk, and in this way licenses were obtained to fish these waters in defiance of the laws of Canada. That the department was made aware time after time that the Dominion Fish Company was really the Booth Fish Packing Company of Chicago can be demonstrated from the files of the department. But the representations made to the minister time after time by representative men, and in petitions from the settlers along the lake who were being deprived of their fishing rights, were all of no avail. It seemed impossible to obtain from the department any redress for the people. After a long and tedious fight for years, the Fishery Department at last realized that there was something wrong, and instituted an inquiry, and we have here to-night the result of that inquiry before us.

One of the reasons why I am troubling the House at the present time is that this is not the first report of a royal commission that has been filed in the Fisheries Department. In 1884 or 1885, at the request of the settlers of Lake Winnipeg, assisted by myself, the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, granted a commission. We complained at that time that the Americans were controlling our waters, violating the law by setting out double the quantity of nets allowed, polluting the waters with dead fish and depleting the waters. That commission reported, but there were influences at work sufficiently strong to stay the hand

of the department, and the report has never been acted upon, although it proved every contention made at the time in three or four hundred sheets of foolscap. Up to the present time that report remains a dead letter, I presume locked up in the archives of the Fishery Department. It is for fear that a similar result may happen to the report of this commission that I have brought this matter before the House to-night, that the House may realize that the American fish trust has friends at court sufficiently strong, even in the face of a report as drastic as this one is, perhaps to influence the government against carrying into effect the recommendations of their commissioners. I trust, however, that no influences will be allowed to interfere with the minister or the government in seeing that the spirit of this report is carried into effect. I cannot say that I agree with one or two of the recommendations, which I consider to be rather drastic at the present time. The report recommends that Lake Winnipeg be closed from 1911, and yet Captain Robertson, of Winnipeg, who was president of the Dominion Fish Company, which was part of the Booth Fish Packing Company of Chicago, is to-day getting ready a fleet of 26 sailboats and two tugs to fish in that lake next summer. If some measure is not taken to make that impossible, it will mean almost the total destruction of the fisheries of Lake Winnipeg next summer. The companies realize that public opinion has been aroused on this question and is demanding that the government take action to protect this great fishery. They realize that next summer will be the last opportunity they will have, perhaps for some years to come, and if some power does not intervene, the damage that will be done will be almost irreparable. I trust therefore that the government will take steps to see that such restrictions are put on the fishing operations on Lake Winnipeg for next summer as will make it impossible for any combination virtually to destroy that great fishery. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to inflict this report upon the House, but with your permission, I will hand it to 'Hansard'—it is only two or three pages.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the custom is for an hon. member to read anything he wishes to place in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BRADBURY. If you insist on my reading it——

Mr. SPEAKER. Not for the pleasure of having it read, but the custom is that nothing is to go in 'Hansard' that is not uttered in the House. The hon. member will have to read it if he wishes it to go in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BRADBURY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is absolutely necessary that a part of this report should go on 'Hansard.' At six o'clock I was quoting from the report:

> The system of fishery inspection, supervision and licensing carried out by the department requires, we are convinced, to be radically changed if effective enforcement of the law is to be secured. The local officers we have found to be inefficient, poorly paid, without proper means of transportation and not properly instructed in their duties. They habitually fail to report breaches of the law in their own localities. Even when such officers do report to the district inspector, it frequently occurs that no instructions relating to the case are given, owing to law methods in the carrying on of the inspector's work. Serious delays occur in this connection and very frequently the evidence that the law has been broken is not available when the instructions come to hand. We found that the chief inspector at a critical season of the year was engaged upon hatchery business, and was thus compelled to neglect the proper duties of his office. If it is absolutely necessary that the officer named should be absent frequently from his office, a deputy should be in charge.
>
> The patrol of Lake Winnipeg by the inspector cannot be effective as at present carried out, his boat the 'Lady of the Lake,' being most unsuitable for such work.

During the discussion last year I drew the attention of the House to the fact that this government had purchased for the fishery inspector for patrol purposes a large steamer called the 'Lady of the Lake,' which cost the country some $8,000, and, according to returns brought down, about $7,000 a year to run it. It is the height of absurdity to have a boat of this kind on Lake Winnipeg. It is utterly useless for the purpose it was bought for, as I then pointed out, and as the commission now affirms:

> Its large size gives early warning of its approach to all persons engaged in illegal operations. A small swift tug or launch should be provided on Lake Winnipeg, and indeed on each of the more important lakes of the province.
>
> 10. We found it very difficult to get reliable statistics as to the catches of fish on the various lakes, and recommend that sworn returns should be required as to the quantities of all fish taken out of the water——

I might draw the attention of the House to the fact that this was one of my contentions last year, that as the reports were made up it was impossible for any one to arrive at a fair idea of the quantities of the different kind of fish taken out of these waters.

> —such returns to be furnished by each licensee to the inspector twice a year, on the 31st March and 30th of September, and that failure to furnish the said returns shall deprive the licensee so failing of the right to a new license until his default shall be remedied. We further recommend that the inspectors be required to analyse and summarize the said

returns, so as to indicate clearly the quantities of each kind of fish taken from each of the principal bodies of water in the province.

I shall not read any more of the report. I wished to place that part of the report on record so that the country may understand some of the features I have been discussing here. But I wish to emphasize as clearly as I can, the fact that the danger is that the department is apparently not strong enough to carry out even the recommendations of this commission. I find that in the days gone by when we have endeavoured to get grievances such as these rectified there have been influences at work which have made it almost impossible to do anything and I trust the government will take this matter up earnestly and see that the spirit of this report is carried out.

I wish to refer to the report on Lac du Bonnet. I drew attention to the fact that this is an important sturgeon breeding ground and urged the necessity of closing it against all commercial fishing. This report, like the other, verified everything I said then and contains a recommendation along the same line. It has been recommended that the export of sturgeon from Manitoba waters should be prohibited and this is a phase of the question which I wish to emphasize. If we are to protect the sturgeon of Lake Manitoba, Lake Winnipeg and Lac du Bonnet, the only way to protect it is to prohibit the export. According to this report and my recommendation the settlers around the lake should be allowed to fish for sturgeon. It is a great food fish. We have along this lake 600 or 700 settlers. In the lower part of the lake we have a French settlement at St. George and they draw their food supplies largely from this lake. If the lake is allowed to be fished for commercial purposes, one year would, I think, thoroughly deplete this lake of sturgeon. This report has verified that fact, and I wish to emphasize, as I stated before, the necessity of the government prohibiting the export of sturgeon from Manitoba. I desire to call the attention of the government to the absolute necessity of taking action this summer in protecting Lake Winnipeg and Lac du Bonnet. If this report is allowed to stand over until the fishing season starts, until the great companies have secured their licenses, there will be a repetition of what has been done in former years by the large commercial companies. Last year I think some 2,500,000 pounds of whitefish were taken out of Lake Winnipeg, I believe that if the quantity this year is limited to that amount no great harm could occur to the lake this summer, until the commission completes its work. This is an interim report, I understand the commission is ordered back to Lake Winnipeg to complete its task. If that limitation is not imposed, then, with the introduction of this great plant I spoke of, together with the plants now on the lake, this amount can be trebled and 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 pounds can be taken out. That would be a serious matter for the lake and the settlers, and I trust that action will be taken along these lines to make it impossible for these great companies to destroy our great lake fisheries.

One of the modes of operation of the American companies has been to take advantage of the American customs regulations. All fish caught in American nets have been permitted to go into the United States free of duty, while fish taken in nets owned by Canadians have been met with a duty of a quarter of a cent a pound at the boundary line. You can realize what that means, it gives the absolute control of the American market into the hands of the Booth Fish Packing Company of Chicago. The manner in which they did this was well known to the Fisheries Department, because it has been brought to their attention time after time. The Booth Company organized a Canadian branch and called it the Dominion Fish Company. They put Captain Robinson, a Canadian, at its head. This company obtained a license from the Dominion government to fish, and signed a declaration when they got their license that they were the actual owners of the plant and gear fishing in these waters according to our law. Then, when the fish reached the American markets, the Americans took the oath that these fish were caught in American nets. The consequence was that our law was violated and the American law was violated, but the Americans got their fish in free, while the Canadians were met by a duty of one-quarter of a cent per pound. That is one of the modes of operation of the American combination, and it is one upon which the government should take some action. I trust that the Fisheries Department will see to it that the spirit of this report is put into operation at the earliest possible opportunity, and that the interests of our settlers will be protected and winter fishing under wise and fair regulations provided for.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the evil antedates the action of the fishermen. The evil starts first in the Fishery Department in giving licenses to a number of individuals away in advance of settlement to control certain important and valuable fishing grounds and fishing waters for a mere trifle. We have had it brought to the attention of this House more than once. Take the case of Mr. McNee and others associated with him, and Mr. Markey, of Montreal. They have got license after license from the govern-

ment extending over a number of years and covering operations on Lake Winnipeg, Great Slave lake, Great Bear lake and Lesser Slave lake, Hudson bay and various other small lakes and rivers throughout that country for a mere trifle, and turned around and sold their leases to others who are trying to get control of them to the disadvantage of the settler when he came there and of the country as well. These parties are usually associated with Americans. And, after catching the fish in Canada, they evade the customs at the boundaries and take the fish into the United States free. A Canadian, wishing to export fish, must pay the duty, and so he is unable to compete. Two years ago—and I believe the same thing goes on to-day—the Buffalo Fish Company was carrying on operations of this kind on Georgian bay. The law of the United States, I understand, provides that fish caught by Americans are admitted to the United States free of duty. So they come here and get a license, and are able to take the oath that the fish have been caught by Americans, and so they get the advantage of the American market, while the Canadian is shut out. As might be expected, the result is that these operations are all carried on by Americans who hire Canadians to do the work for them. If you go into the Marine and Fisheries Department you will find that license after license has been issued, some as low as $8 a year, and from that up to $100 a year, through which these people control these valuable fisheries to the detriment of our own people. And the licenses are renewable.

Now, is that right or is it wrong? If the government wishes to manage the department in a wise and business-like way, would they carry out this policy? No. Who are the people who get the benefit of this system? The speculators and the operators. And so we have these licenses covering these privileges in the Peace River district, in Slave lake, in the Hudson bay, in the Nelson river and in all that northern country—all held by men who never worked as fishermen, but who are the managers of the concerns and who manage them so as to make large sums of money out of them. And all the money that is made outside of that of the exploiter, goes into the hands of the Americans. Do not the government agree with me that the principle is wrong and that, until settlement or other interests make it necessary, these fisheries should be reserved? I think it is time the government looked into these questions. I cannot imagine for a moment that they do not understand the facts. They cannot be ignorant of the way this system is carried on and of the evils that must result. But, because some of their political friends, who are always—I was going to say on the graft, but perhaps I should rather say with speculative aim in view, improper speculative aim in view—they are allowed to carry on these nefarious operations. It is time that this should be stopped, and, unless the government put a stop to it soon, they will be obliged to do generally what they are doing now in many cases, providing breeding establishments, at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars to stock the depleted waters of our country—depleted not by our own citizens, but by those living outside the country altogether. This matter has been brought to my attention over and over again by the fishermen of the Georgian bay. But it has seemed to be impossible to control the government. Sometimes, it is said, that the banks own the government If we consider the Marine and Fisheries Department, I should be inclined to say that this class of fishermen seem to control it, and citizens of this country have no power to bring about right management.

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I ask a question? To which government does he refer when speaking of fishing in the lakes of Ontario?

Mr. SPROULE. The federal government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not the hon. member aware of the fact that no person is allowed to fish in the waters of Ontario without the license of the provincial government also?

Mr. SPROULE. The Ontario government impose a license for purposes of revenue, but it is the Dominion government that regulates the size of the mesh of nets and other matters in relation to fisheries. Besides, this government has control of Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and all the country to the north, with their great and valuable lakes. And they are giving these practically interminable licenses just as in the past. From what I know, I am inclined to believe that the provincial government is desirous of conserving these valuable rights for the people of the province, but they are unable to do so because of the conflict of jurisdiction between the federal and provincial governments upon this question of fishery rights. Several times I have called the attention of the government in this matter, and have asked if they could not hurry up their arrangements so as to reach some definite conclusion, that it might be known to which authority these rights actually belong. The federal authority has control and is exercising these rights—not in Ontario, for, since the decision of the Privy Council on the subject, the government of Ontario has exercised control. But it is being carried on in other parts of the Dominion by the department here and those who have these rights from the department, enjoy the benefit of the fisheries.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot pretend to have the knowledge of the Fisheries Department to enable me to supply the information sought by my hon. friend from Manitoba (Mr. Bradbury). But his remarks will be brought to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. As to what my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has to say, he mentioned one or two of what he called glaring instances in which the rights of the people had been sacrificed and the privileges given. He spoke of a lease given to Mr. McNee, and another given to Mr. Markey. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that these leases were cancelled long ago, and the privileges taken away, because onerous conditions which had been attached to the leases, were not fulfilled by the holders. My hon. friend will find, I think, that in the Marine and Fisheries Department, in this respect as in others, a great change and reorganization has taken place, and most of what he has been talking about has not been done for several years past.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister will excuse me, I was on the Public Accounts Committee the year before last, when we discussed the matter, and it was admitted by the party who was brought before the committee, that he had the license.

Mr. FISHER. I admit that such licenses were issued at one time, but few licenses are now being issued in the way he has described. Old licenses issued years ago were perhaps described fairly by the hon. member. But the two he mentioned in particular were cancelled, because, as I have said. onerous conditions were not fulfilled—the conditions were so onerous that the parties were not able to fulfil them. That showed that the government which issued those licenses was safeguarding the public interests sufficiently to require the licensees to do certain things which they were not able to do, and consequently the licenses were cancelled. This has been the case with other licenses. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the reorganization of his department, which he has carried on in such a splendid manner, and which he is continuing to improve, so far as his health permits, has also dealt with the issuing of these fishery licenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It did not appear quite clear to me what my hon. friend is asking for. He seems to point out a grievance, but the main grievance he pointed out, if I understand him, was something over which this parliament and government have no control. He informs us that fishermen fishing in Lake Winnipeg and in some of those inland waters, are allowed to send their fish into the United States market without paying any duty, providing the fish are caught in American nets and American bottoms. Now this is not a matter which this government can control, although it may seem a hardship to Canadian fishermen.

Mr. BRADBURY. The law of this country is very distinct, that no man is permitted to fish in Canada except he is a British subject, and except he is the actual owner of his boats and gear. Now, if he is the actual owner, how can an American own the nets? As soon as the department becomes aware that these fish are going into that country free of duty, on account of the American owning the nets, then it is the duty of the department to cancel the licenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR. It may be their duty. The business, as pointed out by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury), appears to be fraudulent, because these fishermen are representing themselves to be Canadian fishermen catching fish in Canadian waters, and then in the United States, he says, they produce evidence that the fish are caught in American nets. If that is the case, of course there is fraudulent fishing carried on, and that would be good reason for cancelling the licenses. I have no doubt that if a case of that kind is brought to the attention of the minister, the license will be immediately cancelled.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have brought cases before them from time to time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. No one proposes to stop granting licenses altogether. I assume from the fact that the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) supports the Ontario government that grants the licenses, he is not opposed to granting licenses.

Mr. SPROULE. I take the ground that there is no justification, from settlement or any other cause, to grant licenses to fish, whether it be to fish on the Great Slave lake or in Lesser Slave lake, or in Hudson bay.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand my hon. friend was also criticising the method of granting licenses in the Georgian bay as well as in the great lakes to the north.

Mr. SPROULE. I said fishing had been carried on there to the detriment of the people, and I spoke of the evils that have resulted. I also spoke of the far distant country where there was no settlement, and where it would be a wrong thing to do.

Mr. SINCLAIR. If my hon. friend will examine the law and the regulations in the department, he will find that the licenses

granted in this northern country must be operated or they are subject to cancellation at any time. It is a condition on which licenses are granted, and if there are cases in which the licenses are not being operated, then they are subject to cancellation. It is easy to work up complaints in a matter of this kind, but hon. members ought to be in a position to propose a remedy. If they are serious about this matter, if they have any complaint for which they can find a remedy, then I would like to hear what the remedy is. I listened carefully to the hon. member for Selkirk, but it did not appear to me clear that he had anything to propose to the department that would remedy these complaints.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that I was simply emphasizing the report of the commission appointed by the government to investigate this matter. I approve of the commission. The commission brought in very drastic recommendations, and I was asking that the government should carry out those recommendations in the spirit of the report. I also pointed out that there was another commission appointed under the old government in 1884-5, and the report of that commission is lying in the department to-day; it was never carried out, it was burked by the influence of this American fish trust.

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

Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward Island —Belfast pier—renewals and repairs on pier head and general repairs to approach—revote of $1,800 lapsed, $2,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is to reconstruct portions of the face of the pier at Halliday's wharf, and to make some other general repairs. The total estimated cost of these repairs is $3,000. Some work was done and there was an appropriation last year of $3,000, of which amount there has been spent $1,200.

Belle River harbour — repairs to and strengthening works on either side of entrance, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked for by the resident engineer to strengthen the works on either side of the harbour entrance.

Mr. JAMESON. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in Queens county, Prince Edward Island.

Brudenell—wharf on north side of river—revote of $2,000 lapsed, $5,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a wharf at Brudenell. The total estimated cost is $5,400, of which $2,000 is a revote.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there any vote for this last year? I do not see any amount in the revote column.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason it does not appear in the revote column is that the amount was voted in a previous year; it lapsed and it was not voted last year. We put this in to show the committee that there is a revote.

Cove Head—repairs to and strengthening shear dam, $1,250.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is reported by the resident engineer to be necessary to prevent damage to the existing work.

Mr. JAMESON. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in Queens county.

China Point—pier—renewals and repairs, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make necessary repairs.

Haggerty's wharf—repairs to existing work and enlargement of pier head, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This vote is asked for by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the work is also reported as being necessary by the resident engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this item sufficient to finish this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; this will cost $4,000. We are asking for $2,500.

Harbours, rivers and bridges, generally—repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a general vote for all the different wharfs and bridges that are not specially provided for.

Lennox island and Port Hill — wharfs on Lennox Island Indian reserve and on main land opposite, near Port Hill; the Indian Department to contribute $2,500, $5,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay our portion of the construction of wharfs on the Indian reserve.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it customary for the Department of Public Works to construct wharfs and roads and make repairs on Indian reserve.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we do not build roads, but we do contribute very frequently, and I think as a general rule, towards the construction of wharfs where they are used by the public as well. Of course, if a wharf were regarded as one which would be absolutely private to the Indians, I presume that our department would not contribute, but ordinarily we do contribute towards these wharfs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My object in making the inquiry is that in my riding we have two large reserves and the people on either side of them are seriously in need of roads being opened up through them. If it were customary for the Department of Public Works to spend money on Indian reserves for roads and bridges it might be able to assist in this matter to which I have just called the attention of the minister.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The federal government does not build roads as a general thing, while it does build wharfs, as they are an aid to navigation.

Miminegash harbour—repairs, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to repair and strengthen the works on either side of the channel entrance, also to extend the brush work and repair the approach.

Mr. SPROULE. How are the expenditures on these works going to be made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By day's work.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean with reference to these votes generally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is new work, even although it may be small, as a general rule, we ask for tenders, but if it is repair work, as a general rule, we do it by the day because it is impossible to tell what will be the extent of the repairs to an old wharf. You cannot tell until you begin to tear it away to see what the under timber is like, what the extent of the repairs will be, and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to let a contract for such work.

Naufrage pond — protecting entrance to channel with bridge across piers and roadways of approach, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We require the $4,000 to complete it. There was an appropriation last year of $14,500 and it is probable that up to the 31st March next, there will be an expenditure of $11,000, leaving $3,500 which constitutes a revote; so that we are only asking $500 additional. The work is under contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

New London—repairs to breakwater, &c., $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for repairs to the protection work on either side of the harbour entrance. These works are generally damaged by the fall and winter storms and the resident engineer reports that the work is needed.

Port Selkirk pier—repairs, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the repairing and covering of the floor stringers of this pier, &c.

Red Point wharf—general repairs—revote of $1,500 lapsed, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One thousand dollars will be necessary for this work.

Mr. SPROULE. How much is in that vote? There is a revote of $1,500 and there is only $1,000 now voted, what do you mean by that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The session before last we had a vote of $1,500, none of which was used and we are now asking for $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it cannot be a revote of $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that is perhaps rather erroneous but all that means is that the total amount has lapsed. The object is to show the committee that it was once voted and not used.

Rustico breakwater—protection block at outer end, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the extension of the present block at the outer end of the breakwater on the northern side of the entrance to the harbour.

Mr. DANIEL. What are these blocks made of ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Timber, plank covering, cross-ties and ballast, bolts, close piling, &c.

Mr. DANIEL. Are the stones cemented together or will they be loose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Loose.

Mr. DANIEL. Has this breakwater been broken away by storms to any extent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think not. The extension is necessary to prevent the forming of a channel which would otherwise be formed. It is to change the direction of the current so as to preserve the navigable channel.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this finish the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it be done by tender and contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Souris—rip-rap protection on seaward side of Knight's Point breakwater and renewals and repairs—revote of $5,800 lapsed, $7,500.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this finish the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So it is estimated.

Mr. JAMESON. The hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fraser) has something to say with regard to some of these items and more particularly, I think, with the item under consideration. The hon. gentleman is unavoidably absent at the present moment, and I would ask the minister before

the items for Prince Edward Island are passed to allow one item to stand so that my hon. friend may have an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will not press to have the item stand, but I will undertake that if the hon. member for Kings desires to speak on any item for Prince Edward Island, he can do so when any item for Quebec or Ontario is called, or, upon the dredging vote, or any convenient opportunity.

Mr. SPROULE. Or the supplementaries?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. JAMESON. That understanding is perfectly satisfactory.

Summerside harbour—for completion, &c., of breakwater extending from Indian Head to outer end of Lighthouse Spit, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the work which is under contract.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the total amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $133,942.

Mr. JAMESON. How long is this breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 3,240 feet.

Mr. JAMESON. Is it merely a breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to afford protection to vessels lying at the wharf in the harbour during westerly and southerly gales.

Tignish—extension of harbour channel protection piers inwardly, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost including superintendence is $25,000, and we are asking for the full amount.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this contract work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick—Bayside wharf on Johnston Cove, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a new wharf on the St. Croix river which will accommodate quite a number of farmers.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500. It is expected this will cover the whole expenditure.

Mr. DANIEL. A portion of the cost of this wharf is not paid by the provincial government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Buctouche—channel through beach, inclusive of breastwork and breakwater repairs, $3,500.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the expenditure on this last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To the 31st September, $2,169.

Mr. CROCKET. When did the work begin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. May, 1905.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total expenditure to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure on harbour improvements at Buctouche has been $39,123, but I cannot say over what period that extends.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the object of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The object of the cut through the beach was to effect a saving of ten or twelve miles in the sailing distance of the Buctouche fishing boats on their way to the fishing grounds, and the same distance is saved in the towing of logs. It also forms an entrance into a convenient harbour of refuge.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the length of the channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The length of one of the breakwaters is 2,800 feet.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the width of the channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Its width is fifty feet. I cannot give my hon. friend its length.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this appropriation complete the channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that this will complete it. I should correct the statement which I made. The $39,123.75 which I mentioned was the total expenditure on Buctouche harbour works up to the 31st March, 1909. The total cost of this work to that date was $16,933.66.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there to be any dredging in connection with it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, 1,000 cubic yards.

Mr. DANIEL. Who does the dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is hand-dredging, done by a mud digger, operated by a steam winch.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the depth of water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Three feet at low water, and I am told about thirteen feet at high water.

Mr. CROCKET. My information is that the money that has been expended on this so-called public work is an absolute waste.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For what reason?

Mr. CROCKET. I will state it. The minister has stated that this work was begun in 1904, and that the object of it was to cut a channel so as to make a short cut for vessels going into Buctouche harbour. This expenditure has been going on year

after year since that time. There was expended in 1904 $2,438.93, in 1905 $1,895.17, in 1906 $5,960, in 1907 $1,998.92, in 1908 $3,500, in 1909, $3,773.75, a total of $19,556,-27, and the amount asked for this year is $3,500. My information is that the work of one year is washed away in the following year and has to be completely renewed, and this has been going on during the past six or seven years. When we look into the accounts for this work, we find that Mr. J. D. Irving, who was a witness in an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee the other day, has figured very largely in the money that has been appropriated for carrying on this work. I find that he has got out of it in these years $5,049, and that his brother, Mr. R. A. Irving has got out of it $1,538, or a total of $6,587, out of an expenditure of $19,556.27, a large proportion of which sum was for the rent of an engine and a scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How much for the rent of the engine and scow?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Irving, for a little bit of a scow, which he told us had cost him $150, and which he has owned for several years, has got from this government $514 as rent; he has been receiving $2 a day for it while this work has been going on during all these years. For an engine which he valued at $500 he has received $8 a day, or a total of $1,778.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not that $8 a day include the fuel and the hauling of fresh water for the engine and the wages of a man?

Mr. CROCKET. I understand that the claim is that it includes fuel and the wages of an engineer; but my information is that the man who runs the engine figures in the pay-roll. I do not say that absolutely, but that is the information I have. It seems to me that $19,556 expended in that way year after year is making a perfect farce of the expenditure of public money. If the work served any good purpose, there might not be quite so much ground of complaint; but I have it from reliable residents of that county that the work done two or three years ago was washed away and had to be done the following year and so on from year to year. It consists in getting a lot of brush and stone, for which Mr. J. D. Irving is paid $2.50 per cubic yard for large stone and $1 for small stone. Then his brother, who is a lawyer, has been supplying large quantities of stone also.

Mr. PUGSLEY. His brother does a very large general business outside of being a lawyer. He owns a mill, I think.

Mr. CROCKET. I think J. D. Irving owns the mill. It is a most extraordinary thing to find barristers of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick supplying stone for public works, particularly at such prices. I do not think my hon. friend knows many reputable members of the legal profession in the province of New Brunswick who go into that kind of business. If you go into these accounts, you find that this money is being circulated largely among the Liberal managers of Kent county. The belief down there is that these appropriations year after year are made not so much in the public interest as to circulate the money among political friends of the government. Perhaps the minister can state exactly what condition this work is in. It has been of no service up to the present time; not a single boat has used the channel since it was started seven years ago. If the minister can assure us that this $3,500 will be the end of this expenditure, perhaps we will not have very such more to say. I do protest, however, against money being expended in such a perfectly useless work as this and expended in that wasteful manner. It seems to me that a work going on regularly year after year, consisting largely of what is spoken of as dredging done with a shovel—

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not an ordinary hand shovel. It is a mud digger of the kind used on the north shore for digging mussel mud and is operated by a steam winch.

Mr. CROCKET. Who owns the mud digger?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the property of the government or is rent paid for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not used very long, and I understood there was some work done with scrapers. My information is that this work will be effective for the purpose for which it is intended. The member for the county of Kent (Mr. LeBlanc) in whose judgment I have a very great deal of confidence, has represented to me that the work is of very great importance, and that when completed it will be effective for the purpose. One difficulty has been that instead of taking the whole amount required at once, so as to complete the work in a short period it has been carried on from year to year. I shall look into the allegations of my hon. friend and see exactly the condition in which the work is, but my information has been that the work will be effective and that this $3,500 will complete it.

With regard to the moneys that have been paid to the Messrs. Irving my hon. friend should not take too seriously the suggestions or insinuations made by political opponents. There is a general disposition among many people who are opposed to the government to create an impression that moneys are being wasted by being

paid over to political friends. I suppose that will be the case with all governments, Liberal or Conservative. My information is that the Messrs. Irving are thoroughly reliable people. It is not a crime that they happen to be Liberals, they are just as good men as if they were Tories, and the mere fact that they are Liberals ought not to imply that they have been paid more for the stone, or the engine, or the scow than their services were worth. It was proved before the committee that the engine was used for only a short period each year and that the charge of $8 a day was a reasonable charge and included, in addition to the hire of the engine, the fuel, the labour and expenditure of hauling fresh water a considerable distance for use in the engine and also labour of the men, so that the charge of $8 a day was reasonable. With regard to the scow, it was proved to be a large scow, well adapted for the purpose. It was used by the government for only a short period each year and during the past season, instead of renting it to the government, Mr. Irving was asked to rent it to a private contractor and it has been used during the past year at Cape Bald in the county of Westmorland, where he receives from a private contractor more than he was getting from the government. Therefore I do not take too seriously the suggestions of my hon. friend because I realize that when he makes them he is not speaking from his own knowledge but from statements made to him by others.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not condemning Mr. Irving because he is a Liberal. I would not condemn any man because he is a Liberal or a Conservative. I am condemning the department. My opinion and the opinions of those who have stated their opinions is not based upon the party affiliation of the Irvings at all. So far as I am concerned, it is based on the bald facts that appear by the Auditor General's Report and the value that Mr. Irving himself before the committee stated as the value of the scow and of the engine. My hon. friend states it was only used for a few days of each year. In 1909 alone, he was paid for seventy-three days, or $584——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is only a little over two months.

Mr. CROCKET. —an amount considerably in excess of the whole value of the engine. For the scow he was paid for 95 days at $2 a day, and the scow was worth $150. I do not, however, speak so much of that as of the perfect uselessness of this work. I ask the minister if he does not himself think it very strange that a small work of this character, the cutting of a short channel through a mud flat to make a short cut into Buctouche Harbour has been in progress year after year from 1904, with no more evidence of its being completed to-day than at the time the work was begun.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is aware that this is tidal water, and it is not so easy to make and complete and make perfect against storms a channel which is in tidal water, you have to protect it thoroughly with brush and stone.

Mr. CROCKET. And the reason is that the work which is done one year is as regularly washed away and must be renewed the next year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is wrong. My information is right to the contrary.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has no statement to make as to the necessity of this work. He has not shown that any boat or vessel has used this channel. It is not in a position to be used, notwithstanding the work has been going on for seven years, and all that time it has been carried on under this system of day labour and the purchase of stone from political friends in the neighbourhood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the objection to the purchase of stone?

Mr. CROCKET. It has been purchased at $2.50 a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are very large stones.

Mr. CROCKET. I know one of the contractors at Richibucto told me that some stone was bought from him at 5 cents a cubic yard. The minister should look into this matter and be able, before asking another appropriation, at least to state just what position the work is in, whether it is ever to be completed or if it is going to continue from year to year as in the past.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the Committee of Public Accounts, Mr. Irving swore positively that out of the supply of stone during the past year, after paying for quarrying and hauling the stone a considerable distance, his total profits were $36.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he quarry the stones?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and it is very desirable in work of this character, exposed to the action of the sea and storms and heavy winds, that the stone should be as large as possible. These stones for which $2.50 is charged, as my hon. friend says—I have not a memorandum of the charge before me —were very large stones, and for those of smaller size the charge was $1. There is evidence that out of the total year's supply, after paying expenses, of quarrying and

hauling the stone this considerable distance, the profits were only $36, which, I think, no one would call unreasonable.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Irving's statement applies to the first year, but I think he has gone on supplying stone since that time. Who was the conductor appointed for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a foreman, sometimes called a conductor.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister his name?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Mr. A. Cormier.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the mud-digger there worked by hand or by this engine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The mud-digger in use was worked by an engine. My information is that it was not used very much. I think the work has been done with scrapers at low tide. Still as to that I may be wrong.

Campbellton—deep water wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for completing the work.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the work under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Does this amount complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected to complete the work.

Mr. CROCKET. What wharfage will this give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is 304 feet long by 35 feet wide. This is connected with the easterly end of the present wharf by a span of 15 feet.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the extension?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What will that make the total length of the deep water wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Shives wharf would be 250 feet in length. And, as well as I can make out, this would be added, making a total of 554 feet.

Mr. CROCKET. What depth of water have they there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is eighteen or twenty feet. Some dredging has been done.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that independent of the present contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. How much has been paid up to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To 30th of September last, the amount paid was $30,745.80.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total amount of the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $35,475.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister must be mistaken as to the amount paid, for in the last Auditor General's Report it appears that over $18,000 was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is in the previous year.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. William Glover.

Mr. CROCKET. Of Campbellton?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Cape Bald—breakwater pier, $18,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a breakwater and wharf at Cape Bald in the county of Westmorland, and is to make provision for the completion of the contract.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amount of the contract is $32,890, to which there is to be added superintendence, contingencies, &c., $3,110, and also the cost of making a road $2,729.36. The total estimated cost is $38,729.36. This is being built of concrete. It is in a place where the work will be much exposed to storms and where it is very desirable to have a work of a permanent character.

Mr. DANIEL. Was this a new contract in the year ending March 31, 1909?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for in the fall of 1908 and the contract was let in the spring of 1909.

Mr. CROCKET. How many tenders were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four, and the contract was, as usual, given to the lowest.

Mr. CROCKET. To whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. E. A. Wallberg.

Mr. CROCKET. Did the minister or the department have representations as to the necessity of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. From whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Among others, from the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). I think there were also representations from the farmers and fishermen. This is an important place in the county of Westmorland, and is situated between Shediac and Cape Tormentine. It is quite distant from the railway, and the people who raise large quantities of farm produce,

have had no means of shipping, and so were at a great disadvantage. It will be a great advantage to them to be afforded the means which this wharf will give them of shipping the produce either to Cape Tormentine or to Shediac.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there no wharf there before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. None.

Mr. CROCKET. Why did the department decide to make it of concrete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. First, because it is in an exposed place. Concrete is rapidly becoming a favourite material for the construction of wharfs as well as buildings. Besides, this is in a locality where, as was represented to us, I believe, the teredo was likely to do considerable damage to a wooden wharf. Taking all these things together, we thought it would be better to build a concrete wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the department built other concrete wharfs in New Brunswick?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to New Brunswick. We have built them on the Ottawa river. There is one at Arnprior. We have just completed one also at Lakefield, a very fine wharf. It was not found to be much more expensive than timber.

Mr. CROCKET. Was this contract let in bulk sum?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was a bulk sum contract.

Mr. CROCKET. Who were the other tenderers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot give the names. Four tenders were received, ranging from $32,890 to $62,000. The lowest was accepted.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the government acquire the title to the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We acquired the title on the 6th of October, 1908, for the sum of $310. It consists of six and a half acres.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister spoke about the right of way to the wharf costing $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would be for building the approach. This $310 would include the right of way and the site for the breakwater. The roadway was done by day labour, and is completed. That expenditure was made in 1908-9.

Mr. CROCKET. Most of it in October, I suppose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it ran over eight months. We got through with it on the 30th of November.

Cape Tormentine—breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to rebuild the facing and replace the stone. It is asked for by the resident engineer. It was built many years ago, and requires annual repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. I see on V—182 that the department bought an old flat car from the Intercolonial railway for $150. What was that for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1908-9 the sum of $9,226 was expended in driving 74 creosoted piles along the pier head. Ballasting and covering the pier head was completed for about 2,200 square feet. A flat car was purchased from the Intercolonial on which to erect a derrick. This was used in handling and placing 823 cubic yards of large stone, to raise the slope alongside the face of the pier head.

Mr. DANIEL. I would call attention to the fact that the stone that was obtained for this breakwater was paid at the rate of $3.50 per cubic yard, whereas that used at Buctouche was paid for at the rate of $2.50. The money is being paid to Mr. H. C. Reid. I do not know if he is a lawyer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think Mr. Reid is proprietor of the Stone Quarries at or near Sackville.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this work being done by contract, or by day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By day labour.

Mr. CROCKET. It did not occur to the department to rent that car from the Intercolonial.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We got it at a very reasonable price.

Chance harbour—to raise inclined low tide landing pier up to high water level, $2,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The present pier is 176 feet long, 25 feet wide and 18 feet high at the outer end, but it is covered at high tide, and this is to raise it up. It means the general elevation of the whole breakwater about 8 feet.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this cover the whole expense?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will cover the whole cost.

Cummings Cove, Deer island—wharf, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards the construction of a wharf at Cummings Cove. It is for the building of a trestle approach 23 feet wide and 290 feet in length, consisting of pile work. The total estimated cost will be $19,400, outside of superintendence.

Mr. DANIEL. Was there anything spent on this last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we called for tenders but the tenders submitted were considerably higher than the engineer's estimate, we declined to award the contract and propose to call for new tenders.

Dalhousie harbour—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a breakwater at Dalhousie to protect the basin. There was a sort of breakwater there which had been built up with mill refuse and edgings, and that sort of thing, and it had been used as a roadway. The central part of that has been washed away and this has exposed the inner harbour, sometimes called the Ferry Harbour, to the storms. It will be very inconvenient, if not somewhat dangerous, for vessels unless this breakwater is built. It will be very useful, as it will give protection to the harbour.

Mr. DANIEL. This is called the Ferry wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not this breakwater. This leads from a point out to the island, and it is to be a new work.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this to replace the old breakwater the minister spoke of as being composed of mill refuse?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will replace it.

Mr. CROCKET. By whom is that property owned?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will belong to the public. The title will be in the Crown. It was under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But, of course, that will be looked into carefully to see that the title is in the Crown. The Department of Marine, I believe, own the island. They have taken it under expropriation. I think this would be the foreshore extending out from the shore of the river to the island, but, of course, we will look into that carefully before expending the money.

Mr. CROCKET. When did the Department of Marine and Fisheries acquire the island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps about a year ago.

Mr. CROCKET. And the intention of this work is to connect that island with the mainland?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it will extend from the shore to Douglas island.

Mr. CROCKET. That extends from the property of the Dalhousie Lumber Company to Moffatt's Island, which has been purchased by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I think the property of the Dalhousie Lumber Company would be rather to the westward of this breakwater. I do not think they own from the point at which this breakwater will proceed. Douglas Island was expropriated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister know how much the island cost the Marine Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not, but I understand the amount was not large.

Mr. CROCKET. The reason I ask the minister about this is that there is an impression that a large amount of the work that has been done by the Department of Public Works at Dalhousie has been for the benefit of the Dalhousie Lumber Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who entertains that impression?

Mr. CROCKET. That is the general impression prevalent at Dalhousie.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That surprises me greatly.

Mr. CROCKET. Most of the dredging which was done at Dalhousie last year was done along the wharf frontage of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. I was informed that the Minister of Public Works is a stock holder of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. Perhaps the minister will deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does the hon. gentleman think that the minister would deny it?

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister deny it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not.

Mr. CROCKET. There is no question about the fact that A. and R. Loggie have been paid thousands of dollars for dredging for the benefit of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. I was at Dalhousie last summer myself and saw the Loggie dredge at work dredging out and making more valuable the property of the Dalhousie Lumber Company, and that work is being paid for, although it is entirely for the benefit of the Dalhousie Lumber Company, out of the public treasury. It is a matter that members of this House have a right to protest against. There is no doubt that much of this same thing has been going on all over the country. Item after item, involving thousands of dollars, is being asked and appropriated by this parliament year after year for the building up of private property. That is a fact in reference to the work at Dalhousie. It is true that the minister has spoken of the basin at Dalhousie that lies beyond the lines of the company's property but the major part of the dredging which was done last year was done right at the wharf of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. Perhaps when

the dredging items come up we can get some further information in reference to this matter, and discuss it more fully. I do not think that this House should be asked year after year to appropriate large sums for the benefit of private corporations. There are hundreds of places throughout this country where public money is being spent in this way while hundreds of other communities are crying out in vain for appropriations which are urgently required in the public interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be much more convenient if the hon. gentleman would discuss the item before the committee. When the dredging vote comes up he will be able to discuss this matter.

Mr. CROCKET. I mention that in connection with the information the minister has already communicated to the committee that the appropriation which is now being asked is for the purpose of removing that old breakwater, as he terms it. In fact it is nothing more than a bridge which was for the convenience of the Moffat firm, from whom the Dalhousie Lumber Company acquired their property, and the work now proposed includes the replacement of the roadway of which he speaks. I have understood that it is a work in the interest of the Dalhousie Lumber Company, whose propery lies right at that point. That is the reason why I have said what I have in reference to the dredging, because when we have this vote in reference to the dredging and another large expenditure for this so called breakwater which is lying at the same point, it appears to add colour at least to the belief that public money is being appropriated in the interest of a lumber company of which the minister is a stockholder.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entirely in error in so far as this work is concerned. This work is to protect what is known as the Ferry harbour. There is a public wharf, the ferry runs there, there is a large traffic and this is for the erection of a public breakwater. In so far as it being a benefit to the Dalhousie Lumber Company is concerned I am not aware that it will be of special benefit to them, although, by reason of their owning one or two of the large mills at Dalhousie carrying on a very large lumber business, the largest lumber business there, and in view of the shipping constantly resorting to the port for the purpose of carrying away the lumber which they manufacture, I suppose, to a certain extent, they will derive a benefit from it. The Dalhousie Lumber Company will get the same benefit as any other firm carrying on business in the town. So far as I am aware this is not to be built on the property of the Dalhousie Lumber Company at all and the object of it is to protect and improve the basin which is a public harbour. The hon. gentleman has asked me if I am a stockholder in the Dalhousie Lumber Company. It is true that some six or seven years ago I took some stock in that company. I paid my money for the stock the same as other people did and I can assure the hon. gentleman there was no watered stock in connection with that company; every man paid his hard cash. That company is engaged in large lumbering operations upon the Restigouche river and its vicinity cutting some 25,000,000 feet per year. I happen to be one of the stockholders.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this involve the purchase of any property from the Dalhousie Lumber Company, or any rights?

Mr. PUGSLEY. None whatever so far as I am aware.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been here nineteen hours out of the twenty-four and I think it is time to adjourn.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not a bad suggestion.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Monday will be private members day?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 31, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.

CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT SOCIETIES.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to Bill (No. 26) on Public Bills and Orders respecting Co-operative Credit Societies. My right hon. friend will remember that this co-operative measure was introduced two or three times into this House, and on the last occasion, two years ago, it was referred to a select committee, which after a long investigation, made a unanimous report in its favour and the Bill was afterwards adopted unanimously by the House. It then went to the Senate and

was defeated there by one vote at the end of that session.

Bill (No. 26) is exactly to the same import. I would remind my hon. friend that the Bill which was adopted by this House was taken up by the government after the report of the select committee and was put through by the Minister of Labour. I am afraid that the Bill I refer to, which is among Public Bills and Orders, as well as one a little further down the list of a more comprehensive character having reference to co-operation, introduced by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) may not be called this session, which would be a great hardship to those interested. Could not the right hon. gentleman give us an opportunity to have these Bills put through and sent again to the Senate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we agree to this, I am afraid we shall have to agree to other motions of a similar character. At all events, I do not say nay to my hon. friend's request. We can go on with the order of the day and see this evening how far we have advanced.

THE NORTH POLE—TERRITORIAL RIGHTS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to call the attention of the right hon. the Prime Minister to the following despatch which appeared in the 'Citizen' and other newspapers on Saturday morning last:

('Citizen,' Saturday, 29th January, 1910.)

New York, Jan. 28.—The question of who has territorial possession of the North Pole has been revived again by Capt. J. Bernier of Canada, who is here to attend the annual dinner of the Arctic club of America to-morrow night. Captain Bernier, will ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, to request Britain, the United States, Russia, Sweden and Norway and Denmark, all maritime nations bordering on the Arctic sea —to designate official representatives to accompany him on his forthcoming Polar expedition which is to leave Quebec on July 15th next. The principal object of the expedition, he said, will be for a division of the Polar sea in order that Canada and the other six nations may have their fishery rights properly defined. Captain Bernier will visit both Croker Land, discovered by Peary in 1906, and Bradley Land, which Dr. Cook reported that he sighted, and, after raising the British flag, will proclaim them formally annexed to the Dominion of Canada. Great Britain, he said, formerly ceded to the Dominion all islands in the Arctic sea lying within its lateral boundaries.

I desire to ask the government whether they have received any such request from Captain Bernier; and if so, is it the intention of the government to remind Captain Bernier that Canada is not yet a nation but part of the British Dominions and intends remaining so, and the expression that Canada is another nation or that Britain is another nation separate from Canada is not applicable to actual conditions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have seen the despatch mentioned by my hon. friend. I do not know of any such intention on the part of Capt. Bernier as that attributed to him. I do not think that he has any intention of going into international complications. But, if Capt. Bernier spoke as he is reported to have spoken, all I can say is that I think he had better keep to his own deck.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to imply that there is a project on to send Capt. Bernier to the North Pole under sanction of the Dominion government. Is that so?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. Capt. Bernier will go north again this summer to patrol the waters of the north and assert Canadian jurisdiction.

Mr. FOSTER. I think somebody ought to take charge of this gentleman. He seems to be running loose.

PRIVILEGE—ACTION OF THE CROWN IN CAPITAL AND IN OTHER CASES.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. I desire to say a word, as a matter of privilege, with reference to something that fell from my lips in connection with the discussion which took place on the 17th of January, on the motion for papers relating to the capital case of Walter Blythe. In discussing the practice upon the consideration of questions of clemency in capital cases, I made the remark that, in capital cases, His Majesty's instructions to the Governor General are not to act except upon the advice of his Privy Council, but, in other cases, he does not take that advice. It has been pointed out to me that the inference which might be drawn from my language—and which, I am sorry to say, was drawn by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule)—was that, in cases other than capital cases, His Excellency acted upon his own responsibility. That, of course, is not the case. I was discussing capital cases only, and intending only to point out that, in capital cases, the responsibility for the action of His Excellency was upon the whole government; in cases other than capital cases, the responsibility is not upon the whole government, but no more is it upon His Excellency individually; in such cases, His Excellency acts upon the advice of some minister, not necessarily the Minister of Justice, but ordinarily in practice always the Minister of Justice, upon whom the responsibility rests.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad the minister (Mr. Aylesworth) makes the explanation,

because it seems to me it was different from the general impression and understanding, certainly different from the understanding I had, and I think it worth while to have a definite statement of it.

POST OFFICE AT CAMBORNE.

Mr. GOODEVE. Referring to an answer given by the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on behalf of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) with regard to the post office at Camborne, B.C., I see that a petition has been sent in to the government asking that the post office at Camborne should be removed from the hotel. The Prime Minister, speaking on behalf of the Postmaster General, said that if the post office was in the hotel, the matter would be taken into consideration. I have a diagram of the hotel, showing the post office situated in the office of the hotel, between the bar-room and the card-room, which is very strongly objected to by the citizens. I will hand this over to the Postmaster General, and I trust he will take steps to have this remedied.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take it up with the Deputy Postmaster General at once.

THE WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has anything to announce respecting the present position of the Waterways treaty, and, if not, whether he expects to be able to make an announcement at an early day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I told the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) the other day, we have some subsidiary negotiations as to the interpretation of an article of the contemplated treaty. As soon as these come to an end, we shall make an announcement to the House.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to ask the government when I may expect a return to a motion adopted on the 24th of November last in reference to printing?

Mr. MURPHY. I will have that attended to at once.

PURCHASE OF WAR VESSELS.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a request I made of him some time ago for information as to what had passed between the government and the British authorities with reference to the negotiations for the purchase of war vessels. The Prime Minister promised that the papers should be brought down. We ought to have these papers, before the debate on the Bill, which, we understand, is to be gone on with. There is also in the memorandum which has been brought down of the proceedings of the defence conference an article which implies that correspondence is taking place with reference to the flag question. The Prime Minister will know to what that refers. I think it would be well also if he should make a definite statement upon that subject. If there are papers to be laid on the table, they may be brought down or at least the Prime Minister might make a definite statement when the second reading of the Bill comes on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there are any papers, but I will inquire.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE MERCHANTS AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.

On section 10,

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the value of the property which the company may hold is very small, only $5,000, and in the province of Quebec, $10,000.

Mr. MONK. That seems to have been their idea; I have no special instructions, but they are satisfied with the figure. The amount of $10,000 is fixed as the annual value, that is, the rental; that would represent a considerable piece of property in Montreal. Deducting insurance and taxes, a property worth an annual value of $10,000 would represent at least $100,000. I suppose the annual value would be fixed upon the value as computed by the assessors. The assessors in the city of Montreal do not give a very high actual value, and a property might easily be worth over $150,000 in reality, while its annual value, as fixed by the assessors, would not amount to $10,000. It seems to be a fair amount for an insurance company that is beginning in the city of Montreal.

Bill reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 120) respecting the Royal Guardians.—Mr. Rivet.

Bill (No. 121) to incorporate the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

Bill (No. 124) respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. D. A. Gordon.

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY EXCAVATION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Upon the section of the Transcontinental railway from mile 1,534·04 to 1,558·17, from Moncton, district 'F,' let to O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall, what were the government engineer's estimated quantities of (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, and (c) common excavation, upon which the tender was accepted and contract let?

2. At the time the contract was let what was the estimated expenditure, based on contract prices, for (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, and (c) common excavation?

3. How many cubic yards each of (a) solid rock, (b) loose rock, and (c) common excavation and of what value, separately have been returned and claimed by the contractor or his sub-contractors for work alleged to be done and what is the estimated quantity and value under each of these headings of work yet to be done according to latest estimates?

4. What sums have actually been paid under each of these headings?

5. At the time this contract was let, what was the total estimated expenditure, based upon contract prices?

6. The same information is asked in respect of mileage 1,407·65 to 1,534·04, districts 'E' and 'F,' let to the same contractors?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

Section from mile 1,534.04 to 1,558.17 from Moncton, district 'F.'

1. (a) Solid rock, 493,400 cubic yards; (b) Loose rock, 71,900 cubic yards; (c) Common excavation, 374,000 cubic yards.

2. (a) Solid rock, $715,430; (b) Loose rock, $39,545; (c) Common excavation, $93,500.

3 and 4. Quantities returned to November 30, 1909. (a) Solid rock, 344,334 cubic yards; (b) Loose rock, 330,805 cubic yards; (c) Common excavation, 128,611 cubic yards.

The sums actually paid under each of these headings to November 30, 1909, are: (a) Solid rock, $499,283.86; (b) Loose rock, $181,942.75; (c) Common excavation, $32,152.75.

The estimates upon which the contract was let were approximate only. In a number of lakes, muskegs, &c., where no soundings had been taken it was found as the work progressed that the bottom of many of these was of such a nature as to require much larger quantities of filling, than was estimated in order to get a solid bottom. These fills had to be made of material nearest to the work, which was almost entirely loose and solid rock. This accounts to a great extent for the large returns of loose rock. It was more advantageous to use such material, as it stands at a steeper slope and does not require rip-rapping. The latest estimate of quantity and value under each of these headings is the estimates upon which contract was let. It is impossible to give the quantity and value under each heading yet to be done without making a new estimate which has not been done.

5. $1,158,258.25.

Section from mile 1,407.65 to 1,534.04 from Moncton, district 'F.'

6. (1) (a) Solid rock, 2,602,000 cubic yards; (b) Loose rock, 89,000 cubic yards; (c) Common excavation, 1,489,000 cubic yards.

(2) (a) Solid rock, $3,850,960; (b) Loose rock, $75,650; (c) Common excavation, $431,810.

3 and 4. Amount and value returned on progress estimates, December 31, 1909, are as follows:

(a) Loose rock, 658,182 cubic yards, $974,109.35; (b) Solid rock, 242,178 cubic yards, $205,851.30; (c) Common excavation, 228,703 cubic yards, $66,323.87.

The estimates upon which the contract was let were approximate only. In a number of lakes, muskegs, &c., where no soundings had been taken it was found as the work progressed that the bottom of many of these was of such a nature as to require much larger quantities of filling than was estimated, in order to get a solid bottom. These fills had to be made of material nearest to the work, which was almost entirely loose and solid rock. This accounts to a great extent for the large returns of loose rock. It was more advantageous to use such material, as it stands at a steeper slope and does not require rip-rapping. The latest estimate of quantity and value under each of these headings is the estimate upon which contract was let. It is impossible to give the quantity and value under each heading yet to be done without making a new estimate which has not been done.

5. $5,967,208.75.

EMPLOYEES' PASSES, INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. How many employees' passes were issued on the Intercolonial railway in each of the months of September, October and November, in each of the years 1907, 1908 and 1909?

Mr. GRAHAM:

No record has been kept of the passes issued in the year 1907, but the following are the number of employees' passes issued during the months of September, October and November, 1908 and 1909:

	September.	October.	November.
1908	1,467	1,024	812
1909	1,296	983	793

COST OF BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. What was the cost to the British and Canadian governments of the Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration?

2. How much of this cost was paid by the British government and how much was paid by the Canadian government, respectively?
3. What was the result of the arbitration?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. $212,032.83.
2. $140,665.79, and $71,367.04.
3. (a) The denial of the claim of the United States government to extra territorial jurisdiction in Behring sea beyond the ordinary three-mile limit, and the 'findings of facts' which formed the basis of a convention for the settlement of the claims in respect of Canadian sealing vessels seized and otherwise interfered with by the United States authorities.

(b) The Paris Award Regulations, controlling the seal fishery on the North American side of the North Pacific ocean as affecting Canadian and United States sealers.

POSITIONS IN CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. How many applications for positions in the proposed Canadian navy have been received?
2. How many have been received from officers or ex-officers of the Royal navy?
3. How many have been received from officers of the Royal Navy reserve?
4. How many from Canadians?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Total number of applications, 234.
2. Number from officers Royal Navy, 59; number from ex-officers, Royal Navy, 6.
3. From officers, Royal Navy Reserve, 37.
4. From Canadians, 115.

LANDS LEASED TO SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What are the terms of the lease of government lands occupied by the Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright in regard to the timber thereon?
2. Has the government at any time received from the lessee of said lands any money obtained from the sale of wood or timber cut on these lands? If so, when and how much?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. It is a condition of the lease that the timber on the property shall not be cut down except for the purpose of thinning and improving the same.
2. No.

CONTRACTS TO EASTERN DREDGING COMPANY.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. Have any contracts for dredging in New Brunswick been let by the government to the Eastern Dredging Company, Limited, during the present fiscal year? If so, for what dredging and at what places?
2. Have any payments been made through the Public Works Department to the Eastern Dredging Company, Limited? If so, what is the total amount of such payments?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. No.
2. No.

PAYMENTS TO T. C. NORRIS.

Mr. MEIGHEN:

What was the total sum paid by the government to T. C. Norris, of Manitoba, in each of the years 1908 and 1909, and for what services?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

(As far as the Department of the Interior is concerned.)

Fiscal year.
1907-8.. .. .. $2,457 84
Services as auctioneer at school lands sale.
1908-9.. .. .. Nil.

NEW DEPUTY MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Who has been appointed to the Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways and Canals?
2. What duties is he to perform?
3. Is he also appointed Chairman of Board of Management of the Intercolonial railway?
4. What are the qualifications of the new deputy minister?
5. What have been his services during the last ten or twelve years?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Archibald W. Campbell, C.E.
2. The duties incumbent upon a Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.
3. He will act as chairman of the Board of Railway Management.
4. He is a civil engineer and has an excellent reputation as an executive head.
5. He has been Deputy Minister of the Department of Public Works in the Ontario government, and head of what is known as the 'good roads movement.'

MARITIME PROVINCES REPRESENTATION.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the maritime provinces of Canada should have preserved to them the representation in the House of Commons that they now enjoy. That in the redistribution of the constituencies to be made after the next decennial census the number of representatives to be returned from the said provinces should not in any case be reduced. And that an humble petition be presented to His Majesty praying that the British North America Act be amended in accordance with the purport of this resolution.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the subject introduced in this resolution has come before parliament on several occasions and under varying circumstances during recent years.

We are now approaching the time when another decennial census will be taken, on which will be based a new redistribution Act. A resolution was moved here a few years ago by Mr. Hughes, the then member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, in which he asked to have restored to the maritime provinces the representation which they had at confederation. The resolution which I have the honour of moving this afternoon, varies somewhat from that resolution. We are not appealing to the House upon this resolution for the purpose of reversing a decision given by the Privy Council a few years ago upon an appeal from the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada. Upon a strictly technical interpretation of certain clauses of that Act it was determined that, as a matter of law, the maritime provinces were subject to have their representation reduced after each decennial census if the population has not increased in proportion to the increase in the province of Quebec. As a matter of law we are deprived of any further consideration of this question, but I appeal to the House of Commons of Canada as the high court of equity and the keeper of the King's conscience. On every consideration of equity and moral right I submit that the maritime provinces are entitled to special consideration in respect to the representation they are hereafter to enjoy in the House of Commons. Before I proceed to discuss the question, let me point out that in Great Britain the representation of the constituencies further removed from the seat of government is based upon a different principle from that which is applied to constituencies located nearer the capital. The county of Kent, which is near the city of London, has a representative for each 30,000 electors, while the more remote constituencies of Northumberland and Cumberland have a representative for each 10,000 and 9,000 electors, respectively. In England and Wales there is a member for each 10,000 electors, in Scotland a member for each 8,800, and in Ireland a member for each 7,000 electors. I point this out to show that in Great Britain, to which we look for precedent in constitutional matters, the various constituencies have their representation based upon a principle, different from that which in Canada is applied to the maritime provinces. It is well known that conditions which prevailed at the time of confederation and which it was supposed would continue, have not been realized with respect to the different parts of Canada. It was expected then that in the course of the decades to come population would largely increase, not only in the older provinces which first formed the Dominion, but in the new provinces in the west which sooner or later would become part of the confederacy. Acting upon the presumption that the maritime provinces would increase in population quite as rapidly as the others, it was not considered necessary that precaution should be taken to preserve to these eastern provinces their representation undiminished. In 1873, when British Columbia entered confederation, although her then population did not entitle her to so large a proportion, she was given six members, which was to be the minimum representation of the province, and it was also stipulated that the representation should be increased in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act. It is quite plain to every one who looks into the matter with any care that had the representatives of the maritime provinces who took part in the pre-confederation conferences insisted that the representation with which they entered the confederacy should be the minimum, there would have been no hesitation in accepting that proposal, but no one ever dreamed then that such a precaution was necessary. I am not making any special appeal on behalf of the maritime provinces because we have lost population, or because of any decadence in our industrial growth, the causes of which have brought about a reduction of the representation of the maritime provinces is not due to any defect inherent in ourselves, it has to be looked for outside. The population of the maritime provinces has kept on increasing decade after decade, but the records of the immigration department tell the story of our diminished representation in the House. During the last nine years immigrants to the number of 49,521 came to the maritime provinces; to Quebec, 187,382; to Ontario, 227,756; to Manitoba, 255,921; to Alberta and Saskatchewan, 359,578. Thus, the maritime provinces have not kept pace with Quebec and Ontario and the western provinces, not on account of any depopulation, but rather on account of the enormous immigration which has flocked into the other provinces in excess of that which has come to us. I need scarcely remind the House that for the last 30 years the energies of the immigration department of Canada under all governments, Liberal and Conservative, have been exerted to bringing immigrants, not to the maritime provinces, but to the fertile plains of the northwest. True, no special effort has been made to prevent immigrants coming to the maritime provinces, but we must recognize that immigrants are attracted to the northwest because there they can get fertile farms for the asking. The maritime provinces are not peculiarly adapted for agriculture, we do not possess these fertile fields that have attracted to the prairie provinces so

many immigrants from European countries. Our resources are largely to be found in our lumber wealth, our fisheries and our mines. The European immigrant coming to the western provinces to engage in farming needs little capital to start in his new life; a comparatively few dollars will give him a homestead location, and all he has to do is to turn up the ground, plant the seed and start in business. But, the man who comes to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick to develop our natural resources must have capital, and so for the vast number of immigrants with little capital the western provinces provide the greater attraction. Therefore, were it not for the enormous increase by immigration in the population of the other provinces, the maritime provinces would be able to hold their own in population and retain their representation as when we cast our lot with the Dominion.

I have before me a statement of the estimated population of the Dominion of Canada issued by the Census Department at the end of last year. According to these figures, the population of the province of Quebec, which was 1,648,289 in 1901, is estimated to be 2,088,461 at the present time. The population of the maritime provinces, which was 893,553 in 1901, is estimated to be now 1,037,112, or an increase during the last nine years of 143,151. Having regard to this very substantial increase in the population of the maritime provinces, one would naturally be inclined to the opinion that we would hold our own in respect to representation. But when we come to apply the rule which determines the representation which the provinces of Canada shall have in parliament after the next census is taken and taking the province of Quebec, which is the pivotal province, and dividing its estimated population of 2,008,461 by 65, the number of representatives, which that province is entitled to in this House, we find that the unit of population after the next census will be 32,130 in place of 25,000, which was the unit at the last census. The figures which I have quoted are the estimates of population at the end of the past year, and if the increase of population will continue for another year and a half, at which time the census will be taken, we may fairly assume that a much larger disparity will exist as between the population of the maritime provinces and that of the province of Quebec. Having ascertained the unit of population to entitle a constituency to return a member to parliament at the present time as 32,130, and dividing that unit into the population of the maritime provinces, we find that instead of thirty-five representatives, to which they are entitled at the present time, they will be entitled to only 32 representatives after the next census is taken. This disparity as regards population has been going on for a good many years. At the time the late hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) moved his resolution three years ago, certain hon. gentlemen who took part in the debate hoped that the conditions would be changed somewhat before the next census was taken, and held that there was evidence that the proportionate representation of the maritime provinces, if not restored, would at all events not suffer hereafter any further diminution. As I have pointed out, the fact is that although the population of the maritime provinces has increased by 143,151 during the last nine years, we stand to lose three more representatives after the next Redistribution Bill has passed this House.

There is another test by which the representation of the maritime provinces is determined, and that is the section which provides that if the population of a particular province has not decreased more than one-twentieth as compared with the whole population of Canada, that province shall not suffer any decrease in its representation. It was argued before the Privy Council, in the case which was referred to in respect to our representation, that Canada meant and included the four older provinces of Canada. There would seem to be strong ground for that contention; and had it been accepted by the Privy Council, the maritime provinces would not be in the position they are in to-day in respect of their representation. If the population of the older provinces of Canada were taken as the basis upon which the estimated decrease was to be calculated, there is no doubt that we would retain our representation as we had it in the past; but when we take into account the fact that the population of the provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba is included with the population of the older provinces of Canada, it would be more than we could hope for that the maritime provinces, with their small proportion of immigrants, would be able to hold their own in that calculation. When I come to discuss the question of immigration, I am naturally reminded that the money which goes to bring immigrants into this Dominion is not the money of the respective provinces which are receiving the benefit of that immigration; it is the money of the whole Dominion of Canada, which is contributed proportionately by the people of the maritime provinces. Then, it will not be denied for a single moment that from the causes which I have indicated, the maritime provinces have not received their fair share of immigration, notwithstanding the fact that some $9,000,000 has been paid by this government during the last nine years for the purpose of bringing into the country the immigration which has come into Canada during that period.

There is another question that ought to

have some bearing on the consideration of this matter, apart from its legal aspect, but from the point of view of the equitable rights of the maritime provinces; that is, in respect of the increased territory which has been awarded to the different provinces. Hon. members of this House are quite familiar with the fact that a few years ago the province of Quebec, which was designated by the framers of the Confederation Act as the 'pivotal province,' upon which the representation of all the other provinces should be determined, received a very large increase of area, equal to about 118,000 square miles. It is contended that this is not an increase of the area of the province of Quebec, but that the resolution of the House which determined that this additional territory should be given to the province of Quebec was only intended to identify or further locate the boundaries of that province. At the time of confederation, the northern boundary of the province of Quebec was regarded as the height of land lying between the watershed of the St. Lawrence and that of Hudson bay. That being the case, we may assume that the representatives of the maritime provinces, who attended that conference, assumed that the province of Quebec was the province as it was indicated by those boundaries, and did not include any additional territory. In awarding the province of Quebec additional territory, the question is raised as to how far that affected the maritime provinces with respect to the representation which we are hereafter to enjoy. It may be argued that there is no population in that additional territory, and that therefore it does not affect the unit of representation for the province of Quebec. At any moment valuable gold mines might be discovered, which would cause a rush into that territory and thereby materially increase the population of the province of Quebec. That province would then be placed in this position, that those people would be unrepresented in parliament, or the British North America Act would have to be amended for the purpose of giving them representation. The population of that new territory would be too remote from the settled constituencies of the province of Quebec as they exist at present, and we might have a demand from the province of Quebec for an amendment to the British North America Act in order to give to that additional population its due representation in parliament.

The province of Ontario has added very largely to its territory since 1867. By the decision of the boundary case in 1884, the Privy Council awarded Ontario additional territory now designated as New Ontario. At present the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario are knocking at the door of the House of Commons for additional territory. The territory in question was purchased and paid for by the people of the whole of Canada. It is not territory for which the province of Ontario or Manitoba made any sacrifice, but was territory purchased by the government of Canada, in which every province and every individual in the Dominion has an equal interest and share. The provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, which have lately been established, extend as far north as the territorial rights of Canada extend and the same is true of British Columbia. Were it possible for the maritime provinces to increase their territory, or improve their position in respect of natural resources, we would not be coming to the House of Commons asking compensation as a set-off to the new territory which other provinces have been given. We get no benefit from the investment made by the government of Canada in those lands which are to be awarded the other provinces. We receive no benefit from the money expended year by year by the immigration department for the purpose of inducing immigrants to come to this country; and all we ask, as a compensating condition, is that hereafter, under no circumstances shall the number of representatives from the maritime provinces be decreased in this parliament. The resolution which I have the honour of introducing does not in the slightest degree affect the representation of the rest of Canada. We are only asking that the number of representatives which we send to parliament shall not, under any circumstances be decreased. In that respect we are only asking what was granted British Columbia. If the representation in this parliament of British Columbia is to be permanent, and not subject to any decrease that same condition should be made to apply to the other provinces. I submit that the proposition involved in my resolution is not unreasonable in view of all the circumstances and in view of all the considerations upon which the Act of confederation was based.

The principle of fixing a minimum in the representation of any state or territory, has been followed in the case of every other commonwealth organized as a confederation. In Australia, when the Commonwealth Act was passed, it was provided that the House of representatives should consist of 77 members, of whom 20 were given one province, 23 another, and 9, 7 and 5 to the smaller provinces, and it was specially provided that not one of the original states forming the commonwealth should ever have less than five members in the house of representatives. The constitution of the United States also provides for a minimum representation. It seems to me that these precedents are so reasonable that hon. members should not

regard the proposition I am advancing as one open in any degree to objection.

I yield to no one in my admiration and appreciation of the great men who met together in 1864 for the purpose of considering the conditions under which a union of the provinces of Canada might be brought about. We who are living in a period somewhat remote from that important epoch are perhaps sometimes inclined to think that the men of that day were possessed of transcendent ability, that they were more far seeing, that they possessed the faculty of looking into the future and providing for future conditions to a degree far exceeding that possessed by the men who are occupying similar positions at the present time. Well, I do not think I am detracting in any respect from the merits of those great men when I say that the public men of the day, who are discharging their duties in our federal parliament and provincial legislatures, are quite as far seeing as those who preceded them forty years ago.

In the view of subsequent events, we would not be justified in assuming that the framers of the Act of Confederation saw in advance all the conditions and circumstances likely to arise in respect of the various provinces of the Dominion for all time to come. It would be preposterous to say that these men intended to impose upon this country a piece of legislation which never could, under any circumstances, be amended in order to meet conditions bound to arise in a country of our rapid growth. As an instance, to show how men, familiar with the subjects they are attempting to discuss and settle, may be mistaken, let me quote the statement of the late Archibishop Taché regarding the possibilites of the Northwest as a wheat raising country. That venerable archbishop wrote a pamphlet in 1869 in which he asserted that the country now described as Alberta and Saskatchewan would never produce wheat, yet during last year the plains and valleys in these two provinces produced no less than 130,000,000 bushels. No doubt the venerable archbishop made that statement in all sincerity and honesty. It was made about two years after the Confederation Act was passed, and based on the information then at hand. Consequently we may very well assume that the framers of the British North America Act, who were representing the older provinces of Canada, could not have anticipated the enormous influx of population which would flow into those western provinces during all those years.

What are the objections heard against the very moderate and modest demand which the maritime provinces are now making? The answer given in some places is that the British North America Act has provided a system by which the representation of all the provinces shall be determined and that we must adhere to it. In other words, to use the language of that unsympathetic and exacting creditor immortalized in the 'Merchant of Venice,' 'it is so written in the bond.' I submit that written constitutions, if they are to be durable, if they are not to bear harshly and unfairly on certain elements of the population and certain parts of the country, must be subject to amendment from time to time. In fact I think I am well within the mark when I say that every essential feature and condition of the British North America Act has been amended from time to time since 1867, except that one provision which fixes the representation of the maritime provinces. In 1869 a resolution was passed by the House of Commons to the effect that it is the undoubted privilege of parliament to fix and determine the amount of all expenses chargeable on the public funds of the Dominion, but that the House was of the opinion that no further grant or provision beyond those made by the Union Act and the Act respecting Nova Scotia, should in the future be made out of the revenues of Canada for the support of the government or legislature of any province.

In addition to the fact that the amount of subsidy payable by this government to the different provinces was determined by the Act, we have years afterwards the resolution I have just read setting a limit to the amount of subsidy to be paid those provinces. It is within the knowledge of hon. members, that, a few years ago, the provincial premiers met in conference and passed a resolution by which they requested that a further appropriation be made to the respective provinces out of the federal treasury. That resolution was received favourably by the federal government and by this House, and, as a consequence, these provinces are enjoying a larger subsidy than they heretofore enjoyed. I might also remind the House that the question was not entirely unanimous, because the premier of British Columbia withdrew from that conference, refusing to accept the proportion that was allotted to the province of British Columbia. When these resolutions were presented to the imperial parliament for legislative enactment, it was sought to insert into that Bill a provision that there should be no further increase from the federal treasury to the provinces of Canada, but that the amount fixed by the Act then passing should be final and conclusive. That amendment was not inserted in the Act, showing that the imperial authorities did not regard it wise that any specific act of legislation should be held to fetter and trench upon the future development and future conditions that might thereafter arise with regard to this great Dominion.

Another objection that has been made to

the acceptance of this resolution is one which I find stated in the columns of the Toronto 'Globe' of Wednesday last. The late Hon. George Brown was the great exponent of representation by population, and during the whole of his public life he endeavoured to work out that principle in its application to the provinces of Canada. He was the proprietor and director of the Toronto 'Globe' for many years, and that paper which was established by him and which is taken to represent his views so far as the application of his views could be made to the conditions of the present time, made this objection, and this objection only, to the acceptance of this resolution:

The most serious objection to the change is the resultant tendency to make the House unwieldy. There is neither wisdom nor despatch in an overgrown deliberate body. With large membership it is necessary that the preponderance take no part in the work. Even with the present representation at Ottawa, if every member took an active part, progress would be virtually impossible. Every increase must increase the element of silent idlers, and that is not desirable. The relative strength of the contingent from the maritime provinces would be no less under the change required by the present law than under the change sought. In either case it would be in proportion of population.

Now, Sir, it does seem to me that the merits of this resolution must be fairly apparent when the Toronto 'Globe' can find no stronger objection to the acceptance of that resolution than the tendency it would have to make the House of Commons unwieldly. Even should all the representatives from Prince Edward Island lose their seats in this House at the next re-distribution, it would leave only four vacant seats for the accommodation of the increasing number of members who will come to this House from the west after the next re-distribution. At the very worst I cannot conceive that more than ten members would be taken from Nova Scotia during the next twenty or thirty years, and perhaps the same number from the province of New Brunswick. And, while such a large decrease as that would affect very seriously the interests of those provinces in this House, there would be no corresponding advantage as respects the unwieldly character of the House of Commons, when we take into account the increased number of members that must necessarily come to parliament from the new provinces in the near future. The objections of the Toronto 'Globe' suggests a picture of the members who are hereafter to be elected from the now unformed constituencies in the great west, sitting upon the door-step of the House of Commons, patiently, yet hopefully awaiting the inevitable reduction of representatives from the maritime provinces, provided for in the British North America Act, by which representatives from those provinces are deprived of their seats whereupon they may joyfully enter and take possession of them. It comes to this, so far as the objection of the Toronto 'Globe' is concerned, 'in the time to come the number of representatives from the larger provinces will necessarily increase, and, in order to provide room for them, some provinces must be deprived of their representation—and why not the maritime provinces as well as any other. I sympathize with hon. members in their desire to adhere strictly, so far as strict adherence is possible to the conditions of the British North America Act. I am not one who would lightly change the conditions under which all the provinces entered confederation. Nor am I one who would wantonly amend the British North America Act for some trifling consideration. But in matters of serious moment, matters that affect so vitally the interests of the maritime provinces, in view of the amendments that have heretofore been made, in view of the principle followed in other countries similarly circumstanced, I feel strongly that the members from the maritime provinces are not asking too much when they ask that a minimum be fixed beyond which their representation would not be reduced. With respect to the constitution of the United States, that constitution was drawn up by men I suppose equal in talent, foresight and statesmanship to those who drew up the British North America Act. But the people of the United States do not regard the American constitution as a piece of sacred legislation that is not to be amended or changed under varying conditions as they arise in that great country. No less than seventeen constitutional amendments have been made to the American constitution to meet the changing conditions in the United States, and whenever it is necessary to have further amendments, there seems to be no hesitation on the part of the people of that progressive nation to make the amendments to suit the circumstances of the day.

The province of Quebec having been selected as the pivotal point on which the representation of the other provinces is determined, some hon. gentlemen are inclined to say that it was so selected to assure to the province of Quebec its proportionate influence and standing in the confederation of Canada. I beg to suggest that no such consideration entered into the minds of the gentlemen who were interested in selecting Quebec as the pivotal province. The reason why Quebec was selected is given in the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald in the confederation debates, wherein he stated that Quebec was accepted as the pivot on which the whole would turn on account of the comparatively permanent character of its population, and from its having neither the

largest nor the least number of inhabitants. It was not selected in order that the rights or customs of the province of Quebec should be preserved to the people; it was not selected on account of any fear that their influence would become less as this Dominion grew and became more populous; it was selected simply and solely because it was represented to be not the highest or lowest in point of population, and its population was less likely to vary than that of any other. That was another respect in which the framers of confederation did not anticipate the facts as they have occurred.

The province of Quebec has benefited largely by the inflow of population from European countries. It is situated upon the great waterway of this Dominion. The immigrants coming to western Canada first view the beautiful hills and the fertile plains of the province of Quebec, lying along the River St. Lawrence; they come to the great city of Montreal, which is the entrepot of the whole Dominion of Canada. The city of Montreal is destined to become a great city; and I am pleased to know that some of our hon. friends from the province of Quebec are sanguine enough to look forward to the day when the city of Montreal will have a population of a million. When the city of Montreal has a population of a million, I wonder what will become of the representation of the maritime provinces. It is not too hopeful, or too sanguine, a view to take of the development and increase of the province of Quebec, and of the great city of Montreal, to say that hon. gentlemen who predict a population of a million for Montreal within the next thirty or forty years are not reckless in their prophecy. But when the city of Montreal has a population of a million, then I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what will be the position of the maritime provinces as a factor in the public affairs of this dominion, as represented in this House of Commons. The city of Montreal, regarded as the national port of this country, has been the subject of large grants of money on the part of the national government, millions of dollars have been expended for the purpose of making Montreal the great centre of transportation for this country. It is money well spent, and I am sure no member from the maritime provinces begrudges the city of Montreal and the people of Quebec the money which has been expended to make its harbour safe and to deepen and to improve its channel. But every dollar that has been spent by the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of improving the city of Montreal makes possible a large increase in its population, and therefore a large increase of population in the province of Quebec is due to a considerable extent to the generous disposition with which the maritime provinces have received every proposal to spend money in the province of Quebec and in the river St. Lawrence, at the same time that it is calculated to redound to their disadvantage on account of the increased population which it will bring about, and the corresponding decrease in the representation of the maritime provinces. I beg leave to move, Mr. Speaker, the motion of which I have given notice.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). My hon. friend from Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Kyte) has built up a very elaborate argument on what seems to me a very flimsy foundation. Not being learned in the law, I do not propose to follow along those lines. But there are some facts in connection with this matter that I think it might be well to lay before the House. The entire principle underlying the argument of my hon. friend is a wrong one. He has argued as if some injustice was being done, or had been done, to the people of the maritime provinces. He says that the British North America Act has been amended on many occasions, and that it ought to be amended again to meet his views. Why, Mr. Speaker, if any injustice was being done to the people of the lower provinces, every man in this House would be ready to call for an amendment of the British North America Act to remedy the injustice. But my hon. friend, during the whole of his speech, has not indicated one single injustice that has been done, or is being done, to the people of the lower provinces. They will continue to be represented in this House just exactly in the same proportion, according to their population, as they were at the time they entered confederation. Nothing that could be said at the present time could make us believe that the fathers of confederation, who had this matter in hand, that men like the Hon. George Brown and others who had fought their whole lives for the principle of representation by population, would have agreed to any such proposition. They must have foreseen that in the future one province might increase in population faster than another, and they never would have consented that one province should be represented in the federal parliament on one basis, and another province on another basis. No one can gather from the debates of that period that any such intention was in their minds. Why, the whole basic principle of confederation was the fact that in the House of Commons every province was to be on an absolutely equal footing. If you want any further proof of that, you can consider what was done in the organization of the second chamber. It was provided that the smaller provinces, smaller territorially and in population, as they would not have an

equal number of members in the parliament of Canada, should be protected, if any protection was necessary, by giving them a predominance in the upper chamber. But the whole groundwork of confederation was the fact that there should be absolute equality of representation in proportion to population in the different provinces of the Dominion. Now it is almost half a century since that took place. At the time of confederation, when the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick united, does my hon. friend think for a moment that a resolution like this would have met with favour, that special consideration would be given to the lower provinces, that they should be allowed representation in this House on one basis, and the great province of Ontario, that came in at the same time, under exactly the same conditions and that has lost more representation in the past than the lower provinces have lost, should be allowed representation on another basis? Does my hon. friend think for a minute that the province of Ontario would sit quiet and allow herself to be unrepresented according to population? I do not think so for a moment. Just as certain if we adopted the suggestion of my hon. friend, then next year you would have the province of Ontario coming forward and rightly saying: We came in under the same terms, under the same conditions, as the lower provinces, and we are entitled to the same consideration.

Mr. JAMESON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the province of Ontario has lost any of its representation?

Mr. TURRIFF. Certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. Its original representation was 82.

Mr. TURRIFF. But ten years ago it was 92, and since then it has been losing some of its representation, because the province of Quebec has increased in population faster than the province of Ontario. The same thing is happening in the lower provinces. My hon. friend stated that the increase of population in the province of Quebec was largely owing to immigration, and he quoted figures, some 50,000 odd coming to the lower provinces, and 180,000 into the province of Quebec. That is just about an even proportion according to their population. Now, if the lower provinces are treated as my hon. friend proposes, Ontario would come in and ask to be treated in the same way, and in that case, what would be the position of the rest of Canada? Where would Quebec be, where would the west be? Mr. Speaker, I was born in the province of Quebec, and lived there for the first 23 years of my life. I am proud of the province of Quebec, which is inhabited chiefly by French Canadians, among whom I lived for so many years. I learned to admire and respect them, and the longer I live the more I admire and respect the French Canadians of the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec is justly jealous of her position in confederation. Would it be fair, would it be reasonable to ask the province of Quebec to allow her representation to be cut down? Because if you give an increased representation to the other provinces, and keep Quebec, the pivotal province, at its original representation, it is cutting down her representation, proportionately.

Mr. DANIEL. If the original area of Quebec at the time of confederation was, say, 150,000 square miles, and Quebec was made the pivotal province and the unit of representation was sixty-five divided into its population, would the hon. member consider it just and right that if the area of Quebec was nearly doubled after confederation no allowance should be made for that increase of area and consequent increase in population, in fixing the unit for the representation of the other provinces?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am glad the hon. member has asked that question. That is the one point on which I think there is a peg to hang a hat on. I claim that if the province of Quebec in the future should have its territory largely increased—as in all probability it will, and I hope it will—and there should be a large influx of population into that newly added portion of the province of Quebec, in justice to the other parts of the Dominion the population in that new part that may be added to Quebec should not be a factor in governing the number of representatives from the other parts of the country, and I would be one of the first to object to and oppose any such concession or advantage being given to the province of Quebec or any other province. We have a great confederation, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, nine provinces, and we have been working along on good lines, on autonomous lines, simply because every province has been exactly on the same basis. But to suggest that any one province should have an advantage over any other province, would be to sow the seeds of discord at the very outset.

It seems to me that a proposition of this kind comes with less good grace from a member from the province of Nova Scotia than from a member from any other province, because I think Nova Scotia has already more than its share of influence in this parliament. There is one ground on which I think the lower provinces have rather an advantage, and I am pleased to grant them that advantage and hope they will always continue to have it, that is that during the years that have elapsed since confederation, certainly to-day, the repre-

sentatives from the lower provinces have averaged up better and more able than the representation of the whole Dominion, and to that extent they have an advantage and long may they continue to have it, long may they continue to send the same class of able men they have in the House to-day, so that in the future we will be able to acknowledge that they are the most able men in the House. One of them at all events is the most nervy man, to bring forward a proposition of this kind, to put Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces up on a pinnacle, all the other provinces to take a back seat. But it is not only in that respect that they have an advantage. Compare the position of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, we will say, with the position of Manitoba and Saskatchewan at this moment. Manitoba and Saskatchewan have one quarter more population than Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island conbined, but Nova Scotia has two members in the government, while Manitoba and Saskatchewan have not a single representative in the government. Does any one mean to say that if for the past five years, Nova Scotia had not a member in the government, the members from that province would have sat still and allowed that state of things to exist? That is exactly the position we have been in in the west, and I am beginning to think that the Liberal members from the west have been too modest and moderate in not having insisted on the rights to which they are entitled. The provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan are certainly each entitled to a member in the government, they have not any such representation, and we have been content to take it easy and leave it to the government in their own good time, when they should be able to do it nicely, to give us the representation that is certainly our due. But, on account of that, apparently because we have been easy-going, because we have been moderate, my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) now comes forward with a proposition to put the west and the province of Quebec as well, although I am not looking after the province of Quebec, for all time to come, in a degraded and an inferior position. Is there anything fair and reasonable in that? I do not think there is. I do not think for a moment that the proposition brought forward by my hon. friend ought to meet with support in this House.

My hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) spoke about the subsidies. The subsidies were given on a basis that was fair to all, each province got an increase, there was no proposition made at that time to give one province an increase and not any of the others. Had it been attempted to do that I do not think the attempt would have met with any success; this parliament would not have agreed to the proposition made by the different premiers of the various provinces. I hope my hon. friend will not press this matter because if it is pressed and if it meets with the support of the members of this House, you would be sowing the seeds of discord, you would be starting in for the dismemberment of the Dominion of Canada. I know quite well that so far as the west is concerned, speaking as a member from the province of Saskatchewan, representing here 45,000 people, the best people from Ontario, Quebec, the lower provinces, Great Britain and the United States, they would not stand for one moment for accepting a position in confederation that would be inferior to the position held by any other province in the Dominion of Canada. So far as as I am personally concerned, if such a resolution as that was to find acceptance in this House and were followed up in the only logical way it could be followed up, by a Bill to give effect to it, that Bill would not have had its second reading for five minutes, until my resignation would be in your hands, because I would refuse to sit in this House as a member representing people on any other terms than on the terms of fair and just equality from one end of the Dominion to the other.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman please explain how it would militate against the standing of the people of the west that the present representation of the maritime provinces should be made permanent?

Mr. TURRIFF. It would mean at present that four men in the lower provinces would have as much to say in this House as five men in the west. It might mean in the time to come that one man in the lower provinces, would have as much to say in this House as two men in the west. Is there anything fair or reasonable in that? My hon. friend must see that according to the present arrangement the lower provinces will always have absolutely their just fair share of representation, their just proportion.

Can the hon. gentleman ask that these provinces should have any more than their just proportion? No. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) does not himself believe that what he asks is right because if he has any ground for his demand at all it is that these provinces should have the same representation on which they entered confederation. If they are not entitled to that they are not entitled to any change. I hope this resolution will not pass because I do not believe it is in the interests of the whole Dominion. I trust the conditions will continue as they are from the Atlantic to the Pacific; I trust that our people will remain as they are: happy, and prosperous, and contented, working for the

advantage of the Dominion generally. If this spirit should actuate the Canadian people there will be none who will be found to complain that they have been unjustly treated in the matter of representation in this House.

Mr. A. B WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from the province of Prince Edward Island which, I contend, has a grievance in this matter, and which can present strong claims to have that grievance redressed, I wish to place my views before the House. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) that our just demand is that the representation of all the proivnces of the Dominion should be the same as that which they had when they entered confederation, but I cannot agree with him in much else. I do not believe with him, that our western friends take the same view as he does. Since I have come to this House and become acquainted with gentlemen from the other provinces of the Dominion, both Liberal and Conservative, I have learned to know their feelings and to respect them, and I doubt very much if the representatives of the great province of Ontario would stand up here and declare that the principle which is working out so harshly to the maritime provinces should continue for ever. I do not believe that my fellow countrymen of French extraction in the province of Quebec, when I appeal to their chivalry and sense of fair play, would desire to see the representation of the maritime provinces dwindle until we have practically lost a voice in the councils of the nation. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) represents a district in one of the great western provinces which some day, perhaps soon, will hold the balance of power in this country. He knows the west better than I do, but, when I remember that in that great west men from the maritime provinces are in the forefront of progress and development, I must doubt that the people of the west take the extreme view he has taken. We have sent the best of our blood to the Northwest, and throughout the length and breadth of that prosperous land the sons of the maritime provinces are to be found in the front rank of the population We are glad that our people have gone to the Northwest to continue to live under the British flag rather than that they should bend their energies to the development of a foreign nation. But, Sir, I refuse to believe that these children of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island will lend countenance to an effort to crush down the old provinces of their birth. Let me remind the House that the maritime provinces were the cradle of confederation. In the early sixties Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland thought it would be in their interest to have a union of their own, and in the spring of 1864 they met in Charlottetown with a view to bring that union about. It so happened that then, and for many years before, there was a practical deadlock in the political affairs of Ontario and Quebec which rendered it practically impossible to carry on government. Ontario fought for representation by population, and I do not blame her, because while she had a larger population than Quebec, the parliamentary representation of the two provinces was equal. However, when the Charlottetown conference was in progress it occurred to the statesmen of Upper and Lower Canada that they should sink their party differences and endeavour to find a solution for the troubles that confronted them by inducing the maritime provinces to enlarge the scope of the conference so as to include Ontario and Quebec, and with that object in view Sir John Macdonald and Hon. George Brown, and others, came to Charlottetown. This is probably the only instance in the history of Canada in which the leaders of both political parties agreed to sink their political differences absolutely in order to achieve a great end. The conference ended at Charlottetown to meet in Quebec in October of the same year, 1864, and at the Quebec conference the question of union was fully threshed out. It is to be regretted we have not fuller reports of the proceedings of that conference which were largely secret, but the result was that four of the provinces agreed to enter confederation. This question of representation in the Dominion parliament was fully discussed then. According to the census of 1861, Prince Edward Island was only entitled to five members, and the Hon. George Brown proposed a resolution which gave to Ontario 82 members, to Quebec 65, to Nova Scotia 19, to New Brunswick 15, to Newfoundland 7, and to Prince Edward Island 5 members. Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick agreed to this proposition, but Prince Edward Island declined. I do not wish to take up any considerable time in discussing this matter, Mr. Speaker, because during the earlier part of this session I dealt with it at some length. In that very conference it was provided in advance that there should be a violation of this very rule of representation by population; there was a loop-hole provided for that purpose. At page 40 of Pope's 'Confederation Documents,' you will find in a report of that conference that this provision was made:

> The Northwest Territory, British Columbia and Vancouver, shall be admitted into the union on such terms and conditions as the parliament of the federated provinces shall deem equitable and as shall receive the assent of Her Majesty.

Nevertheless, there was one colony about which the conference had some

doubt, and in order to make sure of that colony coming in they made an exception in its favour, as follows:

And in the case of the province of British Columbia or Vancouver, on such terms as shall be agreed to by the legislature of such province.

The new provinces were to come in on such terms as should be arranged by this parliament, but the province of British Columbia was to come in on such terms as should be agreed to by itself. At that time Prince Edward Island voted against that resolution, because it did not give it sufficient representation. Quoting from the same Confederation Documents, I wish to give a few of the remarks made by different members of that conference on this very question. Mr., afterwards Sir John A. Macdonald, in the discussions of the conference, referring to this question, at page 57, said:

The rate of increase of population in Canada must be greater in future than in the maritime provinces.

Showing that the condition which has now arisen was foreseen. The Hon. George Brown, who fought all his life on behalf of the principle of representation by population, in the same discussion, at page 67, made use of the following words:

After the census of 1871 we shall adopt the same rule. The practical result will be that while Lower Canada (Quebec) certainly will not be less and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of representatives.

There were further expressions of opinion from other members of that conference. Mr. Brown's motion for a general government to protect the diversified interests of the provinces carried, Prince Edward Island alone voting against it. In this discussion, Mr. Haviland, one of the Prince Edward Island delegates, afterwards a senator of Canada and a lieutenant governor of the province, and a strong Conservative, said:

Prince Edward Island would rather be out of the confederation than consent to this motion. We should have no status. Only five members out of 194 would give the island no position.

As Mr. Haviland was all his life an earnest advocate of confederation, he must have had very strong reasons for taking this position. Mr. Palmer, afterwards chief justice of Prince Edward Island, said:

I take exception to the principle adopted by this resolution. Representation by population is not applicable when a certain number of provinces are throwing their resources into one confederation, and giving up their own self-government and individuality. When a colony surrenders that right, she should have something commensurate in the confederation. . . . Not even two or three more members would induce me to give my assent to the scheme.

I may say that Mr. Palmer was not a strong advocate of confederation, though he afterwards supported it. The Hon. Edward Whalen, one of the most able and brilliant men we ever had in the province, and a red-hot federationist, said:

I thought that Prince Edward Island had not been fairly treated as to representation in the Legislative Council, but I gave way on that occasion. I do not think, however, I could say that I was satisfied with the representation of five in the Federal House of Commons. We are in an isolated position. Our resources are large, and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that the confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island, and that we shall eventually be forced in. Better, however, that, than that we should willingly go into confederation with that representation.

Mr. Whalen was supposed to be invincible in his constituency; but when it became known that he was prepared to support confederation on these terms rather than not go into confederation at all, he was beaten out of his boots in the next election; and it has always been said in Prince Edward Island that as a result of that defeat he died of a broken heart. Col. Gray, another delegate from Prince Edward Island, said:

I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provision of five members is unsatisfactory.

The Hon. J. C. Pope, afterwards Minister of Marine in this House, said:

I cannot ask it as a matter of right, but one of expediency, as one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island. I therefore ask for six members.

Hon. Mr. Haviland said:

I fully agree with Mr. Pope. It would be an insuperable difficulty to us if we had not six members.

So much for what took place in the Quebec conference But shortly after the return of the delegates from that conference, the matter came up in the local legislature. The Hon. Mr. Pope, who was leader of the government at the time and who was very strongly in favour of confederation, if he could get terms suitable and right for Prince Edward Island, introduced a series of resolutions. The first had reference to financial matters, but the second took up the question of representation. He said:

That if the relative circumstances of Canada and this island rendered a union prac-

ticable, the evident injustice of the term agreed to by the Quebec convention would prevent there being ratified by the legislature of this island. Without alluding to all, it was proper to notice some of the objectionable features of the report. Without admitting the principle of representation according to population under all circumstances to be sound, it is, in the opinion of this House, particularly objectionable as applied to this island in connection with Canada, taking into consideration that the number of our inhabitants is and must continue comparatively small, owing to the fact that we have no Crown lands, mines, minerals or other resources sufficient to induce immigrants to settle here, and that we never can expect to become to any extent a manufacturing people, in consequence of our navigation being closed for nearly half the year, and all trade and communication with other countries stopped. Under this principle, the city of Montreal alone would, at the present time, have a representation greater than the whole province of Prince Edward Island, and under the provinces of the convention which regulates the mode of re-adjusting the relative representation of the various provinces, at each decennial census, looking at the rapid increase of the population of upper and lower Canada heretofore—particularly the former—and the certainty of a still greater increase there in the future over that of the population of this island, it follows as a certain and inevitable consequence, if a federation of the provinces were consummated upon the basis of the said convention, that the number of our representatives would in the course of a comparatively short number of years be diminished to a still smaller number than that allotted to us at the outset.

This shows that at that time gentlemen representing Canada and gentlemen representing Prince Edward Island foresaw what was going to happen and were preparing to guard against it. Further on he said:

I have said, Sir, that I entertained objections to the details of the scheme. Among these objections I may mention the principle of representation by population. A very simple calculation will show that the adoption of this as a standard would entitle the city of London to send to the British House of Commons no less than seventy representatives, and the city of Montreal in the confederate parliament would have a representation greater than that of this whole island. Its statistics warrant the belief that in a few years the population will be so increased by the influx of the tide of immigration that the island would lose in the halls of legislation even the small voice which she might raise at her entrance into the union.

Other hon. gentlemen spoke on the same occasion. The Hon. George W. Howlan, who was aferwards senator and became Lieutenant Governor of the province, also discussed the matter. He was likewise an ardent supporter of confederation and on the question of representation, he said:

Mr. WARBURTON.

Representation by population might be very well for Canada herself but in a general union of the colonies it would operate injuriously for the maritime provinces, as they could not expect to protect their interests when they would have to contend with one hundred of a clear majority over their own representation. This principle would give the city of Montreal with its 101,000 inhabitants one representative more than this island. Quite different is the representation of Great Britain, for while London has about the same population as Scotland, that city has only sixteen members in the House of Commons whilst Scotland has fifty-three. But it may be argued that as our population increases our representation will increase. This is very doubtful. Indeed under the operation of the 20th and 21st clauses of the report it seems probable that we might loose our representation altogether. Lower Canada is always to have sixty-five members, and the representation of the other colonies is to be arranged every ten years so as to give each the same ratio to population as she will then possess. Now, should the population of lower Canada increase more rapidly than that of this island, which is almost certain to be the case, our representation would decrease and we would be left perhaps without a member at all. To show at least that it is much more likely that our representation will decrease than increase, I will read the House, George Brown's opinion on the subject as given in the Toronto 'Globe.' In treating of the probable effects of these two clauses of the report, to which I have been alluding, on the representation of the maritime provinces, that journal says: The fact is best shown by illustration. Prince Edward Island, with a population to-day of 85,000, is, it is said, to have five representatives at starting. Suppose she increased at the rate of 20 per cent each ten years, at the end of twenty years her population will be 126,000. But at the same rate of progress the population of lower Canada would be 1,600,000. Divided by sixty-five, this would give one representative to every twenty-four, 550 of her people, so that the island would not be able to claim an increase of membership. If similar calculations be made with respect to the other provinces it will be proved that the addition they will be able to make to their representation will be very small. In fact, if the increase of population in some of them be not greater in the future than it had been in the past, they will, if the plan be strictly carried out, lose instead of gain.

Mr. James Duncan, another member of the government at that time, who was also, I believe in favour of confederation, said:

The five representatives allowed to us in the Lower House would not give this colony much influence there; but as our population will not increase so rapidly as that of Canada, there is a prospect, through the operation of one clause in the report, that our five representatives would dwindle down to three. Taking all these points into consideration, therefore, it is clear to me that we have nothing to gain but much to lose by adopting the Quebec scheme.

The Hon. Geo. Coles, leader of the opposition, and one of the delegates to the conference, said:

When the question of representation in the House of Commons came up for discussion this principle was ably and strenuously contended for by the Hon. Geo. Brown, and well it might, for he knew that it would enable Upper Canada to maintain the control of the general legislature for ever. Representation by population will give the two Canadas 100 of a majority over all the lower provinces in the House of Commons, and by each of the Canadas having as many members in the legislative council as the whole of their eastern sisters, they will together always command a majority there of 24 over us, so that the only principle on which we, in the maritime colonies can expect justice will be through the quarrels of the two western provinces.

I have quoted those remarks for the reason that I want to impress on this House the fact that the state of affairs now existing was foreseen and an effort was made to guard against it. That matter was brought up in the legislature of Prince Edward Island in the next session after the holding of the Quebec conference. About the same time the question was referred to the people of New Brunswick at a general election by the late Sir Leonard Tilley, and the people of that province voted down the proposition with a sweeping majority. The question was again referred to the people of New Brunswick and they were then satisfied that this matter was settled and confederation was carried. I am not going into the question of the conditions in New Brunswick to any extent, because I believe that they will be taken up by an hon. member from that province who will follow me. The province of Nova Scotia entered confederation in a rather peculiar manner. The question of adopting confederation was not decided on by the people at all. However, it is not necessary that I should go into that now. I am simply calling attention to the fact. Prince Edward Island did not enter confederation in 1867, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) seems to think, but in 1873, some six years later, and one of the principal reasons why we did not go in before was the fact that we did not think we were getting what was right in the way of representation in this House. In 1873 negotiations were resumed, delegations consulted with Sir John Macdonald, then leader of the government, and with members of his government, and both parties arrived at the basis of settlement. But it was then understood clearly that Prince Edward Island was to have a representation of six and was never to have any less; and had it been supposed for one instant that we would not have that representation, confederation could not possibly have been carried at the poll. Those of us from that section of the Dominion who are old enough to remember, know that this was a vital question, and it was only because we were assured of this representation of six for all time that the people consented to Prince Edward Island entering confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be so, is there nothing at all on record to indicate it?

Mr. WARBURTON. The debates in the House of Commons, unfortunately, are not preserved. The only record we have is in the form of newspaper cuttings, and we cannot get anything from them. But I will give what I consider very strong proof of the correctness of my contention. I gave some figures in an address in this House two or three weeks ago, but, as they have a very strong bearing on my argument, I wish to repeat them. When we came into confederation in 1873, we came in under the census of 1871. Under that census, the unit of population was 18,331. Prince Edward Island was entitled to only five representatives, with a small number over—2,366, about one-eighth of the unit of representation. But we were given six representatives, though we were clearly not entitled to that number, according to the principle of representation by population and on the basis of the unit of population of that time. The reason, of course, is that we would not come in on any other terms. The gentleman who negotiated the terms for us maintained all his life that it was an arrangement, and, though it was not inserted in the terms of agreement, it was observed. When we came to 1881, the time of the next decennial census, we were still entitled to only five representatives according to the principle of representation by population. But we retained our six representatives, though others were reduced. And it was only in 1891, after the men who had negotiated the terms of union were no longer here, that our representation was cut down. I have no doubt that had Sir John Macdonald been alive in 1891, or rather had he been taking an active part in affairs, knowing the circumstances as he did, he would have done as in 1881, and decided that our representation should remain. But, unfortunately, he was not on the floor of this House at that time, and, therefore, in 1891 our representation was cut down by one. In 1901 it was again cut down by one. Thus, there were two different censuses in which we were entitled to a representation of only five, but in both cases we were given six. There must be some reason, and the obvious reason is the one well known in Prince Edward Island, that we would not have come in under any other condition. I said in my opening remarks that a loop-

hole had been provided in the Quebec conference in regard to this very important matter that, in case of an emergency, this principle of representation by population might be evaded, when special reference was made to British Columbia coming in on terms agreed to by her own legislature. And we know that British Columbia did come in with six representatives, when she was not entitled, on a basis of population, to that number. Of course, she is entitled to more than that number to-day, but I think it was twenty years after she came in that her population was such as would justify her in claiming six members according to the unit of population that prevailed in those years. But we know that, when the terms of union were drawn up, the gentleman who was in charge on the part of Prince Edward Island either neglected his duty or did not know what he was doing. He did not, as the representatives of British Columbia, provide that the representation of the province should be 'increased' according to change of population, but agreed that it should be 'readjusted.' There is no doubt that, had he mentioned putting in the word 'increased' it would have been acceded to, that being what was intended. But, in consequence of the difference in the word, we have been losing our representation. British Columbia's interests were better looked after, and so, when it came to a redistribution, she retained her six members, even when her population did not justify it on the basis of representation by population. If, as the hon. mover of this resolution (Mr. Kyte) said, this comes back to a purely legal consideration of the terms of union and insistence upon a legal technicality, I admit, we are out of court. But I put it to this House and this country upon the broad equitable principle that, though, in the terms of union, a word was not put in which was intended to be put in and that we are losing representation that it was not intended that we should lose, it is still within the power of this parliament to remedy that injustice and that wrong. I appeal to hon. members of this House from all provinces to look at this matter in the light in which we look upon it and to restore to us that representation which we formerly had. I am not arguing very strongly in support of the resolution as it is worded, my reason being that I intend to move an amendment. I pointed out two or three weeks ago, when discussing this matter before, that one great reason why our population had not increased proportionately to that of the province of Quebec was that the enormous public expenditure upon the harbours of Montreal and Quebec and upon the St. Lawrence river channel have had the effect of developing the trade of that route and attracting population to the province of Quebec. No one is finding fault with the development of this route; every one wishes it to go on; we hope it will increase. But the effect upon us has been—aside from the question of immigration which my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) brought up, but I think this more to the point—that we who helped as well as we could in building up this country and in making the port of Montreal and developing the St. Lawrence as a highway of commerce are really suffering from the efforts for the general good that we have put forth. The northwest probably benefits more than any other part of the Dominion by that expenditure and the works carried on there. I cannot believe that the people of the northwest, recognizing these facts, are willing that we should suffer by having our representation made less than it was. And I am of opinion that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) would take more than two minutes to resign his seat if this were carried. I shall take up only a few moments more in referring to the amendment which I now beg to move, seconded by Mr. Daniel:

That all the words in the resolution after the word 'House' in the second line be struck out, and the following inserted:

'Each province of the Dominion of Canada shall have as a minimum representation in the House of Commons the representation it had upon becoming a province of Canada. That in the re-distribution of the constituencies to be made after the next and after every future decennial census, the representation of each province shall be not less than that minimum. And that a humble petition be presented to His Majesty praying that the British North America Act be amended in accordance with the purport of this resolution.'

In proposing that amendment, I meet at least one of the objections raised by the hon. member for East Assiniboia when he asked why it was that Ontario and other provinces should not be treated in the same manner as the maritime provinces I agree to that; I think that every province should be placed in the same category, and that point I have covered by my amendment. Ontario, when she entered confederation, had 82 members; she afterwards went up to 92 and now has 86. Though she has four more than she had at first, it may or may not happen that the increase of population in Ontario will be less in proportion than that of the province of Quebec. But if the population of Ontario increases only in the same proportion to that of Quebec, as before the last decennial census, Ontario will be reduced in ten years to her original representation or perhaps less. My amendment would cover such a case as that. So, in moving this amendment, I wish to call your attention

to the fact that it was drawn so as to cover every province in the Dominion. If it was fair to one, it was fair to all. We are more particularly concerned just now in the maritime provinces, because up to the present we have been the victims of this comparatively small increase of population. Although we have only 4 members in the House of Commons at present, Prince Edward Island has 10,000 more of a population than she had when she entered confederation. Our population may or may not increase; it is not to be expected that a purely agricultural province which, owing to its insular character, is of a restricted area, can increase very rapidly. At the same time, we have now a population per square mile greater than that of any other province in the Dominion, we have a population of from 45 to 50 per square mile. But though we may not have much room for an increase of population as an agricultural community, we may increase in population owing to our fisheries, although I do not myself expect any rapid increase. But we are situated, as you know, in a rather peculiar position; we are an outlying part of the Dominion, and, owing to our isolated position, we have peculiar difficulties to contend with. I am not going to refer to those difficulties now, they have already been referred to on former occasions by members from that province. But owing, as I say, to our peculiar situation, a full representation in parliament is more essential to us than it would be to larger provinces. My hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) pointed out that the principle of representation by population was not adhered to in Great Britain, and was not even adhered to in Canada. The city of Montreal, for instance, has a member for 80,000 of her population, which is much greater than the unit of representation for the Dominion at large. Montreal, therefore, has not representation according to population, and when the time comes that half the population of Quebec will be in the city of Montreal, which is not impossible, then if you adhered strictly to the principle of representation by population, Montreal would return half the representation from the province of Quebec. Such a state of things would be most unfair to the rural constituencies, because it is a well known fact that outlying rural constituencies require greater representation according to population than cities, because their affairs are spread over a larger area. In cities, and districts where population is more dense, the representative can have the whole constituency, so to speak, under his eye, and a member representing 80,000 people in Montreal can attend to their wants just as easily as a member representing 15,000 population in a rural constituency. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the amendment which I have placed in your hands.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John city). It affords me much pleasure indeed to second the amendment which has just been moved by my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Warburton), more especially as it contains exactly the same idea embodied in a resolution that I moved in this House in 1908. As my hon. friend has said, it does equal justice to every province in the Dominion, and calls for no exceptional action in favour of any one province. I may say that I was somewhat surprised to hear some of the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). He went into the matter very vigorously, but I do not think that he studied his subject very thoroughly before he delivered himself on the floor of this House. I expected something a little different from the chivalry and generosity of the west than the evidence that a member from that country was willing to accept favours for his own province and neighbouring provinces which other provinces of this Dominion do not, and have not, enjoyed; but when the lower provinces down by the sea ask to have that treatment continued which was promised to them at the time of confederation, the hon. gentleman threatens if this justice is done to put on his hat and leave the House. I want to remind him that when Alberta and Saskatchewan were admitted to this confederation under the Autonomy Bills, one of the clauses of those Bills provided specifically that for subsidy purposes the population of those two provinces should never be less than a certain figure; although Alberta had not at that time, and I do not suppose she has at this time, the population on which that subsidy was and is reckoned. Therefore I was a little astonished at some of the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia, upon whom I have always looked with a good deal of favour as a gentleman of wide views, and not of the narrow views which he propounded to the House this afternoon. I am afraid he has been taking his brief from the Minister of Justice, because I saw the Minister of Justice alongside of him this afternoon, and he has propounded the same ideas that the Minister of Justice propounded in 1907, namely, that the whole scheme of confederation was adopted by the maritime provinces on the one broad principle of representation by population. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that that principle was never recognized nor adopted by the people of New Brunswick. When the Quebec scheme was laid before the people of New Brunswick, they voted against it by a large majority. When this question was up on a previous occasion, I read some of the remarks of the then Attorney General, afterwards Sir Albert J. Smith, a member of the Mackenzie administration in this House. On the 20th of March, 1866,

when he was Attorney General in the Legislative Assembly, he said:

He would not vote for any scheme that proposed to base representation on population, unless there is some check in it that will prevent the interests of New Brunswick from being swamped by Canada.

You may smile, Mr. Speaker, at the idea that the people of New Brunswick should be afraid of being swamped by Canada in voting power—for in pre-confederation days the old provinces were known to us as Canada. What was the condition of affairs then? The people of the lower provinces had very few relations with the upper provinces, Quebec and Ontario; there was no intermingling of the people. Our business was carried on across the ocean, and with the people of New England States and New York and other seaboard states. They had very little business with the rest of Canada, and there is no doubt that when this matter was brought up they did fear that their interests would be swamped by an increased population in that of Quebec and Ontario. Then if we take Canada as it is now, why, Sir, the people of those provinces never supposed, any more than did the reverend gentleman whose statements were read this afternoon, that the great country west of Ontario to the Rocky mountains was anything else but an inhospitable region unable to support population, and incapable of settlement. I might remind hon. gentlemen, especially those sitting opposite, that even for a number of years after 1867, there were loud cries that it was utterly silly and foolish to build the Canadian Pacific railway through that country, because it was sterile, it was fit for nothing but to be the home of the wolf and the bear. I have no doubt hon. members will recall some such statements as that. Mr. Smith, then, Attorney General, two days afterward said, in the Legislative Assembly:

I'll go down in the ship rather than consent to representation by population, as contained in the Quebec scheme; but I have no objection to going for it, provided there is a check in the formation of the Upper House, or otherwise, that will serve to protect the interests of New Brunswick.

In the following month, a large public meeting was held in St. John on the same subject and the Hon. Peter Mitchell, afterwards well known in the history of Canada and I think the first Minister of Marine, said as was reported in the St. John 'Telegram' of April 21, 1866, as follows:

Hon. Peter Mitchell at last night's public meeting, stated, 'Government would not insist on Quebec scheme of confederation; they would accept such improvements as could be had, and would be willing to allow delegates chosen from both political parties, to go as delegates to the British government to urge such changes and alterations as might meet the views of the maritime provinces.'

That was done. On June 26 a resolution was introduced in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick to the following effect:

Resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to appoint delegates to unite with delegates from the other provinces in arranging with the imperial government for the union of British North America——

Not on the Quebec scheme,

—but upon such terms as will secure the just rights and interests of New Brunswick, accompanied with provision for the immediate construction of the Intercolonial railway.

The province of Nova Scotia passed a resolution identically the same except that it made no reference to the Intercolonial railway. That will, I think, give the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) an idea that there was a great disinclination and a determination not to accept the principle of representation by population out and out. What was the result? In accordance with this resolution delegates were sent to the old country. They attended the London conference, and this difficulty of the representation of the maritime provinces was the great stumbling block in the negotiations. An effort was made to introduce something into the Act that would serve as a check, as Sir Albert Smith and the Hon. Peter Mitchell urged, on the idea of representation by population, so that the maritime provinces should not lose their representation, if, as was expected, they did not increase in population as rapidly as the other provinces. Hon. George Brown, who has been spoken of as the great advocate of representation by population, and who certainly took a very active part in this confederation scheme, was troubled over the conditions with which they were met by the fact of these maritime provinces not being willing to consent to that scheme in its entirety, preferring rather to keep out of confederation altogether than to go in with the knowledge that in a few short years their voting influence and their representative influence in the parliament of Canada would be so weakened that it would be really swamped. The result was the framing of subsection 4, section 51, and known as the saving clause which is as follows:

On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of any province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

Mr. Brown thought this clause so valuable that he said of it 'The practical result will be that while lower Canada certainly will not be less, and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of their representatives.'

Then comes the question, what is 'The number of the aggregate population of Canada' To find what comprised Canada, you have only to look at the third section of the British North America Act. That sections reads:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, to declare by proclamation that, on and after a day therein appointed, not being more than six months after the passing of this Act, the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick shall form and be one Dominion under the name of Canada; and on and after that day those three provinces shall form and be one Dominion under that name accordingly.

Under that saving clause the maritime provinces joined confederation. What has been the result? They have found that their charter has been broken, that this saving clause which was put in to prevent their losing representatives has been made of no effect whatever by the subsequent amendments which have been made to the British North America Act, including the population of all the rest of Canada, instead of that merely of the four provinces. The result of that has been that whereas if the original Act of 1867 had been carried out, we would not have lost our representatives, on account of these amendments being read into the Act, and the great population that has been brought into Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia and these other parts which have been included in the Dominion of Canada we have been robbed of our representatives when we ought to have been protected by this parliament. It was on account of these amendments being read into the old Act that the Privy Council decided as it did, because it gave its decision on the law as they found it. That is the great grievance which we in the maritime provinces have; to use a common expression we have been gold bricked by these various amendments which, without our knowledge and consent, have been made to the British North America Act. We cannot seek redress in the law courts, we have to appeal to this parliament as the great high court of equity, constituted to redress the grievances of any part of the Dominion.

Let me refer to the effect which the enlargement of the province of Quebec will have, if it has not already had, on the unit of representation. In 1907, when the Minister of Justice spoke on this question, he declared that there was no doubt in the world that the Quebec which was considered in the Act of 1867 was the Quebec whose northern boundary was the height of land separating the Hudson bay waters from the St. Lawrence waters, and that being so it requires no argument to show that the additional area added to Quebec affects the unit of representation and gives us of the maritime provinces a very real grievance. In the British North America Act of 1871 there is provision for enlargement of the boundaries of the various provinces, but the very section giving that power states that it can only be done on arrangements being made with any other province affected thereby. The Minister of Justice, in the course of that address, also stated that if the lower provinces were wrongfully dealt with in 1901, they should have protested, and that having kept silent they had no right to complain now. But, we have no reason to suppose that were a protest made at that time it would be heeded. Let me call attention to the fact that in 1905 the legislature of New Brunswick did protest to this parliament. When the legislation providing for the autonomy of Alberta and Saskatchewan was before the House the New Brunswick legislature protested against the population of these two provinces being also read into the British North America Act so as to be considered when the representation in this parliament was being readjusted. But, the right hon. gentleman and his government paid no attention to that protest although Mr. Tweedie, now the lieutenant governor of the province, and others who are now close to the Prime Minister, were very strong in supporting it. Mr. Tweedie commenced his remarks by blaming those who were formerly interested in provincial affairs and who had moved to the higher political sphere forgetting their province when they came to this Dominion parliament, but I will not refer to that part of his speech. He said:

'At the time of confederation Quebec had certain well defined boundaries. According to the census of 1871, it had an area of 193,555 square miles. Quebec is the province by which the representation of the other provinces is regulated. In 1898 an Act was passed which extended the boundaries of Quebec so that it contained 351,000 square miles, an addition of 158,000 square miles to its territory. This territory thus added to Quebec is that territory through which the Grand Trunk Pacific will pass, and which we may expect to become populous in the future. The result will be to diminish our representation in a way never contemplated by the British North America Act.'

I call the attention of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) to that statement. On the same occasion in the New Brunswick legislature there was a speech also made by a gentleman, who, however we may differ about him in other respects,

we all agree is a very able lawyer, and anything he states in his legal capacity commands attention. I refer to the Hon. Wm. Pugsley who is now Minister of Public Works, and who was then Attorney General of the province, and who speaking to the resolution moved in the legislature of New Brunswick in 1905, said:

I have never entertained the slightest doubt that the fathers of confederation in framing their scheme of representation intended that it should be confined to the four original provinces of Canada, and that if other provinces were admitted it should be on terms. In that view I was fortified by the statement of one of the greatest statesmen of Canada, who was himself one of the fathers of confederation, and who took a leading part in bringing it about. I refer to the late Sir John A. Macdonald who in his report of the 29th December, 1870, on the admission of the Northwest Territory said:

'The general purview of the British North America Act of 1867 seems to be confined to the four provinces upper and lower Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick originally forming the Dominion.'

I call these words specially to the notice of the right hon. the Prime Minister because I understand that he once held—whether he does now or not I do not know—a different view, and that he contended that Canada was not originally confined to the four provinces but included all that might be added at any time since. Then the Hon. Mr. Pugsley also said:

When British Columbia was admitted into the union it was stipulated that her representation should be increased under the terms of the British North America Act and that this Act should apply as if she had been one of the original provinces of the confederation, the same thing was done with respect to Manitoba. Now what has been the effect of this? It is that you must construe the British North America Act as if these provinces had been in the union in 1876.'

'If that is so, the compact of confederation has been violated by legislation and by order in council without being consulted. Surely the authorities at Ottawa should see that this wrong is remedied.

If the population of the territories and of British Columbia had been excluded New Brunswick would not have lost a representative.'

'Some may say it will be difficult to have the wrong done us righted, but I think that it can be. I have faith in the sense of justice of those administering the affairs of the Dominion.'

'I can only repeat what I said yesterday, that the province of New Brunswick entered into confederation with Quebec with certain defined boundaries, and that it was never contemplated that a Quebec should be created double the size of the original province. Yet Quebec is the pivotal province upon which the representation of this province depends. I feel that they have done us a great wrong, yet I do not despair but that when the matter is brought to the notice of the government and the parliament, some steps will be taken to see that this injustice is not continued.'

I believe that Saint Paul says that faith is the substance of things hoped for, and I hope that my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has that faith, will also obtain the substance of the things which we hope for, and will be able, through his influence in the Cabinet, to have righted some of the wrongs to which we have been referring this afternoon.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I had just read the opinions and statements uttered in the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick with regard to the matter under discussion by the then Attorney General of New Brunswick, and now the Minister of Public Works in this government. When a gentleman of his well known legal ability expresses an opinion, it must be received with the greatest respect.

The subject we have before us to-night is an amendment asking that the minimum representation of every province in the Dominion, or which hereafter may join the Dominion, shall never be less than the representation given to it at the time of its admission. In other words, that would apply the principle to all the provinces which now applies to British Columbia. The principle of course is not a new one. It is carried out in the constitution of the Australian commonwealth, and I believe it is given effect to in the United States not alone with regard to the Senate but also with regard to congress. The idea is also embodied, as I stated before six o'clock, in our law regarding subsidies for the new provinces, in which it was provided that no matter how much smaller the population of the two provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan should become, their subsidies would never be less than those provided in the Acts creating these provinces.

I have spoken about the protest which was sent to His Excellency the Governor General and the Privy Council and also to the right hon. the Prime Minister against the admission of the population of the new provinces into the British North America Act, so that it might also be counted against the lower provinces when their representation came to be adjusted. I shall not read the preamble but will place the protest on 'Hansard.' The preamble recites the fact that the

Privy Council left undecided the question whether the population of the territories should be included in the population of Canada, under subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act. It refers to the fact that the imperial order in council admitting British Columbia and the statute admitting Manitoba provided that the British North America Act of 1867 should apply to them as if they formed part of the original confederation, thus prejudicing the position of the original parties to the agreement. It refers to the enlargement of the boundaries of the province of Quebec without making provision for the effect thereof on the other provinces, and the resolution which was passed unanimously by the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick is as follows:

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House the earnest attention of the government of Canada should be drawn to the effect of the said order in council and statutes, respectively, relating to the admission to the union of British Columbia and Manitoba, and it should be requested to take such action as may be necessary in order to restore the four original provinces to the position in which they would have been but for the order in council and legislation passed subsequently to the Act of 1867 in respect to which, such provinces were not consulted, and to which they were not parties. (2) That in the Act for the creation of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan it should not be provided that the Act should apply to them as if they were in the union originally, and the rights of the original provinces as to revision should not be affected by the creation of such new provinces. (3) That the injustice to the other provinces, particularly New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which have no opportunity for enlargement of their areas, it should have been provided, and should now be provided, that for purposes of representation the boundaries of Quebec, the population of which is the basis of representation, should be deemed to be as they were at the time of confederation, or that some just and equitable provision should be made to save the other original provinces and also Prince Edward Island from loss in the representation. Further resolved that a copy of the aforesaid resolution, signed by the clerk of this House, be forwarded to the Secretary of State with the request that the same be placed before His Excellency the Governor General and that a copy be also forwarded to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister.

I noticed, when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was speaking this afternoon, that he threw out his chest and with an air of great importance informed the House and the country that he represented 45,000 people. Well, let me tell the hon. gentleman that quite a number of members in this House represent 45,000 people and more. I represent that number myself and I never thought it necessary to proclaim the fact as did the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) represents a constituency which has at least 50,000 people. No doubt the constituency of Westmorland, New Brunswick contains over 45,000 inhabitants. There is the constituency of Cape Breton South which has as large a population. I think, as Cumberland, while Halifax county of Nova Scotia, is the largest contituency in the whole Dominion. So that there was no reason for my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) being so chesty, more especially when we take into account the class of people he represents. The people we represent in the maritime provinces are the descendants of the early settlers—English, Scotch, Irish and French. But who does my hon. friend represent? He represents, to a large extent, Galicians, Lithuanians, Ruthenians, Buckowinians, and possibly Doukhobors, all new comers, a great many exceedingly illiterate, not able to speak the language of the country and unacquainted with its constitution. But because he represents some 45,000 of these people, largely the flotsam and jetsam of southern Europe, my hon. friend has all the assertiveness of a grand pasha, and strives to place himself on a par or above par as compared with the representatives of constituencies such as we have in the martitime provinces. Sir, I think there is no comparison between them whatever. But even if we consider only number and not quality, my hon. friend is not a representative of more people than the average member from the maritime provinces.

What we are asking for is what we believe to be the simplest ways of remedying the injustice to which we have hitherto been obliged to submit. There can be no doubt that it is an injustice. Where there is a legal wrong there should be a legal remedy, and that legal remedy cannot be found in our courts, it cannot be found in the Privy Council, the only place where it can be found is this parliament.

And we make this appeal, not for charity, not for something to which we are not entitled; we make our appeal for the granting of our legal rights, rights which have been taken away from us by legislation passed by the imperial parliament at the instance of this parliament; we ask for equity and right treatment from this parliament as the only means by which that wrong can be righted. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House. I have, on one or two occasions, spoken on this subject. It is one that I think very much of, and it is of most signal importance to the people of the maritime provinces. It has not, perhaps, reached the stage of agitation to any great extent yet, but I am quite satisfied that, unless justice is done to us in this respect, agitation will arise in the maritime provinces and that it will continue to aggrandize and enlarge itself until the peo-

ple of the maritime provinces, in so far as the rest of the Dominion is concerned, will show themselves to be in a very dissatisfied condition. And I think it would be far better for this parliament to use good judgment now, at a time when it can be done without any straining, without any complaint, with good-will to all. I have a great deal of confidence, as I stated, in the opinion expressed by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). We have in the present cabinet, as has already been mentioned, three members from the maritime provinces, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), every one of them the holder of a very important portfolio. I cannot but believe that if these hon. gentlemen use the influence that they have with the other hon. members of the government of Canada, there can be no doubt that the justice which we are asking for, the equity which we appeal for, will be done, and that at no distant day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not wish to interrupt my hon friend (Mr. Daniel) in the course of his argument. Would he be kind enough to explain to the House what he meant by stating that the maritime provinces are labouring under an injustice?

Mr. DANIEL. I shall have very great pleasure in doing so. I am sorry the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was not in when I referred to that part of my subject this afternoon. The injustice under which the maritime provinces are labouring is that the saving clause which was placed in the British North America Act of 1867 was made perfectly nugatory and useless by the amendments which afterwards were made to that Act at the instance of this parliament, by which the population of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia were read into the British North America Act and were counted against us when the Redistribution Bills were made up, so that we could know how many representatives we were to have. As a proof of the importance of that fact, I would like to call the right hon. Prime Minister's attention once more to the fact that if the British North America Act, 1867, had been alone used in connection with the last Redistribution Bill, that is if the population of the four provinces originally forming the confederation had alone been counted, the province of New Brunswick and, I think, the province of Nova Scotia would not have lost their representation as they did lose it under that Redistribution Bill. I hope I have made myself clear. That is the gist, the crux of the whole question. That is why we make our complaint—that, without any consultation with the maritime provinces, without the matter being referred to them at any time in any way, the whole benefit of that saving clause has been literally stolen away from us, and we have ceased to receive the benefit from it. to which we are entitled.

Mr. GEO. E. McCRANEY (Saskatoon). Mr. Speaker, for a number of sessions this question of the representation of the maritime provinces has been discussed. It is only with this parliament that the question becomes one of practical politics, because we have in view the redistribution which must take place after the census of 1911 and the changes which are consequent upon it. The proposal which is laid down in the resolution of my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) is that the principle of representation by population, which is incorporated in the British North America Act, be varied, and that there be secured to the maritime provinces for the future a representation which, possibly, their population will not call for. That also is the effect of the amendment of my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton), and, for that reason, the amendment is as objectionable to us who represent the west, which is particularly in the minds of these hon. gentlemen, as is the original resolution. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken, have gone on the assumption that, had their representatives, at the time when the basis of confederation was laid down, insisted on a minimum representation for the maritime provinces, that wish would have been acceded to. I think, Sir, that we should read history somewhat and remember what was in the minds of the representatives from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec when the conferences were going on which led up to the terms of confederation. It is well known to members of this House that this very question of representation was a vexed question in the two Canadas for many years. The basis of representation in the parliament of the united Canadas was that each province should have a representation of 42 members. There was certainly a minimum representation fixed there; and if these hon. gentlemen who are advocating a minimum representation now are looking for results, I think that in the future they may expect the very results which came from this basis of representation in the provinces in the old parliament of Canada. It is very well known, too, that the population of the province of Ontario so increased that it was entitled to very much larger representation than the province of Quebec. Reference has been made to the discussion of that time, and to the part which the Hon. George Brown took in the agitation and his strong move, on the platform and in the 'Globe' newspaper, for representation by population. Those great men who had had experience in the parliament of Canada, representing both the province of Quebec and the province of

Ontario, knowing the heart-burnings which had been caused by this very principle which was laid down of a minimum—and I may add maximum—representation, were very careful to see that no such question should arise in the new Dominion which, fortunately, was the solution of the difficulties of the two provinces.

The representatives from the maritime provinces who have spoken to-day have assumed that if the members from the maritime provinces had only insisted on a minimum representation at the Quebec conference and at the Charlottetown conference that would have been agreed to. We cannot very well guess what those men would have done. My own view is, in view of the history of that day, and of what the men of Ontario and Quebec knew about this question of representation, that insistence upon such terms would have kept the maritime provinces out of confederation rather than have brought them into it. I do think that if the members from the maritime provinces who were at these conferences had looked to the future with prophetic eye, and had insisted that the population of the maritime provinces should be the unit of representation, retaining the number of members which they had at that time, that would have been acceded to, and it would have been carrying out the principle of representation by population. That is the only argument which they can make to-day. It is less objectionable than the other argument, because it is in line with a principle. But to my mind it would also be objectionable, because it would only justify the existing condition of things, and it would add much to the number of members in this House, which I think is large enough now, and which in a few years would make it a cumbersome body?

Mr. DANIEL. How many would it add? Would the hon. member please say.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have not figured that up. We are going to make no changes; if I thought we were, I would perhaps spend some time on the mathematics of the question. As a matter of fact, the fathers of confederation did make provision for the falling off in the population of some of the provinces, they could not foresee at that time which provinces they might be, by providing that if the decrease was not greater than five per cent there should be no loss of representation; that was one point. On the other hand, in the composition of the Senate, the maritime provinces were given 24 members, the province of Quebec was given 24, and the province of Ontario was given 24—no question of representation by population entering into the composition of the Senate. The Senate was to be the guardian of provincial rights, and whatever guardianship the Senate is able to offer at the present time, exists now on that basis, and the maritime provinces are as strong there as ever they were.

One would almost assume, from the discussion in this House to-day, that there was a struggle between the east and the west, and that the east were afraid of losing something because we in the west hope, in a few years, largely to increase our population. Mr. Speaker, if there has been any strife between the east and the west it has not entered this House. As a western representative, I think I may say that the proposals of the west, and they have been many, and we have made great demands, we have a great future—these demands have been met in a liberal spirit, by the people of the east. I have always said that on my own platform, and I am going to say it here. The people of the west have never shown any antagonism to the people of the east.

Mr. McKENZIE. Nobody says that they did.

Mr. McCRANEY. I am inferring that from the argument.

Mr. McKENZIE. The hon. member has no right to infer anything.

Mr. McCRANEY. At any rate, I am denying that such is the case. As long as provincialism is kept out, the east and west will get along together; it is only by the introduction of provincialism that there will be any strife. My hon. friend from St. John spoke about the make-up of the constituency which was represented by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff): Galicians, Buckowinians, Doukhobors, Ruthenians—all speaking unknown tongues—if I understood him aright, the flotsam and the jetsam of southern Europe. My hon. friend informs me that he has none of that population in his riding.

An hon. MEMBER. Four Galicians.

Mr. McCRANEY. Four Galicians, some Germans, and I have no doubt they can all speak the English language. The argument of my hon. friend is that because the people of the maritime provinces have a better educated ancestry, and are better educated themselves to-day, therefore they should count more in the numerical representation of this parliament than do these communities in the west which are largely made up of foreign population. Well, while these conditions do not exist in the constituency of my hon. friend from Assiniboia, I may tell you that they do exist in the constituency I have the honour to represent: French Canadians, Galicians, Buckowinians, Mennonites, Slovacs, Norwegians, Doukhobors, Americans, Canadians. I am very proud to represent such a constituency growing up in the Northwest

of Canada, and growing, I am proud to say, into a Canadian citizenship which will make them the equal of any population which Canada produces.

My hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) stated that the balance of power in the west was held by people from the maritime provinces. I am not able to verify that statement, but I hope it is true. Some years ago there was a large emigration from the maritime provinces, and I am sorry to say it was not to the Canadian west, it was largely to the American states. The tide has turned, we are getting a large population from the maritime provinces. I have been struck with the way in which our own Canadian people are coming back from the United States into western Canada. I have run across so many from northern Dakota and northern Minnesota, who, themselves or their parents, emigrated from Ontario, particularly to the western States, and whose children or themselves are returning to Canada, that, in my part of the country, when a man tells me that he came from north Dakota or from north Minnesota, I always ask him: What part of Ontario did you come from?

There are some counties in the northern part of north Dakota which I could name where the population is very largely Canadian. My only regret is that we are getting, in many cases, only the children, and that of that good Canadian population which should have come into our west we are getting only a few. I am sorry that we are not repatriating people from the maritime provinces. The maritime province men invariably went into the eastern United States, and they did not find farm life there congenial to them. Had they gone into the American west, we might have got them, but I am afraid that most of the people from the maritime provinces who went to the United States prior, say, to 1900, are lost to Canada. But times have changed and we are getting them now. I hope it is true, as my hon. friend has said, that the maritime provinces have the balance of power in the west. I think it has always been true that the maritime provinces have held the balance of power in Canada. It has not been because of provincialism on the part of the maritime provinces that they have held that position, it is because their leading men were not provincialists but great Canadians, and I need only point to such names as the Tuppers, father and son; Sir John Thompson and Sir Leonard Tilley. I would note that the first lieutenant of the Prime Minister is a Nova Scotia man, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is a Nova Scotia man, and his first lieutenant, although representing an Ontario constituency, claims the province of New Brunswick as his birthplace. The Canadianism of the maritime provinces has shown itself not only in these great men who have taken part in the political life of this country, but it has shown itself in the way in which they have taken their position in the interior provinces, in our universities. I need only point to the fact that the late Sir William Dawson, a Pictou man, was president of McGill. The late Principal Grant was a Nova Scotia man, When the University of Toronto wanted a president, they took President Falconer from Nova Scotia. The successor to the late Principal Grant is Dr. Gordon, also a Nova Scotia man. All these go to confirm the statement which my hon. friend makes as applied to Canada as a whole, that the balance of power, in fact I might say the predominating influence in Canada, is a maritime province influence, and I must say, as a Canadian, I am very proud indeed of the maritime province men who have made such a stand.

There is another thing; if the population of the maritime provinces was being lost to Canada, it would be a matter of very great regret not only to the people of the lower provinces, but to us all as good Canadians. We are glad indeed that in our Canadian west we are having maritime province men in our professions, in our lines of business and in our schools. The Chief Justice of my own province of Saskatchewan, Chief Justice Wetmore, is a New Brunswicker; the Attorney General, Hon. Mr. Turgeon, is a New Brunswicker; the president of the new University of Saskatchewan, opened last September, is Dr. Walter Murray, lately of Dalhousie College.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A New Brunswicker.

Mr. McCRANEY. And as my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works says, a New Brunswicker. The time will come when the preponderance of population will be west of the Great Lakes, and when the great representation in this House will come from there also.

My hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Warburton) said that he did not think that these maritime province men in the west would see any injustice done to the maritime provinces. I am sure they will not. As western men, they are not provincialists, you will not find them standing out for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta against the east. I think you will find them big Canadians, willing to do their share in the progress of the maritime provinces, as well as in that of the Canadian west in which they are living. The only danger in which we are in the west is from provincialism. I do not think that such a resolution as is put forward by my hon. friend, with its amendment, is going to

put down provincialism. It is said by these hon. gentlemen that if we only make the changes which they suggest we shall have peace, that can be the only object of the discussion which they have brought on. I believe that if their proposals were acceded to, we would have the same kind of peace after 25 years that they had when the Canadas were united and when the basis of representation was fixed in the Act of British North America by the men who then struggled for some new form of government to get out of a dilemma. I have only to say, in conclusion, that so long as there is no provincialism, and so long as there is a Canadian spirit, east and west will work together. It matters little as to the numbers of the representatives that are in this House, it matters very much as to the kind of representatives who are here. I have no doubt that in the future the maritime provinces will do as they have done in the past, and send us their very best, and if they do that, if they send the kind of representative that has always been here, there will be no danger at all to the interests of the maritime provinces.

I may say that if this question comes to a vote I shall be bound to vote against both the motion and the amendment.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, New Brunswick). Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my voice to what has already been said on behalf of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. Warburton), and seconded by my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel). It seems to me that the mover and seconder of this amendment have made out a case which must appeal to that sense of justice and fair play which, aside from party questions, ought to animate this parliament in its deliberations. The mover and seconder of this resolution have shown that the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island were in a peculiar situation when the confederation compact was negotiated, they were small provinces, with small areas, with no opportunity of expansion of any kind. They could not possibly hope to keep abreast with the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec in the increase of their population. These two small provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were giving up the control of their own affairs with respect to which they formerly had full and plenary powers; they were assigning to the large Dominion parliament in which they were to be greatly outnumbered the control of their trade and commerce, their criminal laws, the right of taxation, and the other important subjects which are assigned to this parliament by the terms of the Confederation Act. In return for that they asked some slight concessions, and I think it will be agreed by any student of the history of the confederation conferences, that these concessions were practically agreed to by the delegates from Ontario and Quebec. The concession which they chiefly asked was a slight modification of the principle of representation by population. There can be no doubt—I do not deny it, and I do not think it will be denied by anybody—that representation by population was laid down as the guiding principle of representation when this confederation was formed. But the delegates from the smaller provinces insisted that there should be some modification of that principle, and the modification which was assented to by the delegates representing the four original provinces is to be found in section 51 of the British North America Act which I propose to put on record, because, although subsection 4 has been referred to, there is a point in the first subsection which is important in this discussion:

On the completion of the census in the year 1871, and on each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces—

I would wish the House to mark this:

—the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority, in such a manner, and from such time, as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules:—

(1) Quebec shall have the fixed number of 65 members.

(2) There shall be assigned to each of the other provinces such a number of members as will bear the same proportion to the number of its population (ascertained at such census) as the number of 65 bears to the number of population of Quebec (so ascertained).

(3) In the computation of the number of members for a province as a fractional part not exceeding one-half of the whole number requisite for entitling the province to a member shall be disregarded; but a fractional part exceeding one-half of that number shall be equivalent to the whole number.

And this is the subsection which has been spoken of as the saving clause and offered to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as a guarantee against diminution of representation:

On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province as ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

That is the section that covers the representation of the different provinces in this House. It will be seen that the original British North America Act contemplated only four provinces and that this

very section uses the expression 'four provinces.' The agreement and the compact was so entered into between these four provinces. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) and my hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Warburton) quoted the declarations which were made by Mr. Galt and the Hon. George Brown upon this question, and the declarations which were made in the legislatures of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island with reference to the contention which those provinces were making. They felt there was a danger in giving up the control of their affairs to such a large parliament as this that they would be outnumbered, and that they could not keep abreast with the increase of the population of Ontario and Quebec. It will not, I think, be disputed by any member of this House that that was the position which those delegates took. When the principle of representation by population was under discussion they made this claim and subsection 4 of section 51 was offered to the delegates of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as a sure and certain safeguard against any reduction of the representation of these provinces. And Mr. Speaker, it would have been a sure and certain safeguard had it not been for the developments which have taken place since and which could not possibly have been foreseen at that time. They were far-seeing statesmen in those days, but how could they possibly have divined the wonderful development and growth of the Northwest Territories? Since that compact was entered into no less than five provinces have been admitted to the union with the result that that which was offered to the delegates of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as an absolute safeguard against any reduction of their representation has been practically read out of the Act. Another thing which occurred after the confederation conferences which had its effect in altering the conditions, was the extension of the boundaries of the province of Quebec. Quebec was made the pivotal province so far as representation was concerned and the province of Quebec had the advantage of having a minimum representation fixed.

Mr. TALBOT. And a maximum as well.

Mr. CROCKET. And a maximum as well. But so far as Ontario and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were concerned they accepted subsection 4 of section 51 as a protection in that particular. It was felt in the maritime provinces, as I think all members of the House will agree, that in order to have effective representation in the large federal parliament composed of upwards of 190 members there must be a minimum of representation fixed. It was felt in New Brunswick that to ensure effective representation of that province and the exercise of the fair influence to which that province was entitled in the confederacy, we should have at least fifteen members, and, the people of Nova Scotia in like manner felt they should have at least nineteen members. That was the representation which was assigned to these provinces at the union, with this saving clause, that there should be no reduction unless the proportion which the population of each of those provinces should bear to the aggregate population of Canada should be reduced by a one-twentieth part or over. Take the case of the last census; it is true that had the population of Canada been reckoned under the terms of that section as it was embodied in the original Confederation Act and made applicable only to the four original provinces: Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, neither Nova Scotia nor New Brunswick would have lost a member as actually happened.

It was only for the reason I have pointed out, that five new provinces have since been admitted to this union, that this result took place. I appeal to the hon. members of this House, if it strikes them as fair or equitable that that expression 'four provinces' in that section of the British North America Act should be construed to mean nine provinces. That is, however, just what the judgment of the Judicial Committee, of the Privy Council means. Although the expression 'four provinces' was used in that section on which we rely, the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada held that in consequence, not of anything contained in the original Act to which we were parties, but of amendments having been made in it afterwards, with reference to which we had not been consulted, the meaning of the section was changed. I ask hon. members if it is fair or equitable that, although that was held, in the very judgment that has been referred to, to be the meaning at the time, we should be held bound by a change of that meaning effected by legislation to which we were not parties at all. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) has stated, in his very able argument this afternoon, that the judgment of the court proceeded upon that ground; and in order that hon. members may see that his contentions were well founded, I am going to read a few brief extracts from the judgment of the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. Perhaps I should first point out that the amendments to which I refer as having been subsequently made to this Act were the amendments made to the Imperial Act of 1871, the Act of 1875 and the Act of 1886. Mr. Justice Davies, in the course of his judgment, used this language:

After careful consideration of the whole Act, and its amendments, I have concluded that the expression 'four provinces' means and must be construed as 'several provinces.'

I have no doubt, reading into this Act those subsequent amendments, that that is a sound judgment, and that technically and legally Mr. Justice Davies was quite right; but I ask this House to consider this question, not upon strict legal grounds —because we all recognize that in strict law we are bound by this judgment—but whether that is a construction by which in equity we should be bound, when the courts of this country hold that the expression 'Canada', consisting of four provinces means for the purpose of the readjustment of our representation 'Canada consisting of nine provinces.' Further, he said:

If any reasonable doubts did exist as to the true meaning of the sections under review, this subsequent imperial legislation would seem to remove them.

That the judgment of Mr. Justice Davies was based, not on the original Confederation Act, but on the subsequent amendments which were made without the smaller provinces consenting thereto is abundantly clear from these extracts. Further on, Mr. Justice Davies said:

Upon the whole, after careful consideration, I am of the opinion that after the admission of new provinces and territories into the union, the expression 'Canada' and 'provinces' throughout the Act of 1867 must, unless specially restricted by the context, be necessarily given an interpretation different from that which they respectively bore before these provinces and territories were admitted.

Then there was the judgment of the chief justice, Sir Elzear Taschereau:

It may be well that the framers of the British North America Act have not foreseen or provided for every possible eventuality in the positions of the different provinces of the Dominion as to population or other matters; it may be that some provinces would have refused to join the union had they foreseen all the results that their adhesion to it is now ascertained to carry, but with such considerations we are not here concerned.

A very proper dictum in a judgment determining a matter on strict legal principles; but I ask hon. members of this House whether such considerations are those by which the parliament of Canada should be bound.

Now, I must express my very great surprise at the opposition to this resolution which has come from hon. members from western Canada. I was particularly surprised at the speech of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who frankly stated that he did not know very much about the legal aspect of the case, and I think that before he concluded he convinced the House that that statement was absolutely correct. What astonished me more than anything else was the threat which that hon. gentleman made that he would resign his seat in this House if this proposal were adopted. The hon. gentleman based his whole argument upon an assumption which I have shown was erroneous. He dealt with this matter as if the maritime provinces were appealing to this House as a matter of favour or grace. That is not the situation at all. It might possibly appear to be so from the terms of the original resolution, and I quite concur in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Assiniboia, that to be logical and consistent, we should ask for the restoration of the representation which was assigned to us when we entered the union. I think, from what has been stated so well by my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) and my hon. friend from the city of Charlottetown (Mr. Warburton), and from the quotations which I have read from the judgments of the Supreme Court, the hon. member for Assiniboia should recognize that we are not asking this matter as a favour. We are asking that a positive injustice which has been done to the maritime provinces in the matter of its representation be remedied by this parliament, and it is only upon that ground that such a request could be made. We think that has been fully established, and I have listened in vain for anything either in the speech of my hon. friend from Assiniboia or the speech of my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), which in any way meets the case which has been so well made out by the mover and the seconder of this resolution. Those hon. gentlemen spoke as if we were seeking to disturb the principle of representation by population and to alter the terms of the British North America Act. We are not seeking to do anything of the kind. We are asking to have restored to us a right of which we have been deprived by the amendments to the British North America Act to which I have referred, and by the admission of five new provinces into this confederation, which, under the meaning of that Act as it was passed and as it was accepted by the delegates from the maritime provinces, was never intended to enter into the calculation when the question of the readjustment of the representation in this parliament should be dealt with. I deprecate the position which my hon. friend from Assiniboia took. I do not think he breathes the spirit or gives voice to the sentiment of the west on this question. I know certainly of one hon. member from the west who, after hearing the very able speech of my hon. friend from St. John

(Mr. Daniel) this afternoon said that the latter had made out a good case and that so far as he was concerned he would, as a representative of the west, vote for it. I would put the question to my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) whether members from the east are disposed to deal with a question affecting the west in the same spirit as the hon. gentleman displayed this afternoon. If they did, what would become of this parliament? Can the hon. gentleman point to any occasion in which the east has shown any disposition whatever to treat the west with anything else than the utmost generosity?

Mr. TURRIFF. Has the west ever shown any disposition to treat the east with anything but fair play, justice and generosity.

Mr. CROCKET. It is not very often that representatives from the east demand anything from this parliament. This is one of the first things we have asked since I have been a member, and the first voice raised against that request is that of my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and he is not content with simply opposing it, but threatens to resign his seat if it be granted. I do not know that I could retaliate by threatening to resign mine if it be not granted. I do not think that would have very much effect, but it would certainly create a very interesting situation if some of our good Liberal friends from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island would threaten to resign if this measure of justice should be denied them. I have confidence in the fairness and the justice of this House upon questions that are not party questions, and I am convinced that members of this House who have studied this question and have followed the debate, must be themselves convinced that a case has been made out to which no adequate answer has been or can be made.

Mr. J. W. RICHARDS (Prince, P.E.I.). I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Warburton). The question now under consideration has been brought up in this House on several occasions. I understand that in the session of 1907, and also in 1908, a lengthy discussion took place with regard to this question of representation. In the province from which I have the honour to come, it is one that has been agitating the minds of the people for a considerable time. You are all aware that Prince Edward Island was very reluctant to join confederation, and it was only after some years of discussion and considerable agitation that it decided to throw in its lot with the union. But there was one question standing out very prominently that is, the question of representation and we were not anxious to enter confederation unless we were assured that we would have six representatives in this House for all time to come. I do not think it necessary to read the despatches and telegrams which were passed at the time the negotiations were going on for the purpose of bringing Prince Edward Island into the union, as these have been already presented to the House and to the country. But there can be no doubt that the intention was to give Prince Edward Island six members for all time to come, and when, on the readjustment in 1891, we lost one member, there was very much dissatisfaction in our province. There was, however, a strong belief in the minds of the people that some measure would be taken to rectify what was considered an oversight on the part of our delegates in negotiating the terms of confederation. The matter went before the courts and ultimately to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The decision was adverse to our contention, and now we can only look to the parliament of Canada for redress of what we consider was an error at the time and which is to-day a grievance. Should we continue to lose our representation in the same ratio as we have done in the past, it will not be many years before we shall have but one or perhaps no representative at all. I do not know what shall be done when that condition comes about; but if there be a desire to remedy this grievance, this is the opportune time to do it. Our Dominion census will be taken again in June, and after that time there will be no doubt redistribution of the representation in this House. The present would be, therefore, the best time for this parliament to take some definite steps and have the matter settled. It is not my intention to go over the ground which has been so well covered by the different speakers this afternoon. I rise only to place on record my views on behalf of my constituents in Prince county, Prince Edward Island. Time and again they have urged me to bring this matter before parliament; and in doing so I am simply discharging a duty which I owe those I represent, and I can only express the strong hope and conviction that this parliament will take such measures as will restore to the maritime provinces the representation they had when they entered confederation. In doing this, parliament would be accomplishing a graceful and generous act. It would remove a grievance and do an act of justice which would be very much appreciated and go a long way to remove the discontent now existing in the maritime provinces.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I think that perhaps it would not be out of place for me to make a few remarks on this very important question, more especially as my hon. friend who seconded the amendment (Mr. Daniel) has referred to the argument I made on the

subject while a member of the provincial legislature and also to the fact that I acted for the province of New Brunswick when the case was argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. In my opinion the way in which this matter should be presented is rather along the line taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Richards) than along that taken by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket). My hon. friend from York said that a great injustice was done the maritime provinces, and he claims that these provinces were not here asking for a favour but demanding, as a matter of right, that a change should be made in the representation.

Mr. CROCKET. If my hon. friend will pardon me, I said we were demanding the restoration of a right of which we had been deprived.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon. gentleman to say, and I think I understood him correctly, that it is not as a matter of favour, but rather as a matter of right that the representation should be restored to what it was. But it seems to me that my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Richards) has put the matter on the only ground on which it can be put, and that is that it would be a generous thing for the larger provinces to recognize the dissatisfaction existing in the maritime provinces and which is bound to increase as our representation declines. It would be an act of broad generosity, for the larger provinces to recognize that fact, to deal in this spirit with the smaller provinces and to restore the representation to what it was at the time of confederation and below which the people then thought it never would fall. The reason that I say that it cannot be said that an injustice has been done to the lower provinces is that we have no right to complain of what is the interpretation given to the constitution by the highest court of the realm. Under confederation we have a supreme court for the whole Dominion constituted by virtue of the provisions of the constitutional Act, under which the constitution may be interpreted. The question of representation came before that court and that judgment was given. Appeal was taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Act was interpreted by that tribunal. We are bound by that interpretation; the smaller provinces are as much bound by it as the larger provinces; and no province has any right to complain when the constitution is being lived up to by the provinces of Canada. Therefore, it is that I say we cannot base our claim upon the ground that any injustice has been done to us. When I was arguing the matter in the provincial legislature, upon the occasion to which my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) refers, I was arguing in the light of the constitution as I interpreted it. But I was contending that, according to the true meaning of section 51 of the British North America Act, the 'four provinces' meant the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I thought that was a fair and reasonable interpretation to give to those words. But the Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have held otherwise, and we cannot complain of the decision which these courts have given. It is the decision of the highest court in the empire and we are bound to regard that as a correct interpretation.

Mr. CROCKET. Was not the argument referred to made after the delivery of the judgment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One argument was made after the delivery of the judgment, I think, at the time the resolution was passed. But, if I remember rightly, I made an argument before the case went to the Judicial Committee. Possibly an argument was made after, at the time of the resolution which was forwarded to this parliament and to His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. DANIEL. In 1905 that was.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may have been referring to the latter argument. But I do not know that that alters the case. We cannot complain that any injustice has been done to us by reason of the interpretation that the highest court of the empire has given to the British North America Act. My hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) said that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has given a decision which has taken away the rights of the maritime provinces, and that that decision was based on legislation put through this parliament by the present government. Now, I was sorry that my hon. friend put the matter upon that ground because I could not help thinking that he was seeking in some way to create prejudice against the present administration by reason of legislation which this government had asked parliament to adopt. If the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council rests upon legislation passed subsequent to the British North America Act, that legislation began in the year 1870, some twenty-six years before this government came into power——

Mr. DANIEL. I was quite aware of the time, and mentioned when these Acts were passed. I do not see how the hon. gentleman could understand me as having referred only to what took place after 1896. The thing was monstrous——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to hear my hon. friend's explanation. He said, not only once but twice, that the decision of

the Privy Council had been based upon legislation introduced into this parliament by this government.

Mr. DANIEL. This parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman used the word 'government' perhaps not meaning to do so. I am glad we understand each other. The first legislation was passed in 1870, when it was provided that a portion of Prince Rupert's land, should be carved out and created into the province of Manitoba. And, by section 2 of that Act, these words were used, and upon them the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has laid some stress, as also has the Supreme Court of Canada.

On, from and after the said day on which the order of the Queen in Council should take effect as aforesaid, the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, shall, except those parts thereof which are in terms made, or, by reasonable intendment, may be held to be specially applicable to, or only to affect one or more, but not the whole of the provinces now composing the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this Act, be applicable to the province of Manitoba, in the same way, and to the like extent as they apply to the several provinces of Canada, and as if the province of Manitoba had been one of the provinces originally united by the said Act.

The same language is used in the order in council admitting British Columbia into the union, and the same language was used subsequently when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were carved out of the Northwest Territories. Therefore, I think no particular responsibility can rest upon one party more than another so far as this parliament is concerned in reference to the legislation enacted here or by the imperial parliament. But, I think that, in considering as to whether or not the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council are such as can properly be complained of we must bear in mind that they rest their judgments to a very large extent upon section 146 of the British North America Act which provides that Prince Rupert's land, British Columbia and also Newfoundland may be taken into the union and become provinces of the Dominion of Canada, and have held that it must be considered that, when the four provinces went into the union they went in with the full knowledge of the fact that Prince Rupert's land, British Columbia and Newfoundland as well might subsequently come into the union, also, that when they did come in, they must come in as if they had originally been provinces of the Dominion, and also that when they did come in the word 'four' should be held to be eliminated and the number be read as five, six, seven, eight or nine as the case might be, and that regard must be had to all the provinces of Canada at the time when section 51 and subsection 4 of that section were being interpreted. I do not intend to say very much more, but I would like to express my own opinion that, strongly as I feel upon this subject, strongly as I feel that it is desirable, not alone in the interests of the maritime provinces but in the interests of Canada at large, that the representation of these smaller provinces should not decline, and that in some way, if at all possible, it would be to the interest of Canada that the number should be restored to what it was at the time of confederation, yet I think it would be a most regrettable thing if this resolution were to pass. Suppose, as we can conceive it possible, this were to pass against the wish of the majority of any one of the provinces, it would be regarded as an attempt on the part of the representatives in this parliament to alter the terms of the constitution against the views of the majority of one of the partners to the compact of confederation. That would be a most deplorable result, and it seems to me that, if we are ever going to attain the wishes we have with regard to the representation of the smaller provinces, we must go about it in a different way.

This thought occurs to me, that possibly the proper way to go about it would be to do the same as was done when it was sought to secure an increase in the allowances which were made from the Dominion treasury to the different provinces of Canada. At that time all the provinces were consulted, at that time an interprovincial conference was held, at which representatives of all the provinces of Canada were present. After considerable discussion and deliberation, they agreed among themselves that it was desirable that the British North America Act should be altered as respects the subsidies to the provinces. They passed a resolution, which was submitted to this government, and as a result, a petition was sent to the Imperial parliament praying that the British North America Act should be amended, and that the basis of subsidies to the provinces should be altered. It is possible that some such course might be adopted with regard to representation. It is possible that if the governments of the smaller provinces were to make representations to the provincial governments of the larger provinces, they might be induced to hold a conference of the representatives of the different provinces of Canada, which might agree among themselves with regard to representation; they might pass a resolution and forward it to this government, with the request that it should be laid before parliament to be dealt with. I can well understand that if all the provinces of Canada were unanimous on this question, if they were all to agree

that the representation of the smaller provinces should be restored to what it was at the time of confederation, this government might feel it to be its duty to bring the matter before parliament, and parliament might feel it to be its duty to give effect to the unanimous resolution of the representatives of the governments of the various provinces. When the subsidies were readjusted, I remember distinctly it was stated in parliament that this was an agreement which had been come to by the family of provinces, that it was a matter for the provinces to deal with, they had spoken with united voice, and their voice ought to be heeded by this parliament. It may be that if the governments of the different provinces were to speak again with united voices in regard to representation, and if they should unanimously agree that the representation of the smaller provinces should be restored to what it was at the time of confederation, then this parliament could act upon such a resolution. But it seems to me that until that course is taken, it certainly would not be desirable, it would not be proper, and it would be entirely against the best interests of Canada, that the present resolution should be adopted by this House.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North). At the commencement of this debate I had no idea that any such an element as sectionalism would enter into it. I am sure that there is no foundation for introducing sectionalism into this discussion; and if the hon. mover of the resolution, or the hon. mover of the amendment, has introduced any argument which might be understood as diminishing any of the powers or possibilities of the west, I am sure it was inadvertently and unintentionally, I do not remember that any such argument was used. But there must have been something that stirred up my hon. friends from the west to make the observations they did, particularly the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). We in the maritime provinces believe that we have a good record behind us in respect to our feelings and actions towards the west. In 1870 they had some trouble in the west. I ask my hon. friends from the west: who were foremost in quelling the trouble that occurred in those days: Were not volunteer red coats from Nova Scotia to the fore in quelling that rebellion, and standing up manfully for the rights of the people of the west? In 1885 another trouble occurred in the northwest, and the same thing happened; the boys from Nova Scotia willingly and manfully volunteered to stand all the hardships that were necessary, to risk their lives within the zone of fire, defending the interests of the people of the west and the rights of Canadians. That is the record of our feelings and conduct towards the west. I do not think that if my hon. friends would read the history of those days, they would likely speak about us as if we had no interest in the west. Our interests in the west have grown very materially since those days, the number of our people who have gone to the west has increased during the last 20 and 25 years, and for that reason our love for the west and our interest in the west have proportionately increased as the years have gone by. For that reason, I think this idea of sectionalism must be wiped out, and anything that has been said along that line must be understood as not having been said at all.

The Minister of Public Works, distinguished and able lawyer as he is, will understand that there are many cases where the courts of law will find that a statute must be construed in a certain way, and that decisions will be given in such a manner as to take away rights and equities which were understood to be safeguarded by the principles and rules of the statute which is under interpretation. The learned Minister of Public Works no doubt knows that on several occasions, on scores of occasions, people have come back a second time to the legislature to get another enactment to take the place of one that had been legally construed by the courts, and so to change it that the original intention would be borne out by the subsequent legislation. That is very largely the position which is taken by the hon. mover of the resolution and the hon. mover of the amendment which are before the House, because there is very little difference between them. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the principle adopted at confederation was not the principle of absolute representation by population. The principle of representation by population was only adopted, as some other things were adopted at confederation, subject to stipulations. For instance, in the British North America Act the subject of education is absolutely given over to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. If you stop there, you would think that this House has nothing to do with the question of education. But you will find that the subject is hemmed in by certain conditions which make it impossible for a local legislature to legislate on the question of education as they may see fit, they must have regard to the stipulations attached to that particular proposition in the British North America Act. Upon the same principle, it is stated here in the terms of confederation that representation shall be based upon population; but if that were so without any restriction at all, what is the sense of this

subsection 4 of section 51? It would have no meaning at all. We must suppose that it was put there for a purpose, and the purpose which I see was that of safeguarding the smaller provinces against the effect of representation by population. We find that absolute representation by population would take away some of the privileges we had at confederation, and this was put in to safeguard them. That subsection 4 of section 51 was to be interpreted of course as it was then understood, together with the section which defines what Canada was territorially; and we submit that properly defining that section 4 which says Canada shall be, or as considered to be, we would still retain our representation; that is our contention. We say: Give this Act the reasonable and equitable interpretation which was put upon it by the fathers of confederation and we will not lose any members at all. Since then four has been converted into nine. Other conditions have come into consideration and the court of highest appeal in our country has said that this safeguard is not enough, it does not protect us at all when the aggregate is turned from the four provinces into nine. The aggregate is so great that five per cent or one-twentieth of the whole is not enough to safeguard our representation.

I say that purely in a court of equity and seeking equity as we come to this House, we have a right to say: If you have enlarged the aggregate from four to nine, you have a right to give us a safeguard in place of the insufficient old one that will protect for us and preserve for us the same ratio of representation which we had when we came into confederation. While that may be an absolutely bad argument in law, as it probably is in view of the decision of the Privy Council, it is a proper argument in equity to lay before this House in asking for fair and equitable treatment, and beyond that we are not looking for anything.

I could understand the disappointment of a member for any province if what we are seeking would deprive them of a single representative in any part of Canada. I cannot understand that it does, I submit that it does not. The unit of representation remains the same, that is all they need be concerned about. In Saskatchewan, Manitoba, British Columbia, Alberta or any other province outside the maritime provinces, disappointment might be caused if the unit of representation was to be disturbed. It is not to be disturbed and therefore they will get the same number of members whether we have less or more; it does not strike them in any way, their population will be divided by 65 as the Quebec representation is to remain fixed at 65. Therefore, the other provinces will get their number of members according as their population bears a ratio to the population of Quebec and they need not be concerned about where we are, it does not take a single member from them. I could understand further that if the number of members who are to constitute this House was fixed they would have reason to find fault, they could say: There is only a place for 181 members, as the original agreement provided, and therefore if there are 15 or 18 from Nova Scotia, there will never be room for us, and it is only fair that they should be put out in order to make room for our representatives. That is not the condition, and therefore that argument falls to the ground because there is no limit upwards to the number of members who may compose this House. Yet it may well be said that this House should not be constituted of a smaller number of members than the number named at confederation. Therefore, as the unit remains the same, as we must make room for the members in this House as occasion requires—a larger House must be built if necessary—no man need be afraid that any group or unit of his people will remain unrepresented, because we have the same number of members we had at confederation, or because there is no room for them in this House. Therefore, unless it be on the question of allowance to members or some expense attached to a greater number of members, I cannot understand where it in the slightest degree touches the right of any province or increases or lessens the number of representatives outside of the provinces asking to be dealt with in this amendment. For that reason I cannot appreciate the objections taken on the grounds that have been set forth by the hon. members for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney). I think it is fair to say that those fathers of confederation who came from the maritime provinces expected that they would have at least the same representation they had at that time. In my own province of Nova Scotia, we can readily understand why we had nineteen members. In those days we had a member from each county, and could not think of having less. The city and county of Halifax had two members. Therefore, our representatives from Nova Scotia agreed upon having the same number of members here that we had at that time. The political division of the province into counties had much to do with it. If we had had twelve counties I suppose we would only be looking for twelve members, and it was never intended that any of our counties should be deprived of their representation. When two counties are joined together in one constituency in Nova Scotia, it is looked upon as if one or both were to some extent disfranchised. If the old member for one county gets the united seat, the other part of the constitu-

ency feels itself more or less disfranchised. Take the county of Shelbourne, take the county of Victoria which I represent, and I think Pictou which formerly had two members. Victoria feels very keenly that it has been deprived of its member. If it can be done, without interfering with the rights of any other part of Canada, it would seem best for the sake of peace and harmony if that which was the intention of the fathers of confederation could be continued.

I would say to my hon. friends who object to the proposal we make—why do they sit in the House for one day with the condition in the Act in respect to British Columbia. I have not heard any one finding fault in respect to that province, and yet that is all we are asking, simply that the condition in the Act in respect to British Columbia, shall be applied to us in the maritime provinces. The representation in British Columbia can never be reduced below the number of members with which it came into this union. My friends in the west are right in touch with the province of British Columbia. They do not regard that provision as unconstitutional or as militating against them, and if that condition of things in British Columbia cannot be regarded as unfair to the people of the west, how can similar conditions concerning what we regard as our rights in the maritime provinces be regarded as in any way infringing on any rights they may think themselves entitled to under the constitution. We do not want in the slightest way to cause any friction in this country, but I think it is our duty to our people to lay our case before this House, the highest and last tribunal to which we as Canadians can come, and to ask the powers that be, in their wisdom, to deal with it as in the best interests of the country.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the history of this whole matter has been so well set before the House by hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces who have already spoken that anything I might say would be repetition, and as I do not believe in reiterating arguments which have already been forcibly advanced, my remarks shall be brief. This question vitally affects the interests of the maritime provinces and more especially my own province of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, (Mr. Warburton) who moved this amendment, has been for a long period of years identified with the public life of our province, and every unprejudiced mind must give great weight to any declaration which he may make concerning our provincial affairs. Let any unprejudiced man in this parliament ask himself: Would the fathers of confederation have entered the union had they known that conditions which at present face us would have arisen, and the answer must be, no. Read the correspondence, read the utterances of the public men of the period, read the newspaper comments, and in all these it appears most forcibly that were it known to the representatives of the maritime provinces at the confederation conference, that in time to come the representation of these provinces would be reduced, confederation would not have been accomplished. I am surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) and the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney) with regard to this motion. I believe that the western members are blessed with a spirit of fair play, and I know that if they study the question they must conclude that no harm can arise to their provinces by conceding that which we justly demand. All we ask is that the original compact upon which we entered the union be carried out in its spirit. The hon. member for Assiniboia said that the representation of the province of Ontario had been reduced since confederation, but I think he is mistaken in that; and that only the maritime provinces are in this unfortunate position. We appeal to the sense of British fair play of hon. members of this House not to allow this injury to be done to the maritime provinces, and we ask them to aid us in getting redress. Let me tell the government that this question will not be settled until it is properly settled; let me tell the government that this question will not down; and that the longer relief is deferred the more troublesome it will become. It may be—I trust the day will never come—but it may be that some day this will become a burning question between the east and the west. We do not seek to injure the west; we helped to build up the west, and we spent our hard earned money in that endeavour. We of the east opened up the west and gave these people the great advantages they now enjoy, and would it be unnatural that they should now seek to penalize the provinces that brought them into existence. When the Hon. Mr. Pugsley was in the New Brunswick government he took a very strong ground on this question, but I am sorry to see that to some extent he has receded from his then position. There are no two men in the House more conversant with this whole question than the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice; because when the former was Attorney General of New Brunswick he urged the cause of his province, and the Minister of Justice himself was retained by the legislature of Prince Edward Island to plead our cause before the Privy Council of England. The Privy Council unfortunately decided against us, and now we appeal to this parliament to give us the equity we

are entitled to. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in referring to this question, and mark you after the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had decided against the contention of New Brunswick, used these words:

In the course of the argument before the Privy Council one of the law lords admitted that if Newfoundland should seek admission to the union she would have the right to stipulate as regards the terms and in respect to representation. How have our rights been taken away by the legislation of the Dominion. The only justification for it is that it was done by the authority of imperial orders in council or imperial statutes at the request of the government of Canada. When British Columbia was admitted into the union it was stipulated that her representation should be increased under the terms of the British North America Act, and that the Act should apply as if she had been one of the original provinces of the confederation. The same thing was done with respect to Manitoba. Now what has been the effect of this. It is that you must construe the British North America Act as if these provinces had been in the union in 1867. If that is so the compact of confederation has been violated by legislation and by orders in council without our being consulted. Surely the authorities at Ottawa should see that this wrong is remedied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the authorities at Ottawa to-day is the Hon. Mr. Pugsley, who then declared that Ottawa should right this wrong, and, on this same subject the same hon. gentleman further said:

Therefore, when we raise the question of representation it is not that we are opposed to Quebec, but because we desire to preserve our rights and to maintain some degree of political influence in the east.

Again he said:

It does not seem to me that in view of the legislation which has already taken place, so seriously affecting our interests, and in view of what is now being done in connection with the legislation for the Northwest Territories, this government is yet doing its duty in asking the legislature to express its views and to endeavour to undo this great wrong.

These are the sentiments which were expressed in the year 1905 by the Hon. Minister of Public Works in the legislative halls of his own province of New Brunswick. Now that he is one of the authorities at Ottawa, I would expect, and I think we should all expect, that he will continue to entertain these views. I will close by asking the members of this House, if they are not prepared to vote in favour of this resolution now, to study the question, and they will find that there is nothing in the resolution to do wrong or injury to any other province in Canada.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby). Mr. Speaker, it is not often perhaps that a debate in this House drags out through so many hours as this one has so harmoniously, and I am glad to find that only two hon. members from the west have raised their voices in opposition to the resolution and to the amendment before the House. I think it speaks well for the modesty of demeanour and the mild-mannered disposition of the Bluenose brigade that they are able to introduce into this House a resolution of this character without, as far as it has gone, striking fire from any of the parliamentary flints which are not infrequently met with. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Public Works that this question should be referred to a provincial conference, let me say that in my opinion it is one which is perhaps too much involved and too directly concerned with the maritime provinces alone, to permit of a solution at a conference of that character. It seems to me also that much valuable time might be lost by referring the question to such a conference. It would be some time before the conference could be summoned, and next year another census is to be taken and a redistribution will shortly follow. So that, while I do not wish to intimate, by any remarks of mine, that the hon. minister is not entirely sincere in putting forward this suggestion, it does seem to me, with all due deference to his opinion, that it would be merely postponing the question indefinitely, and the chances are that if a conclusion were reached by that conference, it would be an adverse one, and not such as one arrived at by the hon. members of this House, who are, it seems to me, the proper parties to adjudicate on this question.

The grounds on which we from the maritime provinces present this case are not legal, but equitable grounds, and we feel justified in putting forward this resolution on the following grounds among others. We consider that this parliament should right the wrong which it has already done. There is no doubt that the destruction of the saving clause in the British North America Act which was provided by the fathers of confederation has tended to bring about the very condition which is complained of in the maritime provinces to-day. Furthermore, there has been the enlargement of the boundaries of the province of Quebec, which has altogether altered the pivotal province, and which in the course of time will make the disparity in point of representation still more apparent than it is to-day. Then, by the amendment to the resolution, all provinces are to be treated equally—there is to be no advantage taken. Each province of the Dominion is to be placed in exactly the same position that British Columbia has been in since the time it was admitted to confederation, by having a minimum fixed below which its representation cannot fall. Again, the objection which

has been urged from time to time, and which has been advanced to-day, that the British North America Act should not be amended, seems to me to fall to the ground, because that Act has already been amended, and amended over and over again, and no serious objection to those amendments was raised at the time they were introduced into this House. Furthermore, it seems to me that the maritime provinces are entitled to fair and generous treatment at the hands of this parliament. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fraser) has made brief reference to that, and I propose, during the course of the very few remarks I shall address to the House on this question, to refer again briefly to that feature of the case.

The right of adequate representation in the nation's council is a principle which is near to the hearts of all free-born citizens. It is one, too, which, history teaches, no governing body can well withhold and yet retain the esteem of the governed. I hope that it will never be the part of any government of Canada to deny to any section of this country that privilege and that right; and I say at this juncture that if the government of to-day were to say that this resolution shall pass, this resolution would pass. There can be no question about that. No hon. gentleman will raise the contention that if the government were to pronounce in favour of this resolution it would be defeated in this House. I am sure that my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) who intimated that he might retire from the House if the resolution were favourably received, was only speaking in a Pickwickian sense when he made that remark. Even at this distance, I think I detected a twinkle in his eye. He knows, as every other hon. member of this House knows, that there is an easy and natural course by which most gentlemen in time retire from this House, and in all human probability the hon. gentleman will find himself in due course retiring from this House in that manner. But I cannot think that the hon. gentleman was serious in that remark, and I believe he wishes us to take it entirely in a Pickwickian sense.

Now, at the time of confederation in 1867, there were four original provinces in the union—New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario. At that time the representation of three provinces was temporarily fixed, and the representation of the province of Quebec was placed at 65 in perpetuity. In 1869 Canada acquired Prince Rupert's land, the Hudson Bay territory and the Northwest territories, paying some £300,000 for the transfer of that property. That sum to-day, a million and a half of dollars, roundly speaking, of our currency, does not perhaps seem very large; but in those days it was a very considerable sum, and it seems to me that the maritime provinces as well as all other provinces of the original confederation, being joint partners, were equally entitled, and stand equally entitled to-day, to what we might term partnership profits. It has been shown very clearly in this House to-day that the boundaries of the various provinces have been enlarged from time to time. Now, the province of Quebec in 1898 obtained an addition to its territory almost equal to the size of the original province. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister whether at the time the Act was put through this House the various other provinces interested in the original confederation were notified? The right hon. gentleman does not say whether that was the case or not; but I think that if they were not notified and if they were not given an opportunity to protest, such an opportunity should have been given them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not know that my hon. friend wanted an immediate answer, and I have no objection to give my view of the case. I do not admit at all that when the boundaries between Ontario and Quebec and between Quebec and the rest of Canada were settled by statute in 1898, that was done with the view of increasing the territory of the province of Quebec. It was done to settle a dispute as to where the boundary was between Quebec and the rest of Canada.

Mr. JAMESON. I am not in a position to contradict the right hon. gentleman, nor would I do so, but according to the census returns of 1871, the area of the province of Quebec was shown to be some 193,000 square miles, and the area of Quebec to-day is stated as 351,000 square miles.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All this is conjecture. It never was asserted.

Mr. JAMESON. According also to the recognized maps of the period just following confederation, we find that the province of Quebec was very differently outlined from what it is at present. Further, let me read from 'Hansard' of March 30, 1905, a speech delivered by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) in which he says, with reference to this very matter:

> If there is any doubt as to the statement I have made, I would like to lay before the House a few extracts from an order in council of the Quebec government, dated the 24th April, 1898, upon which the legislation was subsequently framed. Attached to this order in council is a report from Mr. E. H. Taché, assistant commissioner of Crown lands, who, after discussing the question as to the province of Quebec making a demand for that portion of the coast of Labrador which is under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, goes on to say: The claiming of that territory

would result in serious diplomatic complications which the Dominion government certainly will not raise, but it seems to me that a compromise might be arrived at which will prove acceptable to all those interested. The claims under the old French regime, thus altered, would still include a vast extent of territory, which in extent and value would be a good equivalent to the territory claimed by Ontario. The claim might be framed in the following manner:

Mr. Taché then went on to define in detail the boundary line as it was finally adopted in the Bill passed by this parliament, and he said:

The definition of the limits means an increase in area of 116,550 square miles. In my opinion to go further, as far as the Hudson straits would be too grasping.

That is what I base my opinion upon. In 1908, a resolution was adopted by this House to add to the province of Quebec a portion at least of the territory known as Ungava, and at the same time to add to Ontario and Manitoba the southern portion of the very vast district of Keewatin. I only mention this to show that the province of Quebec has had its territory considerably enlarged, and that, should that additional territory become populated, the unit of representation will be changed and changed very prejudicially to the maritime provinces. Although to-day the land is barren and seemingly inhospitable, no man can say that in its icy grasp there may not be valuable minerals. Indeed we have fair authority for believing that there are, in all likelihood, gold and silver deposits, and even iron and coal there. One American professor, an enthusiast it may be, has gone so far as to say it probably contains diamonds. Well, we know what the discovery of any of these would mean. That discovery would be followed by development, and development means an increased population, so that there is nothing very improbable in the prospect of the addition of this territory considerably changing the unit of representation. To-day we are speaking hopefully of the construction of a railway to Hudson bay, of which no one 25 or 30 years ago would have dreamt the possibility. There is therefore no argument in saying that this territory is not likely to have a large population at any time, or may not figure in the representation to the extent of altering the unit. In this connection let me say that the maritime provinces have also some claim to this vast territory purchased from the Hudson Bay Company in 1869, for the sum of $1,500,000 and that in any further disposition of that territory the rights of the maritime provinces, as partners to the extent of their original partnership interest, should be recognized. The maritime provinces are sea-girt, so that their natural boundaries are fixed and determined and they cannot expand their

population by any extension of their boundaries. Therefore they are not likely to grow so fast as the other provinces. My hon. friend from Kings' (Mr. Fraser) has referred to the building up of the west at the expense of the east. No doubt if there had been no east, we would have no west. We know that opening up of the territories, the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, and the vast inflow of immigration were things not fully contemplated when confederation was formed, and not considered in their great effect when the British North America Act was framed. But despite that fact a saving clause was put into the British North America Act, and it was only by the Act of 1886 that that saving clause was taken away, or its effect destroyed.

The fact that British Columbia was given a minimum of representation seems to me fair ground why we should ask for similar treatment for the maritime provinces. The argument that in order to do so we should change the unit of representation from Quebec to the maritime provinces does not seem to me well taken, and that is the only argument which can be put forward against the conceding of the very reasonable proposition advanced by the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment to the resolution. It seems to me that for another reason too, the maritime provinces are entitled to fair and reasonable consideration from this parliament. At a time when the political fabric of old Canada was tottering to its very foundations, when the statesmen of the day were unable to find a common ground on which to uprear a lasting government, in fact when the very fate of the country seemed to be trembling in the balance, they looked to the Atlantic coast, there they saw the Atlantic provinces, their people happy, prosperous and progressive, their statesmen, wise, firm and far-sighted. The maritime provinces were called in to redress the balance of the old Canadas. Confederation became an accomplished fact, a firm and stable government was erected. The maritime provinces may be said to have saved the situation. That larger Canada gave to the statesmen of the day the courage and to this Dominion the resources and standing in the money markets of England to enter upon the great national undertakings which were then begun and are still going forward with giant strides. I do not think, Sir, that the people of old Canada or of the new west will deny to the maritime provinces who undoubtedly made sacrifices to render these things possible; that mead of recognition in this House which the founders of confederation evidently considered they should have. And I trust that the amendment to this resolution, for the various reasons advanced to-day, will carry, and that the matter will not be deferred as has been intimated.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I think there is little doubt that most people of generous disposition will regard this question as one of equity rather than of law. While it may fairly be admitted that there are elements which have been brought into the situation since the original compact was entered into by the four provinces that disturb the relations of to-day and make them different from what they would have been had the original compact been adhered to closely, still I do not think there is anything in it that seems to give them a legal right—if a layman may be permitted to express an opinion on a question of law. to entitle them to the consideration asked for. But thinking it over it seems to me that the four original provinces might well claim that in our representation here we will adhere to the right which we secured at confederation of having our representation struck by the census of these four provinces, excluding all other provinces, and according to the unit of representation ascertained by dividing the population of Quebec on a basis of 65. Ascertain the unit of representation and by that means determine the number of members each of the maritime provinces should have. But I do not think that Prince Edward Island can claim the same right, because that province came in afterward, and the Act provides that any province which might come in afterwards would come in upon the terms of the agreement that was come to by its own legislature and the federal authority. Prince Edward Island came to some understanding, and that understanding was embodied in the agreement. That is, Prince Edward Island made its terms according to the judgments of its legislature and came in under that Act passed in accordance with those terms. And one of these terms was the unit of representation. It has been cited here to-night that when Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and British Columbia came in it destroyed the proportion. Well I think that is a fair and reasonable contention. I listened to the figures given by the hon. member for York, N.B., (Mr. Crocket) when he said that if representation had been given at the last decennial census, ascertained on the basis of the population of the four original provinces of confederation, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would be quite satisfied. I think they have a right to claim that, regardless of what principle was adopted in giving the other provinces representation, and that it is not in justice to the other provinces if that right is conceded to them, for it is in their bond and they have a right to look for the fulfilment of the conditions of their bond. There is another thing, that has disturbed the relative strength of these provinces in this House. We provided for Manitoba, and Saskatchewan and Alberta taking a census every five years and having their representation rearranged according to the increase of population. The British North America Act provides for redistribution every ten years. Here is another element in this situation that disturbs the balance to the disadvantage of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

In view of these considerations, it seemed to me it would not be unreasonable or very much out of place if this parliament should take it up and give to these smaller provinces a proportionately larger representation than the larger provinces have. That is a principle that obtains in all deliberate assemblies. In our county councils in Ontario we provide that any township with a population of one thousand shall send one reeve to the county council; if it has more it sends a deputy reeve, if still more two deputy reeves; but the smaller townships are given a larger representation proportionately than the larger one. In the United States they follow the same principle in regard to the smaller states of the union, and in legislative representation, and in even the election of the President, they are given a larger proportionate share of power than the more populous states. That seems to be in harmony with the idea that the weaker shall have something to help them in addition to their own strength. I do not feel that the maritime provinces are depending only upon the number of their representatives or that the influence they exercise in the House is simply through the men who are sent here by the votes of the people of those provinces. For, as an hon. member has pointed out, many maritime province people have gone to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and helped to develop that country, some of them have done so well that the electors of their several districts have sent them back here as representatives for those districts. I have no doubt that when they come here and take part in the deliberations of this House they will not forget the fact that they are natives of Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island and will exercise, it may be a silent, but nevertheless a potent influence on behalf of their native provinces in addition to the influence which they exercise as representatives of their constituencies in the west. So they have a little additional influence in this House beyond what mere numbers would seem to indicate. So with regard to the influence we have in the Senate. Come to the province of Ontario. Quebec wisely provided that her province should be divided up into various districts with a senator for each one. But we did not make the same provision in Ontario; therefore, in the rural districts, there are large areas which are unrepresented by a senator, and when you

speak of representing a given district, we have no representation in the Senate from any of those districts. But as the larger number of the representatives in the Senate reside in the cities, they are still representatives of the province, they have their interests in the various portions of the province and in making a calculation how many shall be in this House from the cities we do not give the same proportionate representation as the country districts Why? Because a large number of senators and members reside in the cities, they have the larger share of their property in the cities, and they look after the interests of the cities as well as of the rural districts. We have no rural districts represented in Ontario, in the same sense rural district are represented in the province of Quebec. The same remark applies to the maritime provinces, some of whose population has wandered off to the northwest, and are coming back here as representatives from those various districts. I think there is some thing in the enlargement of the province of Quebec as one of the disturbing elements, it is a factor at least that may be regarded as an element of the situation. The first minister said that it was only in 1878 that we determined what was the boundary line. Well, we passed an Act declaring it, but it was never determined, as it ought to be, by some tribunal established for that purpose. We determined the boundary line between Canada and the United States, not by an arbitration, but by men selected to ascertain where the boundary was. I have no remembrance that we ever appointed any commission of experts to determine exactly where the boundary was between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; but we determined it by Act of parliament, and by so doing we enlarged very much the province of Quebec. It was admitted in this House that we were enlarging the province of Quebec, and when a desire was afterwards expressed to have the province of Manitoba extended it was said that we had enlarged the province of Quebec, but we refused to enlarge the province of Manitoba. We did not determine by any tribunal exactly where the boundary line was between the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but we made practically an arbitrary boundary by federal statute. In speaking now, I am saying very little with reference to the resolution except as regards the equity of the claim. It always did seem to me that there was some equity in the claim; and speaking personally, and judging by public sentiment, I do not think the larger provinces would be averse to conceding to the smaller provinces the right never to have their representation less than it was when they entered confederation.

Mr. SPROULE

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe this day has been very profitably spent in discussing a question which is growing in importance to a certain portion of the Dominion. This is above all things a maritime question, it affects the maritime provinces. The resolution is intended to deal exclusively with the maritime provinces. It reads thus:

That in the opinion of this House the maritime provinces of Canada should have preserved to them the representation in the House of Commons that they now enjoy. That in the redistribution of constituencies to be made after the next decennial census the number of representatives to be returned from the said provinces should not in any case be reduced.

This motion has been prompted by the fact that as a consequence of the two last censuses the representation of the maritime provinces has been decreased on each occasion. Prince Edward Island has lost one man, Nova Scotia has lost four or five, and New Brunswick three or four. If that motion had been adhered to, I think it would have been more favourably received than it can be with the amendment added. The amendment which is to take the place of the original motion, reads thus:

Each province of the Dominion of Canada shall have as a minimum representation in the House of Commons the representation it had upon becoming a province of Canada, and in the redistribution of constituencies to be made after the next, and after every decennial census, the representation of each province shall not be any less than that minimum.

I never heard any expression of opinion asking for a change in our present constitution except from the maritime provinces. I do not see any reason why there should be such a change applied to Ontario, or to any other province. I can see some reason why such a change should be made with regard to the maritime provinces. Therefore, so far as my judgment goes, the only way in which it can be approached is on the lines laid down by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, and repeated by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), that is to say, that the maritime provinces, in view of the peculiar position which they occupy, ought to command a generous treatment from the other provinces. Now, I would like the House to remember that confederation was a compact originally, and must remain a compact between province and province. When the first four started the work of confederation together they agreed upon certain conditions. I have listened carefully to this debate, with the exception of a little time when I was called out; I have listened to the arguments which have been brought forward by hon. gentlemen who have spoken to the resolution. They have

not all been conducive to the resolution, and some of the arguments in support of the amendment have been conducive to the motion. I must say that I differ altogether from the arguments of my hon. friends from the maritime provinces when they assert that they are labouring under an injustice. I cannot see where the injustice lies. They say the injustice lies in the fact that when they entered confederation it was stipulated that the unit of representation should be the representation of the province of Quebec, which was then apportioned between four provinces, and that the unit of representation has been changed by the fact that it is now apportioned between nine provinces instead of four. Now, if there is one thing more certain than another, it is that historically there is not a shadow of doubt that when the four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, made the original compact of confederation, they had no idea that the Dominion would always be composed of those four provinces only, they certainly contemplated that other provinces would join them. Section 146 makes this as plain as it can be:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of the parliament of Canada, and from the Houses of the respective legislatures of the colonies or provinces of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia to admit those colonies or provinces, or any of them, into the union.

Therefore when the four provinces made the original contract it was contemplated that Prince Edward Island should come in, that Newfoundland should come in, that British Columbia should come in. When each one of these provinces was to come in under, what terms and conditions was it to come in? It was to come in under certain terms and conditions to be agreed upon by themselves but always subject to the original contract. These are the very words:

On such terms and conditions in each case as are in the addresses expressed and as the Queen thinks fit to approve, subject to the provisions of this Act.

What was one of the provisions of this Act? One of these provisions, and it was an important one, was in regard to this very item of representation. How was it to be done? Every time that a new member was joined to confederation, an apportionment was to be made on the unit determined by Quebec, but to be apportioned between four, five, six, seven, eight or nine provinces as the case might be. Provision was made for the admission of the three provinces then in existence, and provision was made also for the acquisition of Rupert's land and the Hudson Bay country, and with what object? With the object, accomplished since, of making provinces, and it also has been determined legally by the Privy Council and historically that what had applied to confederation was to extend to the provinces, that every new province coming in was to have the same rights, privileges and restrictions as the other provinces.

The difficulty, however, has arisen from this point, that the provinces by the sea have not developed as rapidly as the other provinces. You would not hear of this motion being made to-day if the provinces by the sea had developed as rapidly and had been able to keep their representation. But Quebec moved more rapidly, Ontario and the other provinces in the western part of the country all moved more rapidly, and the consequence was that as every other province had its representation increased, the representation of the maritime provinces was decreased. They ask for some remedy. They cannot have it in law, they cannot have it, so far as I can see, in the arguments which they have advanced. The only way in which they can have a remedy is, as I said a moment ago, to apply to the other provinces, more potent than they are, with larger representation, to give them some equivalent to what has been given to British Columbia. The members from the maritime provinces must remember that representation by population was a bone of contention in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec for something like 20 years. It did not bring on a revolution, but it almost brought on a revolution, and at last it was conceded that no fairer and no more equitable principle with regard to representation could be found than population. What principle can be fairer than every province which is represented on the floor of this parliament should be represented according to the number of its population? It is impossible to find or to imagine a principle more equitable than this one. And you propose now to limit it. In what way? In regard to the other provinces. I very much doubt if the other provinces would agree to limit it in any way, and moreover, I say to my hon. friends from the maritime provinces, that the principle is fair and equitable and cannot be gainsaid on that ground. But it is another story if you say to me: The provinces by the sea are small compared with the others, they have not the same opportunity of expansion as the others have, they cannot extend their territory, they are necessarily limited; the territory of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, and the other provinces, can be increased because there is a large territory behind them, but the provinces by the sea are cramped, and therefore they cannot increase, and it can be claimed in equity or fairness that it is not a matter of concern to the other provinces, if their representation is kept up to the

limit as at the time of confederation, because the other provinces have become so large that even if the maritime provinces are granted that small privilege the balance between province and province would not be seriously affected and the preponderance of one province over the other would not suffer. This is a view with which, for my part, I would be disposed to agree, but I have to say also that there is great force in the contention of my friend, a force absolute, a force paramount in my judgment, that it would not be in the right spirit of the Confederation Act that the parliament of Canada should undertake to disturb in any way the principle laid down in the British North America Act as to the representation of every province in this parliament unless the other provinces have been consulted. I do not think, for instance, that an amendment of this kind should be taken up by this parliament unless all the other provinces had had an opportunity to express their opinion on it, and for this reason I think it is well that we should pause and look about before we go further into this.

I may repeat that I welcome this discussion. I am sorry that the time has come now that we must adjourn, because I would like to hear more about it. I am sorry that we have not heard from the other provinces. We have not heard from Ontario or Quebec, we have heard from only two of the provinces, other than the maritime provinces, and, therefore, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the Minister of Railways is to make his statement to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER Yes, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in view of the fact that Mr. Butler, the deputy minister, has taken another position, would like to dispose of the estimates. He will premise that with the usual statement in regard to the railway. The discussion on that may possibly take more than one day. I had intended to take up the Naval Bill on Wednesday, but in case this other debate is not concluded to-morrow, I propose to take it on Thursday next.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not appear that there is any provision for a report by the present board of management of the Intercolonial railway. That is due, I presume, to the fact that the board has been constituted under the general powers of management conferred upon the Minister of Railways and Canals by the Act respecting the Intercolonial railway. It would be desirable, it seems to me, that such a report should always be presented to parliament. That is merely a matter of administrative order by the minister, assuming he has the power under the statute to which I have referred. No such report has been laid before us up to the present time, and I trust that the minister, when he makes his statement, will at least give us every item of information which might reasonably be expected if those commissioners were bound under the terms of the statute to make a formal written report to parliament

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall call the attention of my colleague to the matter.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 1, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company—Mr. Low.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Ralph Smith.

PURE FOOD ACT.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) respecting pure foods.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Explain.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Pure food is now attracting world wide attention especially in respect to the conditions under which food is prepared for human consumption. The United States, the Australasian colonies, Great Britain herself, all civilized countries are legislating in the direction of securing the purity of food. In Canada we have the Adulteration of Food Act, and we have the Canned Goods Act, and we have the Inspection of Foods Act, all directed more or less towards this object, but to any one who has studied the subject it would appear that something is still wanting. This Bill among other things proposes to provide legislation for the establishing of standards of pure food, and in drafting the Bill I have endeavoured not to intrude upon the prerogatives of government by placing any charge upon the public or interfering with any trade. I trust the Minister of Inland Revenue, under whose jurisdiction

such matters come, will give this Bill careful consideration. My only regret is that some medical man who may understand the matter better than I, is not in charge of the Bill. This Bill provides that it shall be called the 'Pure Food Act', and that it shall be read and construed with the Adulteration Act, the Canned Goods Act, and the Inspection and Sales Act, and, following the precedents set by the legislature of Victoria it to some extent consolidates these Acts relating to pure food, and provides a uniform law on the subject. Under the heading of 'interpretation', the chief point is the definition of the words 'article of food' and for the purpose of this Bill an article of food is defined to be every article used for food or drink by man. Then, the Bill provides, similar to existing legislation, that an officer may enter upon and examine premises, and 'an officer' for the purpose of this Act is interpreted to be an officer under the meaning of the other Acts to which I have referred. The provisions with respect to seizure and so forth are similar to those in the Inspection and Sales Act and the Adulteration Act. This provision is made because there may be included in the standards fixed under this Bill certain things which are not contained in our present legislation.

Another clause provides that food put up for sale must bear a legible stamp or stencil mark, giving the name of the article, the quantity, measure, volume and so forth, and the name and address of the vendor or maker. The package must have on it, placed in a prominent position, in prominent letters, the words ' prepared under the regulations and standard of the Canadian Pure Foods Act.' The purpose is to give in a larger measure a guarantee to the public that these articles are properly prepared. I find that other countries compel manufacturers to place a guarantee of this kind on their exported goods, so that it gives to the foreign consumer a certain guarantee of their quality. I desire that we should have the same law here, so that any foods or other articles of food that we sell abroad will carry with them a stamp of a pure food law of our own, such as is carried under the laws of the United States and Australia. The next subject that is dealt with is how samples should be taken in packages. Another clause concerning witnesses, provides that a witness need not be compelled to disclose where he obtains his information, also making a provision where and how an officer may purchase samples. Then another clause provides that the prosecution must be instituted within forty-two days after the information has been given, that is to limit the prosecution to a certain specified time. Then again when a person is summoned under this Act the summons is not returnable for fourteen days. The next clause perhaps is one of the most important and defines what is meant by adulteration.

For the purposes of the Pure Food Act an article of food or substance or compound or other article shall be deemed adulterated or falsely described,

(a) When it contains or is mixed with or diluted with any substance in any quality to the prejudice of the purchaser or consumer, or in any proportion which diminishes in any manner its food value or nutritive properties as compared with such article in a pure or normal state and in an undeteriorated or sound condition,

(b) When it contains or is mixed with or diluted with any substance of lower commercial value than such article in pure or normal state and in an undeteriorated or sound condition, or

(c) When it does not comply either wholly or in part with the standard therefor prescribed under this Act by any regulation, or

(d) When it contains any substance prescribed as a prohibited addition, or

(e) When it contains any substance concerning which any restrictive regulation has been made in excess of any quantity or proportion permitted by any such regulation, or

(f) When it contains methyl alcohol, or not having paid customs or excise duty, it contains more than two parts of proof spirit per centum, or

(g) When any article of food or other article or substance or compound in any package is described by any stamp or stencilled or impressed or printed or written statement or claim or brand or covering or label or mark or tag purporting to name or indicate the nature or quality or strength or purity or composition or origin or age or proportion of any article of food or ingredients or substances contained therein, which statement, claim, brand, covering label, mark or tag, is false or incorrect or misleading.

This clause in the Act virtually follows the Australian and American law. The next clause takes up the question of the addition of certain injurious drugs to liquors and wines, and provides that certain dangerous ingredients shall not be contained in them, such as cholorides, sulphites, sulphuric acid and other substances of that nature. The next clause deals with the quality of the tin which is supposed to be used in putting up a package, and makes provision against there being a dangerous quantity of lead in the covering or package. The next clause deals with toys, wall paper and articles of that kind, and provides that there shall be no arsenic in the paint used on them. Then another clause deals with the matter of use of dangerous compounds in wall paper, leathers, and so forth. This provision against the use, for instance, of arsenic and lead, is contained in the statute-books of other countries, and is borrowed largely from them. The principal clause deals with the question of who shall

fix these standards, and that is perhaps the most important section in this Act. It reads thus:

The Governor in Council may appoint for the purposes of this Act a pure foods standard commission.

(a) Such commission shall be composed of fifteen members. The chief analyst of the Dominion shall be a member and shall preside as chairman of the commission.

(b) The other members of the commission must hold the position for the time being or have held the position of professor or teacher of any one of the following subjects in a recognized university in the Dominion of Canada, chemistry, biology, materia medica, physiology, agriculture, sanitation, bacteriology, veterinary science. The said members shall be appointed from the following faculties: One from a university in Nova Scotia, one from a university in Prince Edward Island, one from a university in New Brunswick, one from the University of Laval, one from the University of McGill, one from the University of Queens, one from the University of Toronto, one from the Western University of London, one from a university in Manitoba, one from a university in Saskatchewan, one from a university in Alberta, one from a university in British Columbia, and two provincial medical health officers.

The commission shall have power to fix a standard for foods and drugs, and to establish regulations. In the United States this commission is composed of three officers of the government who frame regulations and fix the standard. There has been considerable difficulty and controversy over these standards, and in order to avoid any theories or fads in the establishment of our standards, I think it would be wise for us to have a board of experts as large as possible, and composed of men who would be above reproach in any possible way. I think the commission I have suggested in this Bill would be well qualified to fix the standards on those articles mentioned in the Bill, and they would remove any onus from the department or officers connected with the department. The public at large could have every confidence in this commission who had fixed these standards.

There are other clauses which provide that the commission shall meet twice a year, and that the commission shall be called on notice of the chief analyst for the purpose of considering the advisability of placing some new article on that standard or of changing the present regulation.

Those, Sir, in substance, are the main provisions of this Bill. I trust the Minister of Inland Revenue will take it into his favourable consideration, and will adopt if possible some of its provisions and incorporate them in our present law. At present the standard is fixed under the Adulteration Act, and virtually it is the chief analyst whose duty it is to fix the standards. The Act has been on the statute-book for many years, and we have had no standards as the law says we shall have. The duty of fixing the standards being placed upon the shoulders of one man exposes him possibly to attack from manufacturers on the one hand, and also to attack from the public on the other. For that reason I think the commission as proposed here would lead us wisely out of the difficulty. The Australian law provides for a commission established on a similar basis, and it has received the commendation of those who have given consideration to the matter of pure foods in other countries, and other countries have followed a similar plan. I think, Sir, that the matters dealt with under this Bill are of sufficient importance to the people of Canada to merit that the Bill should be considered in committee, to see if we cannot arrive at some better method of securing a high quality of foods in this country than we have at present.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it would be premature to discuss the Bill, as explained by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), at the present time. When it is printed and circulated and when we have had time to study its provisions it will be the proper time to give that consideration which my hon. friend asks for it. But, as my hon. friend explains the Bill, it seems to me, that we would require to amend or repeal the Adulteration of Foods Act. The most important provision in the Bill, as explained by my hon. friend, is that providing for the establishment of standards for foods. In the present Adulteration of Foods Act, as my hon. friend has just stated, there is power for the Governor General in Council to establish standards of food and if the Adulteration of Foods Act in Canada has not been that success that it might have been it is due to the fact that standards of food have never been established. But, for some months the chief chemist of the department has had the question under consideration and food standards are now being prepared and will be in force, under the present Adulteration of Foods Act, I think, on the first of April next. These standards embrace 500 or 600 articles of food. It has been a large undertaking for the chemist of the department to prepare these standards, but I am hopeful that as soon as the manufacturers of food stuffs in Canada and others interested have been apprised of what these standards are going to be, and as soon as the standards are properly prepared they will be enforced. I just want to state that at the present time under the Adulteration of Foods Act the department is preparing to put into force what is apparently the most important provision of my

hon. friend's Bill. However, after the Bill is printed and circulated we will have a better opportunity of considering it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RATIFICATION OF FRENCH TREATY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the orders of the day, may I have your permission to state that a telegram has been received announcing that the exchange of ratifications of the Franco-Canadian treaty took place this day at Paris and therefore the treaty is now in operation.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS AND PAPERS.

Mr. U. WILSON. I would like to inquire about a return with reference to immigration agencies that I moved for on the 18th day of November. The minister, a few days ago, said that it had been brought down long ago, but I made inquiry this morning and found that it has not yet been brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in the absence of the right hon. the Prime Minister, whether or not there is any answer to the inquiry made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) yesterday with regard to further documents touching the question of naval defence. I would like to know whether all the papers relating to the recent defence conference have been brought down, whether there have been any subsequent correspondence or communications, which, in the ordinary course, would be laid before the House for the purposes of a debate upon the second reading of the Bill. If there are any such documents or communications I think they should be laid on the table of the House not later than to-day in order that we may make ourselves acquainted with their purport before the debate takes place on Thursday next.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is called to the matter as early as possible. I have no doubt he has given his attention to it, but unfortunately he is not very well to-day and unable to be present, but I will see that his attention is again called to it, so that if there are any additional papers they may be brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Finance would be good enough to communicate with him as early as possible I would be very glad; or, perhaps the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) is acquainted with the circumstances and can answer my question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My impression is that all the papers have been brought down. Precisely the same papers have been laid on the table of this House as were laid on the table of the House of Commons in England. The conference was secret, as was announced at the time, and so were the meetings of the subcommittees of the conference and unless some correspondence in reference to certain ships which have been under consideration may be in my hon. friend's mind I do not think there is any thing whatever connected with the conference per se which has not been laid on the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know of anything except that we would like to have the definite assurance that every thing which ought to be brought down and which in the ordinary course would be brought down has been laid before the House.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will look into that myself to-day.

Mr. JAMESON. I wish to draw the attention of the minister in charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to return (No. 82) respecting the salmon fisheries of Digby county. I find that this return as brought down is incomplete. I know that certain investigations were had subsequent to the conclusion of this return, and I would ask that the return be completed as early as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the acting minister to the hon. gentleman's request.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, according to custom, I propose to make a few observations on the work of the Department of Railways and Canals including that branch of the department's work, so much talked about, the Intercolonial railway. I wish in the beginning to note the regret I feel at the withdrawal from the public service of Mr. Butler, the able deputy and chief engineer of the department. In the few years he has been in the department he has made good, if I may be allowed that expression, and his efficiency in every

branch of his work is acknowledged. But perhaps above and beyond that is the fact that his sterling integrity and unswerving devotion to the public interest are conceded by every person. It is too bad in the public interest that we are not able to retain the services of such men because a question of salary, certainly, in reason, is not to be considered, because the difference between a capable and honest man and one who might lack either one or the other of those qualities, might mean an entire year's salary in one transaction in that department. However, Mr. Butler's ability and knowledge have been recognized by a great corporation, he has engaged with them and will leave the department in a few days I have appointed in his place as deputy minister, Mr. Archibald W. Campbell, who is well known, particularly throughout the province of Ontario. Mr. Campbell is an engineer of standing and for the past few years has been deputy Minister in the Public Works Department of the provincial government. I know Mr. Campbell personally, and he has an excellent reputation, both for ability and honesty, and I believe that in him I have secured a deputy minister who will give good service to the country. I intend to make a change in the officials of my department to the extent that Mr. Campbell will act as deputy minister and a chief engineer will be appointed, separate and apart from the position of deputy minister. I propose also to make Mr. Campbell, chairman of the Board of Management of the Intercolonial railway, of which I shall speak in a few moments.

Mr. LENNOX. What will be the difference in cost by reason of dividing the position?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will depend on the salary I will be compelled to give the new man as chief engineer. Mr. Campbell's salary as deputy is regulated by the Civil Service Act and will be $5,000. Mr. Butler, as chief engineer, receives $3,000 in addition to the $5,000. I may say frankly that I have no anticipation that I can get a chief engineer of the ability required for the position for anything like the difference between $5,000 and $8,000. I propose to look about and see what I can do, and then I shall lay before the House an estimate for the amount for which I think we can get a chief engineer.

Mr. FOSTER. What experience has Mr. Campbell had on railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. Previous deputies of the Department of Railways and Canals have had very little experience in railways, and as deputy he would not need to have any experience in railways other than being a good business man. When the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, that is the Ontario government railway, was constructed, the construction was undertaken through a commission, and that commission originally was under the Public Works Department of Ontario. The present commission reports through that department. In the original construction, I think Mr. Campbell as deputy—I am speaking from memory—had a good deal to do in the department with the detail of the construction, not of the actual work but of the returns. So far as I know that is all the experience he has had in railway work.

In approaching the question of transportation, we enter upon a very large subject. Canada has undertaken very large things in the way of the solving of the problem of carrying the produce of the people at as fair a rate as possible, but the work that she has begun and has now in contemplation does not by any means mean the completion of what she will have to undertake. I shall not detain the House further than to say what I have said before, that I believe the Canadian people have shown greater courage than any people in the world in this direction, and that in the years to come and even now, we are reaping the benefit. But the present benefit is nothing to what the people to follow us will reap in this country from the amount of money we are now expending in solving this great question. I look forward to the time, I think with some degree of reason at least, when Canada will do a large proportion of the carrying trade of this continent. We will not only carry our own goods from west to east and east to west, but will, on account of our situation and the natural advantages we enjoy, be enabled to make a successful bid for a large portion of the carrying trade of our neighbours to the south, because business men accept the best offers they can get for transportation as for anything else; and I say again that I look to the time when Canada will do a large portion of the carrying trade of the continent of America.

I shall not go into generalities, but wish to state a few concrete facts in connection with the work of transportation. During my visit abroad last summer I took occasion to visit the great Kiel canal in Germany. This is, if I remember, the only canal in Germany owned by the state, or at least the only large one. The great majority of the canals in Germany and other countries of Europe are owned by private companies. Some of them are owned by county councils, some by railway companies, which is a somewhat anomalous position when we consider the fact that canals are supposed to be rivals of railways and to reduce the cost of transportation. I visited the Kiel canal, a very large work about 61 miles long. It connects the

Baltic sea with the North sea and is used for the transport of the smaller war vessels, and the great improvements being made in it is for the purpose, I believe, of enabling the German government to move their larger warships from ocean to ocean. The length of the locks they propose to make in the new canal will be approximately 800 feet, and the locks will be 150 feet wide and 42 feet deep. This is looked upon as a very large enterprise and it is, but, Sir, when we look at some of the enterprises that are staring the Canadian people in the face, I think we might well say that Canada has engineering problems that she has undertaken and others that she will shortly undertake that will compare favourably in magnitude with even the great Kiel canal which the German government is building. The question of smaller canals in Germany is one that is attracting the very close attention of the German government. They have plans now prepared to practically make a network of canals all through the German empire. But, as I said a moment ago, they are not built by the state or the government, they are largely owned by private corporations, and in some instances by county councils. They build them in canalized rivers, they build small canals connecting lakes, and also build them where there seems to be practically no communication, in order, as one gentleman pointed out to me, to give manufacturers an opportunity to extend their operations out on these cheap waterways, away from the cities, away from the larger taxation, and the other troubles that they have in cities. The manufacture of coarser goods, such as brick, &c., is said to be greatly assisted by the construction of these smaller canals.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister find any like the——

Mr. LENNOX. —the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is getting anxious again. Another point that struck me, and here I think Canada will stand fairly well in the comparison, is that I did not find a canal in the countries I visited owned by any of these people which was free like the Canadian waterways. We have shown greater courage in making our canals free than any of these countries. In Germany, and in England as well, the rates in many cases were high. On one canal the rates were five cents a ton besides harbour dues charged for loading and unloading in harbours constructed along the canal. On another canal the rate went to seven cents a ton, and these canals are run both for the benefit of navigation and as investments. In most instances they pay a small interest on the investment. I point these things out to call attention to the fact that in that respect Canada has shown greater courage than any of these older countries by spending millions upon her canals and throwing them open to the commerce of the North American continent. I also took occasion to visit the great Manchester ship canal, which is about 60 miles from the sea; but even at that distance Manchester is made an ocean port. But I wish to draw attention to the fact that Montreal is now an ocean port, though a good many miles farther from the ocean than Manchester. We have spent millions of dollars in making Montreal an ocean port, and in that again we have shown courage for a young people. Taking our expenditures on our railways, our canals and our waterways generally, it is not at all out of the way to say that Canada has shown greater courage than any other country in the world in the amount of money she has expended per head of the population for carrying out these great works.

With regard to our canals, we have all heard the discussions pro and con upon the Georgian Bay canal and the Welland canal. The opinion of the government as to these is pretty well known. I might state here that there is now being urged the necessity, owing to the great increase in canal traffic in this country, of building another lock at the Sault. Allow me to make a guess, which will not be considered an educated guess on my part, that this will cost the country from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000. That lock, if constructed, ought to provide for a depth of from 25 to 27 feet, because it would be folly to half do the work, when in a few years we would have either to deepen the lock or build a new one.

A few words of statistical information. The canals of Canada in 1909 carried perhaps the largest volume of traffic in their history. The freight which passed through amounted to 33,720,748 tons, as compared with 17,502,820 in 1908. This was an increase of 16,217,928 tons, or 93 per cent in one year. To give an idea of the measure of increase in the freight traffic through our canals, let me state that three years ago the total traffic was only 10,523,185 tons, and ten years ago it was only 5,013,693 tons; so that last year it was nearly seven times as much as it was ten years ago. Of the traffic of 1909, 27,976,399 tons was eastbound and 5,744,349 westbound.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the proportions of Canadian and foreign?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the figures, but I can state generally that while we carried a large amount of American traffic, the proportion of increase of Canadian traffic has been equal and perhaps a little more than that of American traffic.

In this connection I may be allowed to call attention to Port Colborne and the Port Colborne elevator. The harbour at that point was originally an open roadstead which was at the mercy of the sea, and it became absolutely necessary to protect the harbour if it was to be used as an entrance to the canal. Both the Public Works Department and the Department of Railways and Canals have done a large amount of work there. That entrance to the canal was adopted a good many years ago. At that time or shortly afterwards the depth of water in the canal was only 14 feet, and, therefore, the depth of the entrance was only 14 feet. But when it became advisable to build an elevator at Port Colborne, to unload the traffic from larger vessels into smaller ones, it became necessary to make the depth of the harbour equal to the draft of the vessels on the lakes. As the ruling draft of the vessels on the great lakes is now 20 feet, it became necessary to make this harbour suitable for vessels of that draft. This cost a large amount of money for the protection of the harbour; and I may say that more work will have to be done in the way of building breakwaters in order that the harbour may be fully protected, and that ships may be perfectly safe there, no matter what storms may prevail outside, in taking on or discharging their cargoes. The elevator at Port Colborne has now a capacity of 850,000 bushels, and we have foundations and other provisions for increasing that to 2,000,000 bushels. Last year there was put through that elevator about 1,500,000 bushels. That is a comparatively small quantity, particularly when you bear in mind that this elevator is perhaps as efficient a one as can be found any where, capable of unloading some 60,000 bushels per hour. I was not at all sanguine that this elevator, if carried on by the government, would handle any great amount of grain. I think it is no secret that corporations only use government property when they cannot do anything else. They do not encourage us to any great extent in this work. But I am told by a very large shipper that the fact that there was such an elevator at Port Colborne, ready and willing to tranship grain from the larger vessels into the smaller ones, had a very mollifying influence on the freight rates by other routes. One man thought that this resulted in a saving of nearly a cent a bushel in the rates of the other transportation lines. I am not going to discuss that, because I do not know. But even if the saving were only half a cent or a quarter of a cent a bushel, it would mean a great deal to the people shipping their grain from the west. It might be in the interest of all parties—I have not made up my mind on it—if the elevator were leased and run in connection with some of the lines of transportation; but if we did that, unless some restrictions were imposed, it might deprive us of the benefit the elevator now confers of keeping down the freight rates on other routes.

Leaving the canals, allow me to take up the question of the railways of Canada. We have a larger railway mileage per head of the population than any other country in the world. It now amounts to 24,104 miles, an increase on the previous year of 1,138 miles. There is a peculiar situation in reference to the traffic of last year: there was a considerable improvement in the moving of products, but the passenger traffic fell off. Notwithstanding the apparent improvement in business, the people did not travel as much last year as the year before when business was better, perhaps having less business they had more time to travel the year before. The results were as follows:

The railway mileage of Canada is now 24,104, an increase of 1,138 miles during the year.

The freight traffic aggregated 66,842,258 tons, an increase of 3,771,091 tons. In dollars $1,968,128.00.

The passenger traffic amounted to 32,683,-309, a decrease of 1,361,683. A decrease in dollars of $919,015.00.

Nearly a million dollars decrease in the income from the carrying of passengers last year. I do not attempt to explain it but merely state the fact.

I wish to place on record a memo I have received concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific from Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, chief engineer for the government. I shall just read this memo as I think that is the shortest way to put what I desire on record:

Office of the General Consulting Engineer to the Government and Chief Engineer of the Western Division of the National Transcontinental Railway.

The Hon. Geo. P. Graham,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

Ottawa, Canada, January, 13, 1910.

Sir,—I think it desirable at the close of the year that I should report the condition of the works of construction on the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway up to the 31st December, 1909.

Prairie Section.

This section of road extends from Winnipeg to Wolfe Creek, a distance of 915 miles. The grading and bridging are completed throughout the whole distance, and 1,431 miles of single fencing have been built. The track is laid from Winnipeg to a point about 24 miles west of Entwhistle, a distance of 885 miles, and a telegraph line has also been built. There is a lift of ballast on the line from Winnipeg to Entwhistle, a distance of 861 miles.

The road is in operation from Winnipeg to Edmonton, a distance of 795 miles, and the traffic for the past twelve months has been as follows:—

74,715 number of passengers.

5,880,069 bushels of grain.

117,810 tons of general freight.

The accommodation provided for public traffic service on this section is as follows:—

6 engine houses, 3 machine shops, 6 divisional station houses, 33 way station houses, 56 section houses, 67 bunk houses, 55 tool houses, 35 water stations, 6 coaling stations, 77 loading platforms, 113 grain elevators, 13 stock yards.

For the safety of the travelling public all crossings by this road of other railways have been guarded by an interlocking plant.

The following is the public traffic rolling stock:—

92 locomotives, 6 sleeping cars, 3 parlour cars, 4 first-class cars, 9 second-class cars, 4 mail and express cars, 9 baggage cars, 11 colonist cars, 83 conductors vans, 33 refrigerator cars, 2 official cars, 3,213 box freight cars, 895 platform cars, 31 stock cars, 3 Russell snow ploughs.

Work on the 'prairie section' is practically closed down for the winter season; the only work going on, being the laying of the track and the finishing of some of the buildings.

Mountain Section.

This section of the road is about 837 miles in length.

The following works are under contract, viz:—

From Wolf creek to a point 179 miles west thereof. Messrs. Foley, Welch and Stewart are the contractors for the grading and wooden bridges.

They have done considerable clearing of the right of way and about 200,000 cubic yards of excavation. They, however, have a great number of teams on the tote road hauling in plant, tools and supplies, so as to be in readiness for a vigorous prosecution of the works upon the opening of spring. Only a small force is now at work in the cuttings.

Mr. Charles May is the contractor for the substructure of the Wolf Creek and McLeod river bridges.

There is a large quantity of sand and gravel delivered at both points, and a large force of men are engaged in excavating the foundations for the piers, pedestals and abutments; as soon as the track reaches Wolf creek, say in three weeks, cement will be carried up to that point by train.

It is of urgent importance that the work on these two structures be rushed to completion with the greatest possible speed, in order that the track-laying may be advanced, thus facilitating the transportation of plant, tools and supplies to the unlet portions of the 'mountain section,' enabling intending contractors to bid very much lower for the work than they otherwise could.

From the point 179 miles west of Wolf creek to a point 597 miles west thereof, the work has not been placed under contract.

From the point 597 miles west of the Wolf creek to Prince Rupert, a distance of 240 miles, the work of grading and the construction of wooden bridges is under contract with Messrs. Foley, Welch and Stewart.

No work has as yet been executed on the first 40 miles, and merely a good start has been made on the next 100 miles; the reasons being, that navigation closed on the Skeena river about a month earlier than usual, thus putting a stop to running in supplies, tools, plant, etc. However, the contractors are exerting their efforts to push a tote road through so as to enable them to haul in supplies, etc., by team and keep the work moving throughout the winter. They are now at work on one of the tunnels and some rock cuttings.

The work of grading and the construction of wooden bridges on the last 100 miles, to Prince Rupert, was practically completed when a very heavy storm with a high tide caused damage, washing away some of the rock embankments where exposed to the sweep of the open ocean, and bringing down considerable slides from the mountain sides, filling up some cuttings and blocking up waterways. The damage, however, was not very extensive.

Mr. Ferguson, the contractor for the substructure of the several steel bridges, having failed in carrying out his contract, the Grank Trunk Pacific Railway Company have relieved him of the work, and are carrying it on themselves by day labour. This work is progressing very slowly, but better conditions are promised for the future. If these promises are not realized, the track-laying in the spring will be delayed.

Steel rails for this 100 miles; one locomotive; one conductors' van and 24 cars, for the work of track-laying and ballasting, have been delivered at Prince Rupert, and a large quantity of ties have been delivered along the line.

About one mile of track has been laid, but nothing further will be done in that direction until next spring.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Chief Engineer, West. Div. N. T. Ry.

In addition, at the risk of being tedious, I want just to give in a concrete form the position of the work up to date on the eastern section, so that hon. gentlemen will see at a glance what has been done on the whole undertaking by looking at 'Hansard.'

GRADING ON MAIN LINE.

—	Done to March 31, 1909.	March 31, 1909 to Nov. 30, 1909.	Total done to Nov. 30, 1909.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
District 'A'.....	170·	71·	241·
" 'B'.....	267·25	82·35	349·6
" 'C'.....	Nil.	8·	8·
" 'D' ...	24·29	81·71	106·
" 'E'.....	5·96	27·04	33·
" 'F'.....	258·	49·50	307·5
Total.....	725·50	319·60	1,045·1

TRACKLAYING.

District.	Main line.	To Mar. 31, 1909. Sidings.	Total.	To Nov. 30, 1909. Main line.	Sidings.	Total.
	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.	Miles.
'A'.	34·44	11·44	45·88	124·98	20·84	145·82
'B'.	115·03	11·46	126·49	169·33	13·94	183·27
'D'.	.....	.....	.....	47·44	10·96	58·40
'F'.	126·02	36·98	163·00	255·87	56·81	312·68
	275·49	59·88	335 37	597·62	102·55	700·17

BALLASTING.

——	Done to March 31, 1909.	Done to Nov. 30, 1909.
	Miles.	Miles.
District 'A'.....	25·2	101·5
" 'B'.....	40·2	74·8
" 'C'.....	Nil.	Nil.
" 'D'.....	Nil.	Nil.
" 'E'.....	Nil.	Nil.
" 'F'.....	112·8	212·4
Total.....	178·2	425·0

NOTE.—Above mileages represent the equivalent of fully ballasted track. The mileages of sidings are included.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that up to date?

Mr. GRAHAM. Up to November 30, 1909.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAIN. Roughly, what is the total mileage of the Transcontinental?

Mr. GRAHAM. 1,804. With reference to the steel superstructures, I have the figures here:

RELATING TO STEEL SUPERSTRUCTURES FOR BRIDGES.

STEEL BRIDGES COMPLETED.

District.	Weight of Steel.	Timber	Total cost.
	Lbs.	Ft. b. m.	$ cts.
'A'.....	1,961,486	161,297	48,331 82
'B'.....	19,290,501	1,380,257	917,101 24
'C'.....	.....	.....	.....
'D'.....	.....	.....	.....
'E'.....	.....	.....	.....
'F'.....	2,348,236	190,750	157,015 99
	23,600,223	1,732,304	1,122,449 05

STEEL BRIDGES UNDER CONTRACT NOT COMPLETED.

District.	Estimated weight of steel.	Estimated Timber.	Total Estimated cost.	Paid to Dec. 31, 1909.	Estimated balance to complete.
	Lbs.	Ft. b. m.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
'A'.....	23,296,314	1,237,403	1,148,060 74	637,907 60	510,153 14
'B'.....	4,998,799	350,743	197,386 75	164,754 49	32,632 26
'C'.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
'D'.....	8,471,000	537,400	375,647 00	87,794 34	287,852 66
'E'.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
'F'.....	7,693,504	524,451	423,971 17	59,104 57	364,866 60
	44,459,617	2,649,979	2,145,065 66	949,561 00	1,195,564 66

STEEL BRIDGES REQUIRED BUT NOT YET UNDER CONTRACT.

District.	Estimated weight of steel.	Estimated Timber.	Total Estimated cost.
	Lbs.	Ft. b.m.	$ cts.
'A'	3,281,000	231,500	162,033 63
'B'	9,608,786	865,748	543,765 21
'C'	10,092,000	731,900	491,466 90
'D'	4,879,200	532,400	246,715 70
'E'	9,224,700	757,800	462,984 00
'F'	725,000	100,893	43,022 22
	37,810,686	3,220,241	1,949,987 66

SUMMARY.

Cost of completed bridges	$ 1,122,449 05
Estimate cost of incompleted bridges under contract	2,145,065 66
" " bridges not yet under contract	1,949,987 66
Total estimated cost of steel superstructures of Eastern Division	$ 5,217,502 37
Expenditure from September, 1904, to June, 1905	$ 778,363 63
" for the year ended 30th June, 1906	1,831,263 50
" " nine months ended 31st March, 1907	5,537,867 50
" " year ended 31st March, 1908	18,910,449 41
" " year ended 31st March, 1909	24,892,772 98
" " nine months ended 31st December, 1909	15,939,980 57
	$67,890,697 59

That gives as briefly as possible the standing of the work, both on the western division and the eastern division of the Transcontinental, and hon. gentlemen will be able to see at a glance just about what has been done.

Now, Sir, I come to a very important matter. Hon. gentlemen have no doubt read with some interest the report presented by Mr. Butler, chief engineer and Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways, on the Hudson bay route. This report was made by Mr. Butler after studying the report of Mr. Armstrong, the engineer in charge of the Hudson bay railway project. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it clear to the country and clear to this House that this government has been committed to this work and intends to proceed with it with all possible speed. After a full study of the matter, or rather a study of it so far as is possible at the present time, the government has decided, and I believe the country will concur in that decision, that it is advisable to make the Hudson bay route another great outlet for the rapidly increasing products of the western part of this great country. Every dollar that can be saved to the people of the west in the transportation of their products means that a large part of that dollar will go to better remunerate them for the labour they expend in the cultivation of the land. The government intends to proceed as rapidly as possible with the construction of this work. You will notice in the report presented by Mr. Butler something which no doubt surprised many hon. members, as it certainly did surprise me. I refer to the fact that in the opinion of Mr. Armstrong, the engineer, Nelson harbour is superior to Churchill as the terminus of the Hudson bay railroad. I had always concluded, whether rightly or wrongly, that Churchill was the most suitable harbour on the Hudson bay, but my preconceived idea in that respect has been upset by the report of Mr. Armstrong, who, from the data secured, has no hesitation in expressing his opinion that Nelson is the better harbour of the two.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Which would be the shorter route?

Mr. GRAHAM. To Nelson it is 67 miles shorter than to Churchill, by the railroad.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has he given his reasons why he believes Nelson is the better harbour?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are explained very well in the report.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I drew a different conclusion from the report of the same man.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, he says in his report that Nelson is the better harbour. However, before either terminus is selected it would be wise to make sure of that fact, and I may say that the Minister of Marine will ask from the House a vote for the purpose of sending a ship up through the channel which will come into both these harbours from the outside, make an examination of the channel and of the passage through the straits. This expedition will make a thorough investigation of the entrance to the outer harbours of both places, and when that is done we will be in a position to take up in a more practical way that part of the project at the harbour end. But that need not mean any delay in the beginning of the construction of the railway. Included in this great project there are wharfs and elevators, and the construction of these great wharfs and elevators will be greatly facilitated by having the railway constructed so that the material may be carried in. I repeat that the delay necessary in making a full investigation as to the particular harbour which will be selected does not of necessity mean delay in the construction of the railway which, in my opinion, ought to be constructed in advance of the building of the elevators and wharfs, so that the supplies may be more economically taken on the ground.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Instead of sending a ship round there to take soundings in the harbour, why not send a canoe? It would do just as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not far from the strait into the harbour, and the ship will be sent to make observations in the Strait as well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is a different matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. The ship will enter the harbours of Churchill and Nelson and make observations and give us information as to the approaches to these harbours as well as with respect to the conditions inside.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The approach to the straits would be the same for one harbour as for the other, and I see no reason whatever for delaying to get up a junketing expedition to explore the harbours. There are fifty boats plying along each harbour, and the soundings of these harbours are just as well known as the soundings of the harbour of Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has information about that, because the engineers have divergent views.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister had that information in his department long years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I will not stop to discuss that now. The objection taken to some works undertaken by the government has been that the government embarked on the enterprise before they had full information, and so in this case I am going to try and get information in order that we may ensure that we shall select the proper harbour.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to start to build his railway before he knows where the terminus is going to be? Surely he will want to know in what direction he is going to run the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. For over 200 miles the route will be in common no matter which harbour is selected.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why were not the investigations in regard to the channel made before?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sure I do not know why they have not been made before, but, if we are going to provide what is to be a through route, and if we are going to have a railway to connect with that route for the transportation of the products of the people of the west, I think every one will agree that we ought to have all the information which it is possible for us to obtain as to which is the better harbour. Heretofore the general opinion has been that Churchill is the better harbour, but we are now told by the engineers that Nelson is better, and even if Nelson is no more than as good a harbour as Churchill, if we can save 67 miles railway construction by going to that harbour, I think the country will consider that we are wise in making a thorough investigation of the matter. However, as I have pointed out, that does not mean that we should delay commencing the construction of the railway, because about 260 miles of the road will be the same no matter which harbour is selected, namely, from Pas Mission to Split lake.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How far is it from the Pas Mission to Nelson?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is 410 miles from the Pas Mission to Nelson, and 477 miles from the Pas Mission to Churchill, which gives a difference of 67 miles. There is a very interesting statement in this report, if it be true, that by the construction of this railroad and the establishing of the route, 5 cents per bushel can be saved to the people of the west on the grain they produce. An

examination of the conditions seems to lend credence to that statement, and if that be so it is in the interest of the people, of the west, yes, it is in the interest of Canada as a whole that we should without delay place within the reach of our western people this method of transportation which will enable them to effect this great saving. The report states that the distance from Nelson to Liverpool is 3,200 miles, and from Montreal to Liverpool 3,007 miles, or practically the same distance.

Mr. BRODER. Would the construction of this Hudson bay route have any effect on the Georgian bay canal project?

Mr. CONMEE. There is lots of work for both.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a little hard to say what the result would be, but I am such an optimist that I believe that within the next 25 years, in the Dominion of Canada, we can undertake to build all the projects we have in view and still not have any too many lines of transportation to carry the products of the country.

Mr. BRODER. If you take grain by the Hudson bay route at 5 cents per bushel to the shipper, I do not see that you will get much advantage the other way.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was estimated at 5 cents per bushel in comparison with existing rates, and my hon. friend must remember that running the Hudson Bay railway at full steam, and carrying all it is possible, we can relieve the pressure on the traffic from the Northwest to only a small amount, in view of the vast production of that country. I suppose hon. gentlemen have read that report, and they have seen that it is stated as the opinion of Mr. Butler that the coal of eastern Canada could by that route be taken at a commercial price to at least some of the points in the great west. If that be true, then not only is the west interested in the construction of this great work, but the people away in the remote east of Canada are also interested in the rapid and speedy completion of this great railway transportation. Now, without going into further details, I may say that when the supplementary estimates come down there will be an item providing for the commencement of the construction of this project as rapidly as possible, and I hope during the coming summer; I believe we will be able to undertake the construction of this project this summer, before we have another session of parliament. The country can rest assured that the government proposes to deal with this work in a practical way, and to proceed with its construction; because if any benefit is to accrue, I have always believed in trying to get some of it for the people who are now doing the work and making the investment, and the sooner we get this project completed, the sooner returns will come to the people.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost of the railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer in charge, Mr. Armstrong, made an estimate, and the chief engineer of my department thought that in his estimate he had not provided for a standard of road such as ought to be constructed for the heavy traffic that will be carried during the very busy season. I want to say that this estimate is made on preliminary surveys, a survey party is now engaged in making the location from Le Pas to Split lake. There may be an increase in this figure after the line is properly located, because an estimate that may be approximate on a preliminary survey quite often is not a proper estimate if you have to change the location to some other point, and make it an absolute location. The estimate as given for the entire railway, with elevators, warehouse and terminal facilities at Nelson, is $16,426,340.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is that likely to be as accurate as the Grand Trunk Pacific estimate?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have tried to explain these estimates to the House. I say frankly that these are approximate, because these are not location surveys, and we might run across a different kind of soil, and different material. But this provides for a railway of a grade of four-tenths of one per cent. There may be some difference of opinion as to the necessity of building a road with 80-lb. rails and an expensive grade of that kind. But as a matter of fact, the contour of the country is nearly level, and the engineer thinks he is well within his estimate.

Mr. HUGHES. Four tenths of one per cent going to Hudson bay?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer thinks it is practicable to make a grade of that kind both ways, and that grade will be at least for the east bound traffic.

Mr. LAKE. Is the western end to commence at Le Pas mission and run into the prairie country?

Mr. GRAHAM. The western end of this line has always been discussed and regarded as starting from Le Pas mission. Provision can be made for running lines into the country in other directions, but the western end of this line is supposed

to commence at what is known as Le Pas mission.

Mr. LAKE. Is it the idea of the government to construct this as a government work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman is asking me questions very rapidly. There might be a difference of opinion as to whether this should be constructed as a government work, or whether we should allow the project to be dealt with largely by a company. To-day I am not prepared to say in what way it may ultimately be done. But no matter how it is done, that does not of necessity mean that we cannot begin the construction at once, because if an arrangement were made with a company that was satisfactory, any work the government had done could be handed over to it on reasonable terms in a contract.

Mr. WHITE. The minister has said that there will be an appropriation in the supplementary estimates for building the Hudson Bay railway. I would like to know if there is any chance of an amount being provided for the commencement of the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I think not this year. I have not been discussing the Georgian Bay canal. However, it is a great work which is before the people, and will be constructed in due time by this government, which has always undertaken the great projects that the country required. Now, Sir, the question of what a railway ought to do has been discussed in this House, and discussed elsewhere. Some hon. gentlemen have thought that a railway is a great promoter of industry, that is, that a railway can own industries, run them and make them profitable, and thus develop the country. I think however, that is hardly the proper view to take. As for England, I have looked into a recent decision there which was to the effect, that a railway company could not engage in any other business, but it must devote itself to the business of transportation. But there are cases in the old land where railways have constructed canals and operated them in connection with the railway. I think that is not the best method, because it places the rates practically in the hands of one company, and canals do not operate as they ought to operate in keeping down railway rates. But returning to the question of railways doing other business, in England they are not allowed to transact other business. In France, I think six private companies own all the railways except that portion of the railways that is owned by the state, the figures of which I will give in a few minutes. The conditions of aid given to the French railways are such that, if carried out, the state will own all the French railways by 1950 or 1960. But it is fair to say that as occasion requires, France has deviated from the arrangement with those railways, and has made some concessions and changed the conditions that were originally made. The only railway line not being operated under this arrangement with the government, was recently taken over by the French government, I think they call it the Great West Railway, which is now a part of the system. In the United States, one of the troubles in connection with railways during the past few years has been that they have been doing a coal business in connection with the railway, and imposing rates that the people thought were too high. When the Interstate Commerce Commission took charge, they began regulating the rate of the railways, but the railway could immediately proceed to make it up on the price of coal, and consequently there was no benefit coming to the people from the regulation of that railway. The inter-state commerce law now prohibits railways from owning and operating coal mines. If they do it they have to do it under some other name. I am merely pointing this out to show that the theory that a railway could go into any part of Canada and operate coal mines would not work out to the benefit of the people, and it would not be five years until an Act was passed prohibiting that because we would lose in railway rates by such an amalgamation. The United States has found it necessary to say that railways shall not own and operate coal mines.

I wish to place before the House a short statement in reference to the state railways of the continent of Europe to which I have given some study during the past few months. Germany, out of 35,000 miles, operates 31,043. In answer to my hon. friend I want to point out that the federal government of Germany does not own a mile of railway, but that these railways are owned and operated by the various states in Germany, just as if the various provinces in Canada owned and operated their railways. So, it is hardly fair to point to German state railways and compare the situation there to that which would exist in Canada if Canada owned her railways. I wish to say again that the states of the German empire own and operate their railways and that the federal government does not, while in Canada it would be the federal government that would have to operate them. To proceed with this table:

Country.	Miles of Railway.	Operated by State.
Germany...	35,000	31,043
France..	29,293	5,530
Italy..	10,068	6,600
Russia..	38,300	35,350
Austro-Hungary .	23,600	12,430
Belgium..	3,850	2,480
Sweden..	7,580	2,600
Norway..	1,548	1,329
Switzerland.	2,480	1,500
Denmark.	1,934	1,120

In New South Wales there are 3,623 miles of railway owned by the state and operated under a commission. In Victoria the South Australian railway is operated under a commission, being 1,879 miles in length, while in New Zealand 2,682 miles of railway are owned and operated by the government under a general manager. I may say in passing that in Italy in 1885, owing to dissatisfaction with government operation, the lines were leased to a private company, but they found that private operation was obnoxious, the state took them back in 1905 and they are now being operated by the state.

I could speak at some length on the question of the railways in Germany or with reference to those to which I gave particular attention. I think perhaps it would not be amiss to speak of one or two points. With reference to passenger rates on all railways, I think I am safe in saying that in the aggregate they are lower than in this country. The great majority of people do not travel first-class on any of the European railways. Asked why the traffic was gradually and constantly increasing, the reason given by one of the general managers was that the multiplicity and increasing number of automobiles rendered it so easy for people who would travel first-class to reach their destinations, in comparatively small countries, that a great many of them travelled by automobile instead of going by the railway. But, the fact remains that first-class rates are very high in comparison with second or third class rates. On a German railway I travelled from Kiel to Paris, a small portion of the railway being in France, and I paid, first-class, including baggage—and it was very light baggage—4½ cents per mile.

Mr. LANCASTER. Single fare?

Mr. GRAHAM. Single fare. I also paid for sleeping accommodation $3.50. When we compare this with our first-class fare it would be abnormally high both for the sleeping accommodation and the travelling rate.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that an upper berth?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, this was a good berth. The accommodation is excellent on the trains, but I submit again that there are certain phases of travel in the old land, even in a first-class carriage, or in a good many of them, that are not as good as they are in this country. An improvement is being made and has been made during the past few years, by the introduction of corridor cars, which removes to a large extent some of the objections which I have in mind. Go where you will in the old land, whether on a private or a state owned line, and you are impressed with the fact that first-class travellers have to pay much more than they do in this country. In Germany they practically carry no baggage at all, or a very small amount, and you have to pay for your baggage. That may account for the other fact that people coming from Germany or from the old land carry into their seats all the baggage they possibly can because they have got into the habit of having their baggage weighed in England or weighed and paid for in Germany. When you come to the lower classes, travelling is very cheap in the old land, and it can be cheap because there passengers travel by the million and the railways have the short haul and the crowded trains which is the ideal condition enabling a railway to make money. But, when you come to freight it is a little different. I found this out in my investigation, and I came back impressed with the fact that there is no place in Europe, at least, where the control over rates can at all compare with the control over rates by the government of this country. They have control, through certain bodies, over the rates, but their rules are so lenient and their enforcement is, I think, so lax, that the railway companies, as far as I could judge, practically make their own rates and have very little, if any, interference. A good deal has been said in this country about cheaper passenger fares. That is the ideal situation, but I submit to the House and the country that the people whose labour is involved in the producing of goods are more interested in getting cheap rates for the transport of their goods than they are in securing cheaper passenger rates.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is that the human consideration is less than the dead matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. The consideration is not as my hon. friend stated. It is a matter of dollars and cents, but the human consideration is also taken into account. The matter of dollars and cents comes back all the same to the man's pocket whether he

is travelling himself or sending a carload of freight.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There are some things you cannot measure in dollars and cents

Mr. GRAHAM. That is true, and it is a good thing it is true. When I come to consider the freight situation I say without hesitation that the people of Canada are in an infinitely better position as regards freight rates and the amount they get for the money paid in freight rates than they are in any country in Europe. I will in a few moments give you a table of figures which, I think, will convince you of that fact. The great attention paid to passenger rates in the old land seems to have deterred them from going as far as they might with respect to freight traffic. Of course, they have the small cars, wagons they call them, of 15 or 20 tons, although some, I think, are now 30 tons. But when you come to consider the freight rates they have to pay on this haulage, the people of this country would be astonished. In Germany, with state owned railways, taking into consideration all the special rates—and they have many of them—the freight in that great country of industry, that country filled with population and teeming with the products of the people, are more than double what we pay in Canada. In the matter of freight haulage we in Canada,—owing possibly to the regulation by the commission, and to the fact that we have given much aid to the companies—have rates lower than are enjoyed in any country in Europe which I visited. Speaking of the Railway Commission, I was called on by two or three gentlemen in London and was told that we were giving altogether too much power to our board of railway commissioners. One gentleman said that we were going so far as to perhaps make capital a little timid. Of course, I disagreed with him at once, and took up, as I thought, the practical side, the benefit derived by the people on account of the appointment of the commission and the work they are carrying out. I believe to-day that the decisions of the commission are fair and that the commission are looking after the interests of the people, but not in a way to be unjust to the men who have put their money into these great undertakings. The people of Canada do not want any control to be unjust to the people who have made investments in this country, and I do not believe the commissioners are unjust.

Mr. HUGHES. Have any data been collected as to the possibility of winter navigation as apart from the spring navigation of Hudson straits?

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot perhaps give my hon. friend a satisfactory answer. My idea in having a steamer sent up there would be that we would make observations and get all the data necessary. That is the reason why I thought great care would have to be exercised. I have read in reports that while the navigation in the harbour was open for quite a long period, the navigation in the Strait was open for a much shorter period. These questions only emphasize the necessity of a thorough investigation before we decide on what harbour we should select.

I turn now to another question involved in the management of the Department of Railways and Canals, that is the Quebec bridge. Hon. gentlemen will excuse me, I know, for giving a brief history of this project since it was taken over by the Department of Railways and Canals two years ago, and the work of preparing for reconstruction undertaken. As there are a good many technical terms in connection with this, the House will bear with me if I read the memoranda because some hon. gentlemen in the House are engineers and they will like to see the statement just as it is. The memorandum is as follows:

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Following the precedent of the United States government in the case of the Panama canal; the state of New York in the case of the Erie Canal enlargement; and of the city of New York in the case of the Blackwell's Island bridge, a board of eminent engineers has been appointed charged with the responsibility of designing the bridge, and the following gentlemen were selected for the task:—

Henri Vautelet, M. Can. Soc. C. E., of Montreal, as chairman and chief engineer.

Ralph Modjeski, M. Am. Soc. C. E., consulting engineer, of Chicago.

Maurice Fitzmaurice, C. M. G., M. Inst. C. E., chief engineer, London county council, England.

The task entrusted to these gentlemen is a great one, and, as was anticipated at the time of their appointment, material differences of opinion have arisen between them. Under the provisions of the order in council creating the board, in the event of differences arising, consulting engineers were to be called in to assist. Accordingly, on the question of foundations and substructures, Mr. Alfred Noble, M. Am. Soc. C. E., chief engineer of the Pennsylvania Railway tunnel, of New York (one of the most experienced men in America in foundation work), and Mr. Henry Holgate, M. Can. Soc C. E., of Montreal, were selected, and the matters in dispute were accordingly settled.

The south pier is to be enlarged to an area of 180 feet by 80 feet at the base.

A new caisson is to be sunk for the north pier and is to be carried to the rock, reducing the span from 1,800 to 1,785 feet.

Specifications covering every phase of the substructure work have been completed. Gen-

eral plans for guidance of the contractors have been prepared. The work of the substructure was advertised widely and the work was allotted to Messrs. M. P. & J. T. Davis, they being the lowest tenderers.

The other tenderers were Larkin & Sangster and M. Connolly.

Superstructure.

A great deal of valuable work has been done. The span, centre to centre of main piers, has been fixed at 1,758 feet; the width, centre to centre of trusses, at 88 feet; with a maximum depth of truss of 290 feet. A clear head room of 150 feet above the highest water has been provided for, a width of 600 feet under the centre of the bridge.

A general specification has been prepared, fixing the loading so that it will be ample for all possible contingencies of the future.

The unit stresses allowed have been settled, for carbon steel and nickel steel, and are conservative.

The form of the main compression members has been determined.

A series of tests of model columns has been started and a similar series of tests of chord bars will be carried to completion.

The dead load has been thoroughly computed and the relative concentrations determined, thus eliminating all possibility of error in calculations for the new structure.

Material differences of opinions relating to the superstructure have arisen from time to time between members of the board, and acting under the provision of the order in council, Mr. Paul Wolfel, M. Am. Soc. C. E., consulting engineer of Philadelphia, and Mr. Phelps Johnson, chief engineer and manager of the Dominion Bridge Company, of Montreal, were called in as consulting engineers, and the difficulties were overcome.

The work has advanced and at present stage is as follows:—

An advertisement has been published in the 'London Engineering' and 'The Engineer,' in England; 'The New York Engineering News' and 'The Engineering Record,' in New York; and in the Canadian press, inviting the bridge builders of the world to go to the office of the board at Montreal and study the problem. The plans and general specifications are here, and they will be allowed until May to prepare their studies, get familiar with the details of the plans and specifications; after that date three or four months will be allowed for the preparation of tenders. All tenderers must bid on the plans prepared by the board, but may submit alternative designs—in this way the form of the trusses, about which there is a reasonable difference of opinion, will be tested; the question of a suspension or cantilever bridge will be settled. The board have completed studies for a suspension bridge and also for a single intersection cantilever. The ultimate decision will be made when all the designs are before the board, having regard to: first, safety; second, speed of erection and completion; third, cost.

As the responsibility for the proper carrying on of the work is placed upon the builder, and the fact that the best designs the board are able to prepare is in competition with the best efforts of the best bridge builders in the world, we hope to secure the best bridge that the present state of engineering skill can produce.

Mr. M. P. Davis, who secured the contract for piers, was the lowest tenderer, the other tenderers being Messrs. Larkin & Sangster and Mr. Connolly.

I wish to point out to the House, although perhaps it is unnecessary, that unless you have studied this question beside an engineer and listened to all the difficulties suggested and discussed by him, or you are an engineer yourself, you have no idea of the magnitude of this work. It is so great that men with the ability and the reputation of these men will only move very carefully and very cautiously and not until they have absolutely made a study of every step to be taken. As I pointed out to them when discussing the question with them, the great point to be considered was the stability of this project, there must be no chance, so far as engineering skill can provide against such chance, of any failure in the construction and the remaining constructed of this bridge. That being their instructions—and they would have done it without any such instructions—they studied every step with the greatest care, tests and studies were made both in this country, in the United States and in more than one country in the old world. so that step by step they might be sure of what they were doing.

The effect of the specification as to width and height of the bridge, mentioned in the statement I have read, is that the channel for navigation will be 600 feet wide, and that there will be a clear head of 150 feet from the bridge to high water level.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask the minister whether they had considered the large boats that are liable to come up to Montreal. Some years ago I had occasion to place some statistics and facts in regard to the boats coming across the Atlantic, and I would like to know whether it is not possible to raise the bridge more than 150 feet above the water.

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter was placed before this board and information obtained and discussed, but it was thought that if any vessel needed a greater space than that for its masts or funnels, provision should be made for passing the bridge in the construction of the ship, but in all human probability this 150 feet will accommodate all vessels that want to come to Montreal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Not with the Marconi system; it will only allow the smokestacks to go under.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Has the minister at hand a statement of the differences between the engineers as to the substructure, to settle which these other engineers were called in?

Mr. GRAHAM. The trouble was technical, so technical that I would not attempt to explain it. It was a difference between engineers. The question came up about formations and finding solid rock. Another term I heard discussed was as to the angle of repose for the earth—how far they would have to go to get certain results. There were technical questions of engineering, and these two experts were called in to consult with them. I might say that it is proposed that in the contract with the builder, so that there can be no question, he shall be required to accept the contract on the plans and specifications, and shall be held responsible as a builder for the construction of the bridge on the plans and specifications which he accepts.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will he have a guarantee?

Mr. GRAHAM. He will have to give a guarantee or he cannot get the contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long will it likely be before the bridge will be completed?

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. And what will be the probable cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it would be hardly fair for me to mention the estimated cost while we are asking for tenders. My own opinion is that the bridge will be constructed in about four years. That is not the opinion of the engineers, but my own; I have not asked their opinion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Four years from next fall?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine so.

Mr. LENNOX. Will there not have to be a limit of time fixed within which the contractors will be required to complete the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be very difficult to fix a time limit if that were to affect the safety of the project. The board will probably tell us what time will be ample for the construction of the work, and that will be the time limit we will put in the contract. Up to this time I have not studied that phase of the question, and I imagine that the engineers are not yet prepared to say what time limit should be fixed.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The minister will have to give an estimate of the cost when he comes down with his estimates for the expenditure, and he might just as well give it now.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will understand the difficulty, when we are advertising for tenders, of telling people what they would be able to tender for. I shall perhaps be in a position to give my hon. friend some information as to that a little later. There is no hesitation at all in giving it except public interest.

Leaving that and coming to a question of more local interest, perhaps, I will take up the much-discussed, mildly-criticised and somewhat interesting question of the Intercolonial railway. I want to speak of the question of capital account in connection with railways. The Intercolonial railway management, both under this government and under previous governments, has been criticised for its expenditure on capital account. Some of the criticisms, possibly, have been fair, but some of it I think will not be warranted by a comparison with other roads. A great advance has been made in arriving at a basis of what should be charged to capital account in the last few years owing to the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Under the ruling of that commission, a certain amount each year, according to the particular railway, is required to be devoted to betterments, and any betterments over and above this stated amount must come out of capital. That is to prevent work being done out of revenue that ought to be done out of capital. The result of the former method, or lack of method, was that in good fat years, when there was good business, the companies would make a lot of expenditures out of their revenue. That would really prevent the public knowing what their net profits were. But since the Interstate Commerce Commission have endeavoured to regulate rates, they have insisted that many things which heretofore were charged to revenue, shall be charged to capital account, so that people will know exactly what the profits of the railway companies are, and they can regulate their rates accordingly. I know that is the reverse of the argument that has been used, but that is the absolute fact to-day under the ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission. If we take the principle that is now adopted on all the American railways, the Intercolonial can stand side by side with them on a question of what should be charged to capital and what to revenue. I will go further: I believe that in past years we have charged to revenue what under the Interstate Commerce law we would be compelled to charge to capital.

Mr. HUGHES. And vice versa?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no vice versa in this case. On the question of what ought to be charged to capital account there has been a difference of opinion. I have been told in this House that certain small expenditures should not be charged to capi-

tal account, and that when a railway reaches a certain point its capital account ought to cease.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister speaks of the Interstate Commerce Commission controlling capital account. When does he propose that the Railway Commission of Canada shall have similar control?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a question to be dealt with by the Canadian parliament, of which my hon. friend is a member. I admit that I think he has done his duty in that respect. We want to treat the government railways in as approximately fair a way as we would the railway of a company. This much seems to be forgotten that about seventy-five per cent of the company lines on this continent have gone into liquidation, and the original capital and the original stock-holders have, for all purposes of profit, been wiped out. If you would apply the same principle to the Intercolonial railway, you could have wiped out all the capital invested in it some years ago, and started afresh, just as the purchasers of these other railways did when they wiped out the original investment by legal sale. Every dollar invested on capital account on the Intercolonial railway stands there to-day against it, whereas in many of the company lines one-half the original capital has been practically wiped out by liquidation.

It is said sometimes that the Intercolonial railway charges small things to capital which should come out of revenue. Well, in that respect I submit the Intercolonial stands on all fours with company lines and will also compare with them in that same respect as regards age. If the capital account of a railway must cease after a number of years, then the Baltimore and Ohio, which is 82 years old, ought to have come nearly to the end of its capital account. But it has not. I have its last annual report before me; and I find in that report charged to capital account items of a similar kind as those objected to in the capital account of the Intercolonial railway. For instance, I find such items as repairing tracks at shops, $289.18; a wagon scale, $358.62; new track scale, $983.69; improving track crossing, $98.23; new stock block, $142.44; sidings, new yardmaster's office, increasing water supply, new yards, round house—all these items are very familiar, and we see them all in the capital account of the Baltimore and Ohio railway as presented last year in its 82nd annual report. Therefore, the Intercolonial railway is doing exactly what these companies are doing as regards expenditure on capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. What I would like for my own information is not so much the independent items as the principles laid down for determining what is capital expenditure and what is expenditure out of revenue. If we could have those principles, which have now become operative in the United States, under the commission my hon. friend speaks of, explained by the minister, that would be of real service to the House. In the case of a round house or a yardmaster's house, several things might occur. Was the trackmaster's house to replace one which had been burnt down or was it a new building rendered necessary for the traffic of the road and, therefore, chargeable to capital?

Mr. GRAHAM. The report says a new yardmaster's office——

Mr. FOSTER. Whether the yardmaster was new or not, I suppose the house was one which had not existed before and was not the successor of a similar house.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure whether the yardmaster was new or not. It was the office I was speaking of, and my hon. friend was simply making a little play on words. The items in the Baltimore and Ohio report are identical with those we have in our own capital account. The rule, I think, is that anything which will add to the value of the property, any betterment which will add to the power of earning, should go into capital account. One man, a very great authority, has given the extreme opinion that if you put two nails into a plank where there was only one before, the second should be charged to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. So that is the principle, we can understand it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister give us the principle as laid down by the commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have given it in my own words.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I mean the American commission. Do I understand the minister to say that he has given in his own words what the American commission have decided upon?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is my understanding of the principle on which they act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The American roads, through the commission, are systematizing the whole business of capitalization and keeping accounts. It would be useful information if we could get the actual rules and principles adopted in that country.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that would be a good idea, and I thought I had explained it.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman has put it, if you put an additional nail in a plank along side the one which was already there, and it is serviceable, you can charge that additional nail to capital account. But if the old nail rusted out and you put a new one in its place that would not be a new nail and could not be charged to capital account. Is that the ministerial interpretation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not give the Interstate Commerce Commission rule, but I gave the opinion of a railway authority. Practically speaking, anything that is new and that gives additional value or additional earning power is chargeable to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a nail rusted out and you put another one in to take its place, that gives additional earning power, as the earning power would be less without it.

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose you put in a bigger nail?

Mr. FOSTER. If you come down to measurement, you will charge to excess. The principle is absolute, if that is what we understand. What has been doing service and has become worn out, is not replaced at the expense of capital. But what never has been there and what it is necessary should be there, is chargeable to capital when put in?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, I think, is right. The former condition should be kept up out of revenue, but there is this which all railway companies have done, so far as I can find out. When they are building a new station, to replace an old one, they charge that to capital. For instance, the railway companies will have to build a station in Toronto. Notwithstanding the fact that they have a station there already, every dollar of the new station will come out of capital account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what principle is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not stating a principle but a fact

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what principle is it done?

Mr. GRAHAM. The old station becomes useless. There is no value for it for the railway, and a new, commodious and modern structure must be built, and it will be built out of capital.

I want to put on record just a few things that have been done out of capital account.

Mr. BARKER. All the discussion in recent years in this House arose out of the expenditure on steel rails, steel or iron bridges. It was not a question of these small things; it was whether the minister of the day was taking advantage of putting in heavier rails to charge the whole of the rails to capital account. He had a sixty-six pound rail in the track already charged to capital account; he removed that and put in an eighty pound rail and he charged the whole eighty pounds to capital. That, we protested against. We said he was obliged to put the sixty-six pounds to maintenance and the fourteen pounds, the difference between the two, to capital. That is a perfectly well known principle.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be if you threw away the sixty-six pound rail.

Mr. BARKER. No, your sixty-six pound rail goes into stores for what it is worth.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well the difficulty in accepting that principle absolutely is that some of the sixty-six pound rails which were replaced by eighty pound rails on the main line were relaid elsewhere and still remain in active service. I agree with my hon. friend that when the sixty-six pound rail is sold, capital should be given credit for what it brings, and I would go even further and say that the difference between what the light rail is worth when it goes out of service and what the new rail costs might be charged to capital. The practice of railways is that every year they set aside a certain amount for the renewal of rails, just as the Intercolonial railway has done, but they do not actually charge the rail difference to capital account.

Now, I want to point out a few things in reference to the Intercolonial and the amount of money expended on it. A good deal has been said as to the number of locomotives on the railway, and one hon. gentleman in making his criticism has pointed out that we had so many locomotives last year and the year before and we only have the same number now, so that consequently we have not improved the rolling stock. Well, it is not a question of the number of locomotives or the number of cars. The question is, what the locomotives can haul and what the cars can carry, and if in the renewal of rolling stock the hauling capacity of the engines and the carrying capacity of the cars is increased then the capacity of the railroad is so much greater than it was before, and one need not bother about numbers. One locomotive to-day will haul three or four times as much as it did twenty years ago, and a 60,000 pound car at the present time will carry twice and sometimes three times as much as a freight car carried fifteen or twenty years ago. Here are some figures extending over the last thirteen years which

will give some interesting details as to the increases which have taken place in the different services of the Intercolonial railway:

—	1896.	1909.	Increase per cent.
Length of line	1186·5	1479·13	25
Capital invested	$55,277,034.63	$90,994,664.06	65
No. of locomotives	204	414	100
Tractive power of locomotives, lbs	2,686,725	10,318,716	284
Passenger car service, number	276	450	60
Freight car service, number	6,667	12,692	90
Ploughs, flanges, &c., number	77	103	30
Engine mileage	4,714,661	9,208,327	95
Car mileage	43,005,684	93,374,119	117
Train mileage	3,842,502	6,865,204	79
No. of passengers	1,471,866	2,933,754	100
Tons of freight	1,379,618	3,552,739	160
Sidings	157·25	365·74	132

These figures show improvement all round.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the question of what the Intercolonial railway has done during the past nine months. This question of the managing board is one which is surrounded with difficulties, and I am in a position to speak as to that with some degree of knowledge. The board has been criticised, sometimes I think severely. With that, however, I have no fault to find because the Intercolonial railway is a public institution and these public-managed and public owned affairs are always liable to criticism by the people who are the owners of the property. The question of appointing a managing board was laid before the House last year and discussed pretty thoroughly, and in the discussion one hon. gentleman told the Minister of Railways that if the minister could come back to the House this session and state that the board had managed the railway without any interference from him he would feel that the Minister of Railways deserved to be complimented. Well, I am prepared to say that such is the state of affairs to-day. This board has managed the Intercolonial railway during the past nine months without any interference from the head of the Railway Department. I need hardly say that it has not been easy for me to take that position, but whether rightly or wrongly, I have taken it and whatever was done on the Intercolonial railway last year is entirely the result of the work of the managing board. Now, Sir, a board was appointed consisting of Mr. Butler, the deputy minister of railways, Mr. Pottinger, Mr. Tiffin, and Mr. Brady. Mr. Pottinger is a man of great experience and knowledge of the road. Mr. Tiffin was the traffic manager, and Mr. Brady the general superintendent. They organized some time in June, but their work really began in July, and they held their meetings regularly and discussed what they thought was in the interest of the Intercolonial railway. They started in to bring about results on the railway and they have worked with that idea in the interests of the Intercolonial railway, treating it as a transportation project belonging to all the people of Canada. As is well known, and as was explained to the House last year, the traffic on all railways, the year previous had dwindled very materially and the receipts on all railways including the Intercolonial railway were much less than they were in the preceding year. There was a deficit for the year ending 31st of March last. A large decrease in the traffic without a corresponding decrease in the number of employees and other expenses, gave us a deficit of approximately $800,000 on the Intercolonial railway last year. The board undertook the work, and wishing to bring about an equilibrium, or to make the receipts balance the expenditures, and put the railway in what they thought ought to be a better shape, they did reduce the staff of the Intercolonial railway, all told, 503 employees were dropped. The railway companies had made greater reductions in their staffs months before. I may say in this connection that as time goes on, men are constantly leaving the employ of the railway, some of these men have been taken back already, and as others leave, I am asking the board of management to give the old employees the preference, so that they may regain their employment on the Intercolonial railway when opportunity serves. I hope in a great measure to meet the difficulties that have arisen by dropping the employees, through no fault of their own, except that the board thought there was too great a number on the line. Now, in order to improve repair work on the Intercolonial railway and to get more work out of the new shops, an

expert was engaged, Mr. McKenna, and he did reorganize the work there with the result that a great deal more work is being turned out by the staff with the new machinery than was turned out before.

Mr. HUGHES. These men were not dropped before the last election.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does my hon. friend refer to the election in Ottawa?

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister told us a few minutes ago that he had not interfered with the management of this railway; but he seems to have interfered as to who should be re-employed.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not interfered with the management of the railway; I submit to the wisdom of the House if what I said I have done was an interference. I suggested that it would be wise that the old men should be given re-employment as opportunity serves; that is no interference. I made a suggestion, no doubt every man along the line has made some suggestion or other, perhaps not of that kind. I am free to say that I have not interfered with the Intercolonial railway. When it was impossible to obtain an expert such as the board wanted to reorganize the locomotive shops, they took three of the bright men from the shops themselves, and sent them to the New York Central shops in order to find out what was being done there, and they have come back with new ideas that I think will help in reducing the cost of the work, by turning out a greater amount of it with the same number of men; at any rate, they think that can be done. There were substantial savings made in the maintenance of way department, which is a very expensive department. Now, I want to point out to the House what we are doing in this respect, let me give a list of the expenditures that have come out of revenue, over and above the ordinary.

Unprecedented rain storms in New Brunswick, on the Canada Eastern Division, causing washouts, repaired at a cost of.. .. ..$	2,673 65
Extraordinary high tides causing washouts near Dorchester..	3,426 36
Extraordinary rainfall in Nova Scotia causing washouts near Antigonish..	2,141 78
Forest fires in the preceding year destroyed station buildings at St. Cyrille, Que., Carmel, Bathurst, N. B., Daveluyville, all of which have been replaced this year at a cost of.	9,901 00
Engine house and turntable at Pt. du Chene..	2.055 54
Power house chimney..	1,702 68
Heavy repairs and painting buildings	2 828 29
Repairs to bridges and culverts... ..	29.150 85
Painting bridges...	21.977 35
Extraordinary wharf repairs..	11.102 72
Building and repairing fences.. ..$	36,408 48
Other heavy repairs..	8,138 43
Or in all..	131.507 07
Rail renewals..	100,000 00
Total.. .. ..$	231,507 07

So we have laid aside for the renewal of rails, $100,000. The American railways, I think, lay aside a certain amount every year for renewal. Now 55½ miles of track have been ballasted. I want to call attention to this next item, because it has been stated in the press that no new ties were placed on the Intercolonial this year. I want to tell the House that no less than 574,237 new ties were placed on the Intercolonial during the past nine months; 11½ miles of track were relaid with 80-pound rails to the yard, new steel rails—I am now speaking altogether of revenue; and 5⅓ miles of track were relaid with 67-pound rails. The maintenance of the track has been generally kept up.

Now, I come to another point which is of interest, and I want to give credit to my predecessor for this improvement. During the last year of his service he inaugurated a system of laying aside each month a certain amount for maintenance of equipment along the line. The policy of charging against revenue a fixed sum per month on account of renewal of equipment was inaugurated in the fiscal year 1907-8. In that year large purchases of equipment were made, and the account stood to debit of the fund on March 31, 1908, $57,755.63. During the fiscal year 1908-9 business was dull; a great many cars were idle; the new shops were nearing completion; work of magnitude could not be satisfactorily done; the equipment was more than ample; accordingly the fund was allowed to accumulate, so that on March 31, 1909, there was a credit of $207,262.20. During the current year $25,000 per month has been credited to this account, so that at the end of December the account amounts to $439,000. The following rolling stock has been contracted for delivery before April 1, 1910, and the amounts I am reading now come out of revenue from the road through this account:

1 Pacific type passenger locomotive..$	22,600 00
10 Simple consolidation freight locomotives..	196 000 00
30 50-ton all steel coal cars..	45.480 00
6 box baggage cars for express trains..	9.804 00
3 first-class sleeping cars..	41.600 00
5 first-class passenger cars..	58.890 00
3 full mail cars..	25.800 00
2 full baggage cars..	13.050 00
3 colonist cars..	32.700 00
Total.. .. ..$	445.924 00

I may at once be asked: Is this a betterment or is this new? Well, there is not

a cent of it from capital. I have said to the House that $25,000 a month placed to one side will realize an amount sufficiently large to keep our equipment in good shape from year to year. Now during the next three months there will be $25,000 a month placed to the account of this fund, so at the end of the year, after spending the large amount I have mentioned, there will remain in this fund $60,000 as a nucleus to start with next year. Now these thirty 50-ton steel cars, some one will say, have replaced a larger number of cars, and you are not getting as many. That is true; we are replacing 153 wooden cars and 29 20-ton coal cars. The old cars, only had a capacity of 1,498 tons, while the new cars have a capacity of 1,500 tons. There is a benefit to be derived in transportation, because there is much less dead weight to haul with the new cars than with all these others we had on hand before. So there is not only a small gain in the carrying capacity with these new cars, but there is a considerable gain in hauling lighter weight over the dead weight. Nine new locomtives have been bought to replace several old and smaller ones. These nine new locomotives have a traction power of 338,697 pounds, while the locomotives which they replaced had a traction power of 304,681 pounds. I want to point out that in adidtion we have spent during the past year out of revenue for maintenance:

Locomotive repairs...	$553,500
Passenger cars..	194,800
Freight cars..	440,900

The average number of freight cars repaired per month was 1,200, passenger cars and locomotives 10. I had thought of placing upon record some things that have been said by men who have travelled over this line and who know whereof they are speaking, but I shall just quote one and I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen from Ontario to this one particular question, because it emphasizes the fact that Ontario as well as other provinces get some benefit from the Intercolonial railway as a government road and from the rates which it has always charged. This gentleman has been a shipper of flour over the Intercolonial railway for a good many years and he writes as follows in September:

We must congratulate the Intercolonial railway for the splendid service they have been giving to the province and are trying to support you by giving you everything possible over your line.

I say that the testimony of that kind coming from a business man who uses this line and is going to use it on account of its superior accommodation ought to count for something in sizing up the results of the work of the board of management.

Mr. SPROULE. Name.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think my hon. friend meant that.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, indeed I do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some time I will ask my hon. friend for a name when I know he will not give it to me.

Mr. SPROULE. It is on the principle of asking your brother if he is a rogue.

Mr. GRAHAM. I take everybody to be honest until he is proven otherwise.

Mr. LANCASTER. An anonymous letter has not much weight.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not an anonymous letter at all. I will give any hon. gentleman the name if he asks me, but I do not want to parade this hon. gentleman's name through the House.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I propose that he lay it on the table.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may not be a public document. Now, I come to the question of the trade of the Intercolonial railway. I could go into that question at some length, but I will just refer to the wheat traffic which is of interest at the present moment and may be of more interest in years to come in dealing with the larger problem of carrying goods from the west to our own sea ports. Through Halifax up to January 4, 1910, we contracted for the transport of 329,699 bushels as against 81,904 bushels last year. Through St. John we contracted, up to January 4, for the transport of 1,165,967 bushels as against 525,753 last year.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman from what source he gets that grain?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is handed over to us by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the rate on that wheat from Montreal to St. John?

Mr. GRAHAM. The rate, if it were just going from Montreal to St. John would be practically the same rate as that of the Canadian Pacific railway—I think the same rate.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is where the Intercolonial railway would carry it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial railway carries it there and the Intercolonial has to go 200 miles farther than the Canadian Pacific and carries it for the same rate, which shows one of the difficulties of managing the Intercolonial railway in competition with a line 200 miles shorter to a given point.

A little while ago I mentioned the ques-

tion of railways in other countries, and I want hon. gentlemen to pay particular attention, if this is not too dreary for them, to see the condition that exists in Canada with our government owned railway as compared with government or public owned railways in other cities. I desire to place on record the following table:

Country.	Density of passengers per mile of railway.	Passenger rates.	Freight density per mile.	Freight rates per ton mile, average.	Cost per mile.	Length of line miles.	Inhabitants per mile of line.	Average pay for employees.
		Cents.	Tons.		$			$
South Australia	82,816	1·3	146,437	2·08 cts.	37,250	1,916	188	
New South Wales	85,674	0·84	169,050	2·00 "	64,365	3,471	393	
Germany	482,142	0·99	833,136	1·41 "	107,272	35,652	1,587	252·82
France	368,281	1·5	460,284	1·46 "	126,350	29,293	1,333	
Italy	147,141	1·96	183,446	2·42 "	109,560	10,203	3,119	
Russia	266,356	0·68	833,618	9·32 mills.	83,080	35,214	2,941	
Austria-Hungary	398,904	0·47	113,688	2·07 cts.	87,816	25,618	1,854	
Great Britain and Ireland	417 219	1·54	558,126	2·31 "	272,291	23,058	1,786	261·00
United States	121,862	2·014	1,040,212	7·57 mills.	58,664	227,455	349	641·00
Canada	84,342	1·921	545,991	7·27 "	55,638	24,104	300	505·00
I. C. Ry	95,583	1·775	658,372	0·575 cts.	62,885	1,447	.....	633·00

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I understand from these figures that state owned railways give much lower freight rates than private owned railways in Great Britain.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would appear from the special returns that their rates are less than the freight rates in Great Britain. But there is this difficulty that we have to figure back and forth to get the result as to railways in Great Britain because they will not and do not give the information and even pass a resolution saying that it is not necessary. It is therefore difficult to get a definite statement of statistics from these lines but we have taken their traffic statemens and worked the figures out from them.

Mr. HUGHES. How do German freight rates compare with freight rates in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. The German freight rates are much higher. They are nearly three times as high as the rates on the Intercolonial railway and more than double those of other railways. I wish to point out before I leave this subject that the average rate of wages paid to employees on the Intercolonial railway is only exceeded in one instance and that is in the United States. The average wage paid to the employees on the Intercolonial railway is $128 more than the average paid to railway employees in the Dominion of Canada. It is approximately three times as much as the employees are paid in Great Britain and approximately twice as much as is paid to the employees in Germany.

The managing board has adopted the system of a purchasing department, the head of which is in Ottawa, Mr. Lavoie. From the experience I have had of him, and he has been in the service of the railway for several years, he is not only an able and industrious but I believe a thoroughly honest and upright man and a young man who will make good. These purchases are all made and the tenders opened in the department, Mr. Lavoie overseeing them under the supervision of the Deputy Minister. I might intimate that I am so pleased with the arrangement that I think I will add to the staff and have all the purchases of supplies for canals and everything else placed in charge of this department.

I wish to put on record now the average number of employees on the Intercolonial railway during the last nine months, and the wages paid them to show the public and the country and our friends how much money we are absolutely paying every month to the employees on the Intercolonial railway. This does not mean at all the amount of money expended for purchases, but the money paid to the men, and I say that the Intercolonial railway will compare favourably in a very bright light with any of the railways in Canada in this matter.

The average number of employees and wages paid for the nine months ending December 31, 1909, were:—

	Number of men.	Wages per month.
Maintenance of way	2,671	$ 90,804 48
Maintenance of equipment	2,508	113,699 49
Conducting transportation	3,213	197,762 98
Conducting traffic	78	5,966 33
General expenses	143	8,449 63
Capital account	133	6,884 97
Stores	88	3,902 98
Total	8,833	$427,470 86

Briefly, the result of the operations of the road for the nine months ending

December 31, 1909, are set forth in the following statement:

The expenditure on capital account for the year will be approximately $1,280,000 against $3,867,232.60 last year.		
The gross receipts for the 9 months ending December 31, 1909, amounted to..		$7,073,300 97
An increase of $442,154.87 over last year.		
The gross working expenses amounted to.	$6,310,912 36	
A reduction of $757,087.98.		
Charged to revenue for rail renewals..	100,000 00	
		6,410,912 36
Leaving a net revenue on December 31, 1909, of.. ..		$ 662,388 61

What the net revenue at the end of the year will be can only be estimated, but we are having a very mild winter, and my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) knows that that means a great deal along the line. I predict that if no unforeseen or untoward circumstance arises, the surplus on the Intercolonial railway at the close of the fiscal year ending March 31 will amount to at least $662,000, and probably will exceed it by a small amount.

I wish to speak for a moment of the Prince Edward Island railway. The Prince Edward Island railway forms no part of the Intercolonial railway. It is run on Prince Edward Island, some 260 miles. I wish to take the House into my confidence clearly in reference to it and to state that you need not expect, it is not fair to expect, and nobody does expect, that the Prince Edward Island railway will ever keep even. The traffic is not there to keep it even, and we are prepared and must be prepared to run the Prince Edward Island railway for the accommodation of the people and to take out of the consolidated revenue fund of the Department of Canals whatever deficit there may be, because deficit there will be every year no matter what you do so long as you give the people any service at all. Small boats run around the island carrying a large part of the traffic and the island railway serves the people as best it can. I have a good deal of sympathy with the complaint made on Prince Edward Island that they do not get the passenger service that they might expect, not that they do not get all the passenger service to which they are entitled if you discuss it on the cold calculation of what the revenue would warrant, because on that calculation we might not have any service or not have an efficient service. But it is a matter for serious consideration if we ought not to improve the passenger service on the island a trifle and be prepared, owing to the difficulties that exist there and the isolation of the people, to take out of the consolidated fund of the Dominion of Canada an amount sufficient to give to the people of that island decent and fair passenger service. The members from the island have been urging strongly the construction of branch lines, and branch lines will probably have to be constructed, but that will be a matter for future consideration. I want, however, to place myself absolutely on record as having great sympathy with the people on the island on account of the conditions that exist and to ask the House that when we come to discuss the railway problem as affecting that island, they will not discuss it along distinctly and absolutely business lines, because if you do you will not serve the people of Prince Edward Island as they ought to be served with railway facilities. The amount expended on capital account on the Prince Edward Island railway during the present year will be approximately $170,000. Last year the amount was $561,206.90. Up to November 30 the deficit on the Prince Edward Island railway amounts to $44,554.45. I expect that by the end of the year it will amount to about $70,000, against $89,010.78 last year.

A great deal has been said as to the rates on the Intercolonial railway. It has been pointed out that the rates of the Intercolonial railway to St. John are the same as those of the Canadian Pacific railway, although the haul is 200 miles longer. The rates to competing points are always the same; but I want to point out that where there is no competition the rates on company owned roads are higher than those on the government road, where there is no competition. Moreover, I want to ask hon. gentlemen from Quebec and Ontario, and especially hon. members from the western part of Canada, if they think, from their experience in the west, that if any private company had had during all these years in the eastern part of Canada the monopoly which the government railway has had, the people would not have paid at least two and a half times as high freight rates as they have been called on to pay on the government road? That means millions in the pockets of the people of the eastern provinces, and millions also in the pockets of the people who have had to transport goods on the government railway when there was no competition. The good which that railway has been to Canada cannot be estimated by a casual or superficial investigation, but must be estimated by regarding it as a part of the great transportation system of the country and as a regulator of railway rates during the years before we had a railway commission. I believe the Intercolonial railway is run as well as any other

railway in this country. For the traffic given, I believe it runs a greater number of trains and stops at a greater number of stations and gives greater accommodation to travellers than people could hope to get from any company railway in the world.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. How do the passenger and freight rates on the Intercolonial railway compare with the rates on railways in Quebec and Ontario?

Mr. GRAHAM. The freight rates on the Intercolonial railway, where it has no opposition, are much lower than the rates on company roads where they have no competition. The passenger rates, I think, approximate those of other railways throughout Canada.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What about freight rates?

Mr. GRAHAM. Where the road has a monopoly, they are less on the Intercolonial railway; but from competing points they are exactly the same.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. How do they compare with the rates fixed by the commission?

Mr. GRAHAM. The rates allowed by the commission are higher than the rates on the Intercolonial railway; and if a company had the Intercolonial railway, the commission would allow it to charge higher rates than the Intercolonial railway charges.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before the hon. gentleman concludes, he might give us this information. He has narrated his experience of state-owned roads in Europe, and has made some comparisons between them and private-owned roads. He has not told the House what is to be his policy hereafter in regard to the Intercolonial railway. I gather that he is more than half a believer in government ownership. In view of the observations he has made in Europe, and in view of the statements going throughout the country that the Intercolonial railway may be abandoned as a state-owned road, what is to be the future of that railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a pretty broad question, and would bring us to a discussion of the policy of public-owned versus private-owned railways. Conditions sometime arise that alter situations, or situations arise that alter conditions. But I may say to my hon. friend that there is no immediate danger of this road going to a private company, for I purpose continuing the road under the board of management, and I want to tell the House that I intend to appoint another member to that board in the next few weeks, which I think will be in the interest of the public and of the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Now, I have detained the House too long, for which I must apologize; but I have endeavoured to place before the House and the country the general position of Canada as regards her canals, her railways and the other great projects which we have in hand. I have devoted particular attention to our public-owned railway, the operation of which during the past nine months has shown good results, and which I believe, with the co-operation of those interested in it, such as we have had during the last nine months, will continue to give the people a first-class service at fair rates, and come out at the end of the twelve months without showing a deficit.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of Geo. Robert Buttonshaw.—Mr. Campbell.

SUPPLY—THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. I propose to follow the Minister of Railways briefly through the various points in connection with the Intercolonial railway which he touched on this afternoon. In the compliments which the hon. minister paid his deputy, Mr. Butler, on the retirement of the latter from office, I heartily concur. In anything I have had to do with Mr. Butler, I always found him very kind and obliging and everything that an officer of the government ought to be, and I cordially join the minister in wishing him every success in his new employment. Mr. Butler's successor, the hon. minister has told us, was formerly Deputy Minister of Public Works in Ontario. Mr. Campbell may be very competent for the office, but personally I know nothing of his qualifications, and we have been told by the minister that he intends appointing also a chief engineer who will take the engineering duties off Mr. Campbell's hands.

On the question of transportation, the hon. minister cited the different kinds in which this country is interested, and spoke of some new schemes which he considered were in the public interest. He passed slightly over the Welland canal and had very little to say in favour of what is, to my mind, a solution of the transportation problem for the Dominion. I refer to the Georgian bay canal. The Hudson Bay railway scheme, he said, the government were committed to, and he believed that great benefit would result from its completion to the people of the Northwest by the saving on the cost of transportation of their produce. He was of the opinion that the large quantities of grain exported from

that country would yield an additional revenue to the farmers, through the construction of this railway, to the extent of five cents per bushel. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hudson bay railway scheme was one of the first considered when I entered this House some 37 years ago. I am glad to see it become a practical issue at present, for I was one of the promoters of that scheme. There were then two rival schemes. The promoters of the one declared that the only port worth going to was Fort Churchill, and their rivals advocated the claims of Port Nelson. The Hon. Wm. MacDougall was the promoter of one of the schemes, and I was backing the other. After thoroughly considering the whole question, after reading with interest the accounts of all the voyages made by British officers to Hudson bay, and all the reports of the Hudson bay schooners which had navigated those waters for the last thirty or forty years, we came to the conclusion that the bay was navigable during a certain portion of the year. How long I do not know. The length varied according to the different seasons. I see that the minister quotes in his report a paper by Mr. Armstrong, who advocates Port Nelson as a terminus, much preferring it to Fort Churchill. Mr. Armstrong says that the bay never freezes over at Fort Nelson during the whole season, that the navigation there is a month longer than it is at Fort Churchill, and still another month longer if you go further south. In that connection I would draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) to the statement of Mr. Armstrong, who advocates Port Nelson as the terminus, because that statement opens up a beautiful vista of dredging to be required in that section—a veritable elysium of dredging. For five or six miles out of Churchill there is a sand bank, and along the banks of the Nelson river for about ten miles dredging would have to be done in order to afford accommodation to vessels. Another advantage in connection with Port Nelson is shown by Mr. Armstrong in his advocacy of the canal system of transportation. I see that the minister has become a convert to that system since his travels in Germany There he found out that the Germans, who are a practical, common-sense people, are in favour of what is after all the democratic way of conveying freight and passengers—transportation by water; and one of the advantages of Port Nelson, according to Mr. Armstrong's report, is the possibilities of a canal being built, paralleling the railway, down to Fort Nelson and up to Lake Winnipeg. Well, that is not a possibility in the near future, but it is a possibility, and we may yet have water communication between Winnipeg and Hudson bay. It has that advantage over the Fort Churchill route, because the river is very tumultuous and precipitous along its course. But I would like to draw the minister's attention to one thing. Notwithstanding all the reports and notwithstanding all the references to the particular value of this port or that, through its being a month longer open than any other, the period of navigation is not determined at all by the length of open season at any particular port, but by the navigation of the straits. It does not matter if you have a port open the whole year round, if you can only navigate the straits during four months.

The minister talked about a saving of five cents in the transportation of grain. Well, we had that question discussed ad nauseam some 25 years ago, and the statement was made that we could send grain from Winnipeg and most of the points along the Canadian Pacific railway to the head of Lake Superior cheaper than we could send it to Hudson bay. Calculations were made again and again to prove that from the head of Lake Superior to Liverpool grain could be delivered cheaper than from Fort Churchill to Liverpool. That may seem strange. There are six months' navigation in Lake Superior and the St. Lawrence. The vessels engaged in that trade sail from Montreal and Quebec to Liverpool and have only seven months navigation. But they have this advantage. The other five months of the year they can be employed in other parts of the world. The steamers for the Hudson Bay route must be specially constructed for that service, and so they will be engaged for four months in the year and be obliged to lie idle for the remaining eight months. However, the scheme looks beautiful and no doubt the government will endeavour to carry it out. But, I mention these things to dispel if possible the idea the minister seems to have that five cents per bushel will be saved on northwest grain by sending it via the Hudson bay. From all the information I was able to gather at that time I believe it to be a practical fact that you can take grain from the western country down to Lake Superior and over to Great Britain cheaper than you possibly can by the Hudson Bay route. If that be so, and I think it is, the necessity for the Hudson Bay railway is not very pressing. I venture to draw the attention of the government, when the Transcontinental railway was proposed to the House, to the mistake made in the estimated cost of that railway and the minister now tells us that it is estimated that the Hudson Bay railway with its terminals, will cost about $18,000,000. Well, even $18,000,000 is a very large expenditure on top of the other enormous expenditures we are now making for the building of railways and the improvement of our means of transportation. Let me tell the minister that

if he studies carefully the question he will find that the solution of the transportation problem in this country is the building of the Georgian Bay canal. I have advocated that project for years. God knows I have no personal interest in it, nor have my constituents because we are situated half way between the two charmers', the St. Lawrence river and the Ottawa river. It may be affectation for me to mention that I speak from the bottom of my heart when I say that the Georgian Bay canal would be the wisest scheme this government could undertake now. Nature has favoured us by placing us in a position geographically to control not only the trade of Canada but the trade of the northern part of the American continent. I am glad that the minister is converted to a certain extent to my views because he has expressed the sentiment which I have just given utterance to, and when he did so I wondered if he had in his eye the Georgian Bay canal. Let me counsel the government: Be economical in all your expenditures, be economical because the country needs economy and because by practising it you will teach the people what is right and wrong in the science of government. I have studied the question from my boyhood upwards, I know the geography of the country, and I ask the government to take my word for it that the solution of the transportation problem is the building of the canal along the route followed by the old voyagers, up the Ottawa, across Lake Nipissing and along the northern shore of Lake Superior to the west. Enough upon that question; we have to deal with a good many questions tonight and I would like to be brief.

The Minister of Railways directed our attention to the $7,000,000 already expended on the Quebec bridge, and to my mind nothing has happened in this country so disgraceful as the action of the government in connection with that particular bridge. We were induced to subscribe a lot of money for the purpose of assisting in building that bridge. The bridge belonged to a company; it was assisted not only by the Dominion government but by the province of Quebec and the city of Quebec. When the bridge tumbled down you would have thought that the contractors and the parties who were interested in the corporation building the bridge would have suffered some loss. But no, out of the generosity of our hearts we paid them all the money the members of this company had advanced and we paid them interest upon it; we paid back all the money contributed by the city of Quebec and by the province of Quebec to aid in its construction, and we took the concern over holus-bolus. That was an act of generosity unparalleled in the history of the world.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART.

Mr. SPROULE. Act of generosity; it was more like an act of dishonesty.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I am not saying there is any dishonesty at all about it, It might have been done for state or political reasons. The Prime Minister represents the city of Quebec and he was interested that the city should not suffer, but I do not believe there was anything corrupt about it; if there was I do not know of it nor have I ever heard any authority for it, and I am merely stating the facts I know of. What is the position now? After the bridge fell we employed engineers to devise a scheme for the substructure and the superstructure of the new bridge. The minister tells us to-night that these engineers have agreed upon the plans for the substructure, but they have not yet been able to decide whether it is to be a cantilever or a suspension bridge, and so they will call for tenders for each kind of bridge. And the minister tells us that he will not furnish us with the estimate of the cost. That is curious; it is the first time I ever heard of such a thing in this parliament. When the government comes to parliament for money to build an undertaking the first thing they do is to furnish the plans of the engineers and the estimates of the cost, and then they ask us for the money. But we are told that if that were done in this case it might give an advantage to some contractor. Well, if the minister is in any way afraid of that he could put the estimates pretty low and that would get him out of the difficulty. You remember when the Transcontinental railway was under discussion how the Minister of Finance told us that after making a minute calculation and after taking various things into consideration, the whole cost to the country would represent only $13,000,000. I told the minister what I believed would be the cost of the Transcontinental railway, I told him that the cost would be in the neighbourhood of $70,000 per mile from Winnipeg to Moncton, I told him that the statement he made in reference to $13,000,000 would not cover the Quebec bridge alone. We have already lost on that bridge in the neighbourhood of $7,000,000. Will that bridge and the approaches to it ever be completed for less than $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 more? It will cost in the neighbourhood of $15,000,000 to $18,000,000. When the road was under contemplation, I stated that the Quebec bridge alone would cost more than the sum which the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister said would be the cost of the railway; it is turning out to be so now. Let us see what that road is likely to cost. According to the books, the expenditure on the Grand Trunk Pacific up to the end of last year was $53,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the figures I gave this afternoon were $67,000,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I am basing my statement on the report, not reckoning to the end of the fiscal year. Now, see what an enormous liability will rest upon the country for the cost of the prairie section, 915 miles from Wolf Creek to Winnipeg. That was to cost $13,000 a mile, and we supplemented that by a loan of $10,000,000. The cost of the prairie section, according to Mr. Schreiber, will be $33,007,449. On the eastern section from Moncton to Winnipeg, 1,804 miles, we have spent, up to March 30 last year, $51,950,000. Mr. Lumsden calculated that it would cost $66,427 per mile, making $114,395,765. The interest during construction—I am supposing it will take seven years to construct—will be about $10,000,000. The interest we will have to pay for seven years after construction will be $14,422,000. The terminals at Moncton, Winnipeg and other places will cost $5,600,000. The Quebec bridge, on which we have already spent $7,000,000, will cost at least $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 more. I calculate that the mountain section of the road will cost about $75,000 per mile for somewhat over 800 miles. We have not got from the chief engineer or from the department any information of the actual cost; I am putting it at $75,000 per mile, so that the interest on the total cost will be $10,000,000. We have now reached a grand total of $167,716,000. Then we advance on the prairie section a loan of $11,895,000. Upon the mountain section we guarantee $75,000 a mile, or $62,700,000. Add to the two latter sums the $10,000,000 loan, and we have $84,595,000 to add to the $167,000,000.

Now there is a possibility that that portion of the road from the Pacific to Winnipeg will be paying in a short while, so that it will not be a charge upon the country. It may be worth what has been expended on it. The prairie section must be supplemented by contributing lines of railway; as at present projected, it cannot become a paying concern unless branch lines are built connecting with it. A single line of railway passing through a prairie can only levy for a certain number of miles north and south of it, and from this source it could not derive revenue enough to keep it running. They will have to build lines of railway paralleling the main line for the purpose of assisting the main line. Now there is a possibility that the line to the head of Lake Superior wil never become a charge on the government of the country. What will the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company do? The moment they find that the road from Winnipeg to Moncton is not a paying road, are they likely to continue running it? What means have you of forcing them to do so? You may say that you have a lien upon the stock. Well, your lien upon the stock only becomes valid along with the lien held by the parties who bought the stock. What lien have you upon the road that is being built? You had a lien prior to the company borrowing money for the purpose of constructing that road, and you gave it away to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Your lien at the present time runs pari passu with that of the parties who have loaned money on the prairie section and the mountain section; and how are you going to enforce it for the benefit of the eastern section? You may say that they owe you the money. You take the road and you work it and run it. But who do you take it and run it for? You work it and run it for the benefit of yourselves and other creditors who have with you a lien upon the road. What means have you to compel the Grand Trunk Railway company, who you say have entered into an engagement with you, to work the eastern section of the road? Supposing you obtained an order from the court that the Grand Trunk railway must work it, what penalty could be imposed on the Grand Trunk for refusing? The franchise of the Grand Trunk railway lies in the common stock, and the common stock is worth little or nothing. It is only worth something for speculative purposes. I am not going to say a word against the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk has done a great deal for Canada. The men who put their money into the Grand Trunk have not had the results which they expected from that investment. The people of Canada owe a great deal to the Grand Trunk. I am only pointing out the position of the government with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. If they do not work the road from Winnipeg to Quebec to your satisfaction, what are you going to do? Take over the road, the rolling stock and everything else? You take over, as I say, the western section, subject to the lien upon it held by the parties who have advanced money, subject to the claim on the rolling stock and subject to your own lien. You stand pari passu with the parties who advanced the money for the construction of the road. But, you have no tangible claim whatever for the purpose of enabling you to take the road over. The same is true of the eastern section. You say to the Grand Trunk: Go on and work that road. They say: We have spent money enough on the undertaking, we have found out that it is impossible to operate the road from Winnipeg to Moncton with satisfactory results and we will not run it; run it yourselves. You have no remedy against the Grand Trunk. The only result will be that you will take possession of it. Fancy the government in possession of a road on which they have expended $164,000,000 with no connection at Winnipeg and with no connection with Lake Superior, because the key to the situation, the branch line

from Superior Junction to Lake Superior, is in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They refused to mortgage it or give it as a security for this undertaking. The parties who own the road, own that branch independently, and this government has no claim upon it. You have the road on your hands, you have to work it, and you not only lose the interest on the $164,000,000, but you have the road passing through a country not at all comparable with that which the Intercolonial railway passes through. The result will be that you will operate that road at a cost which will make the people very sick of the undertaking. It would be better for them if you had pitched the whole of the money into the sea rather than that you should have invested it in any such undertaking. There are possibilities. Some mineral discoveries may be made in the country. Some bonanza in the shape of a Cobalt, gold mines, or chance development may give an impetus to the road which does not exist at the present time. The wildest scheme that was ever propounded to the people of any country was the idea of drawing grain from Winnipeg over the western section of the road down to Quebec, across the bridge, and from there to St. John and Halifax, and establishing an undertaking in competition with other roads. We all know that the cheapest manner of transporting grain or heavy freight of any kind is by water. President Taft of the United States, in making comparisons, says that transport by water can be carried on at one-eighth of what it costs by rail. I think that perhaps he is too low; at any rate, let us say one-quarter. That is the cheapest way of conveying heavy freight. What is the result? Grain from the west to the markets of the east will seek the quickest possible way, and that is by means of water communication. The large carrying companies realize the importance of water carriage. The Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway all go to Fort William to take advantage of water transportation. No all-rail communication can compete with water communication from the head of Lake Superior down to the sea. That is one of the reasons why I am an advocate of the Georgian bay canal. It is the cheapest means of transporting the great products of the west to the sea-board. I have shown the enormous expenditure that this country will have to undertake. It will have to pay interest on $164,000,000 plus the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton for the next thirty or forty years. The Grand Trunk is not going to do it. Any one who looks with a prescient eye ahead must say that the results I predict will come. If no other result comes, see what an enormous burden it places upon us. Why did the government not build the line as laid down and advised by the opposition? The opposition were in favour of opening up the west, they stated their plan and showed how the road ought to be built, but I do not believe that the right hon. gentleman could carry out this scheme with the aid of his supporters, unless he agreed that there should be a summer terminus at Quebec and winter termini at St. John and Halifax. Fancy building a road paralleling the Intercolonial railway, our own road, that does not pay at the present moment. They claim that they are shortening the distance by 120 miles. But, does it shorten it any? Sir Sanford Fleming tried to get a better line for the Intercolonial railway, and if such a line could have been obtained, surely he ought to have known it. For years they have been exploring down there. They have their line practically completed, and what do they find? They find that they cannot get a much better line or any shorter line from Lévis to Moncton than the old route of the Intercolonial railway. They at present have a railway that they hardly know what to do with. The Intercolonial railway is a puzzle to them, and there is a deficit on it from year to year except during the last nine months, with which I intend to deal presently. They have built a harbour at Port Colborne at an expenditure of $3,500,000 which has not fulfilled the expectations of hon. gentlemen opposite. Ships were to go down there that would otherwise go to Buffalo; they were to unload a portion of their cargo at Port Colborne, pass through the canal, and go down the St. Lawrence. I told them at the time that if a vessel wanted to load to go to Montreal or Quebec, it was just as easy for it to go to the port of Buffalo, 10 or 15 miles away and get the cargo from a vessel there, instead of spending $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 for the purpose of building this elevator at Port Colborne. They no sooner had it built than the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), in his tour through the west, promised the people in that section the deepening of the Welland canal. What use would the elevator at Port Colborne be after the deepening of the Welland canal? You have 21-foot navigation in the port, and you will have 21-foot navigation on the canal. Vessels will not stay in the port at all, they will go clear through the canal. It is a useless expenditure of $4,000,000. The hon. minister does not seem to be pleased with the business done by the elevator, but he hopes that in the future it will develop. It has been built now and running for over a year and actually 1,000,000 bushels have gone into that elevator, one of the largest in the country. It has been an entirely useless expenditure.

Let us come to the question immediately before the House, the management of the Intercolonial railway. The people of this country will hardly believe the amount that

Canada has expended on the Intercolonial railway. I suppose very few of them read the blue-books, but if they look at the report issued by the Minister of Railways this year they will find the extraordinary statement that $91,000,000 has been expended on capital account of the Intercolonial railway, and nearly $8,900,000 on the Prince Edward Island railway, and for the nine months, bringing the figures down to the present day, there has been a further expenditure of $1.200,000 on the Intercolonial railway. From 1896 up to the present moment the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial railway and its branches has increased from $49,000,000 up to the neighbourhood of $102,000,000. What benefit has the country got from it? What is the difference whether you charge an amount to ordinary revenue or to capital account? The minister never thinks of paying the interest on his capital account. He makes comparisons between what is charged to capital account by this railway and other railways, but he forgets that the Baltimore and Ohio and the others with which he makes comparisons pay interest on the capital account. How long suffering have the people of Canada been? From mismanagement—and I shall prove the mismanagement out of the evidence produced by the Minister of Railways this year—the debt on the Intercolonial railway, or the capital account, has increased in fourteen years from $50,000,000 to $102,000,000. The hon. gentleman says: Oh, the great benefit the Intercolonial railway is to the people in that section of the country! I would like to see figures in support of the statements of the Minister of Railways that the Intercolonial railway carries freight and passengers for less than any other railway. The passenger rate is the same——

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I stated that the passenger rates were about the same as on other roads, I think they are; the freight rates are cheaper.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I said that the hon. gentleman stated that the passenger rates were the same on the Intercolonial railway as on other roads. He said that the freight rates were greatly below the freight rates on other roads. The freight paid by the ordinary merchant, farmer or other customer along the Intercolonial railway is, I venture to say, as high as on any road in Ontario or Quebec. I looked into the question and I state that the people of the maritime provinces pay a fair price on all the freight they carry. The average is brought down by the rates on two or three commodities. Coal, lumber, shingles and some other things—and the coal is principally carried out of the maritime provinces—are carried at a ridiculously low rate. But as a general rule the freight rates on the Intercolonial railway are on an average about the same as in other sections of this country. The passenger rates are the same and the freight rates are the same. Then why is it that it costs so much to run the road? Why is it that there is deficit after deficit? Last year I drew the attention of the minister to the enormous number of employees on the road, a number largely in excess of its requirements. He evidently found my complaint to be well founded, for he tells us to-day that the Commission of Management, who were appointed to manage the road have discharged about 600 men. Then last year it cost a greater amount to collect the revenues on the Intercolonial than it did the preceeding year. Last year they collected less and paid more. Something wrong about that, $600,000 less collected and it cost a couple of hundred thousand dollars more. It is an anomaly, and the officers ought to be obliged to explain it.

The appointment of a commission to manage the Intercolonial is a peculiar move. Who are the commissioners? The deputy head of the Railway Department, Mr. Pottinger, the manager of the road; Mr. Brady, Mr. Tiffin, all members of the staff of the Intercolonial. The curiosity is that when they are under the direct direction of the Minister of Railways the affair goes to the devil. Joined together, meeting together for the purpose of managing the road, they do first rate.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a good idea.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I know Mr. Pottinger, the manager of the road, perfectly well. Give him his instructions and he will carry them out. It is a difficult thing for the manager of the road, when he knows there are a lot of incapables or old men on the road not fitted for their positions and not able to do their work. He does not like to discharge them—it is human nature. He has a kind heart like the Minister of Railways, who interested himself with the commissioners on behalf of a lot of the employees. Mr. Pottinger is a good and efficient manager of the railroad. Give him his instructions, and he will carry them out. Take him to your office, and say to him: Here are the mistakes and faults in the management of the road; you have too many men; make a comparison of the freight rates on your road and those on other roads—why cannot you manage and give as good results as they can? And he will say: Give me a free hand; get rid of the political influences that are tempting me or making me do otherwise; let there be no political influence in the management of the road, and I will manage it as economically and as well as any other manager in Canada can. I had occasion to test this matter when I was Minister of Railways. I found a similar state of affairs to what the hon. gentleman found when

he came into office. I sent for Mr. Pottinger and Mr. Schreiber, both capable men. I said to Mr. Pottinger: I want such and such results. It can be done, but you must discharge such a number of men. Is it possible to do it without degrading the character of the road, impairing the rolling stock or lowering the standard below what it is at present? I want the rails, the stations and the rolling stock all kept up; can you do it and give me such results? And he said: I can if you give me a free hand. He was given a free hand. He found that he had 1,200 men on the road more than were necessary, placed there through political influences. I am not accusing one political party of being worse than the other in this respect; but the minister can keep control, even with the commission that exists at present, though it may act as a go-between between himself and his political supporters in the House. But if he insists on a satisfactory result, it can be got, and it can be got only from a minister who does not represent the maritime provinces. It is a good selection to take a Minister of Railways from another province. If he exercises the power and the honesty which I believe from the bottom of my heart he has, though I differ from him politically, he can manage the affairs of that department so that it will be an honour and credit to the country, and there is no man on this side of the House who would not be proud to see him do it. There is no trouble in doing it. It is just as easy to have a million dollars of revenue from the Intercolonial railway, with the freight and passenger rates as they are at present, as to have the present state of affairs. There has been a saving of over $700,000 in the last nine months under the commission. That looks hopeful of a saving of nearly $1,000,000 a year; and $1,500,000 or perhaps $2,000,000 could be saved as easily. When I was Minister of Railways the Intercolonial railway was a little affair. The total receipts and expenditures were in the neighbourhood of $3,000,000 a year. Now the receipts and expenditures are over $9,000,000 a year, which shows that either the population or the business of the maritime provinces during the last fourteen years has wonderfully increased. There is three times the business done now on the Intercolonial railway that there was in 1896. Why is it that every railway of any enterprise in Canada is paying well except the Intercolonial?

Now, let me criticise the statement furnished by the commissioners. The expenditure on capital account for the year will be approximately $1,280,000, against $3,867,232 for the previous year. But the extraordinary thing is that the Prince Edward Island railway, with receipts of about $200,000 and an expenditure of nearly $300,000, had a capital expenditure last year of about $500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not all on the railway proper.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. It was for enlarged accommodation at stations, sidings and a lot of other things, among them a judgment against the railway obtained by a man who was building a bridge down there. The gross receipts on the Intercolonial for the nine months ending December 31 amounted to $7,073,300, an increase of $442,154 over the corresponding nine months of the previous year. The gross working expenses for the nine months amounted to $6,310,912, a reduction of $757,087. What I want to draw the attention of the minister to is this: He collected during the nine months of this year $442,000 more than he did during the same period last year, and yet he expended $750,000 less in that same period. That is an extraordinary statement. You have an increased revenue of $442,000 in the nine months and a decreased expenditure of $757,000. There must have been a startling condition of affairs in the preceding year when such a reduction in expenditure and increase in revenue were possible, or there must have been a considerable charging up of ordinary expenditure against capital account. I want to draw the attention of the House to the enormous capital account on the Intercolonial railway. We hope for better days, but we have a deficit now which will amount this year to about $800,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. A surplus.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. No, a deficit. The $1,200,000 charged to capital account ought to be charged to ordinary expenditure, and I so stated when that amount was voted for particular expenditures. You can never have an honest statement from the officials of any railway when they have the right to manipulate their capital account just as they please. There ought to be no such thing as a capital account in a railway belonging to a government. It is not an account on which we expect any interest to be paid, and consequently should be wiped out altogether. In saying this I am not merely expressing my own opinion, but I am repeating the statement made again and again by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House when he used to attack the late Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party for having a capital account on the Intercolonial railway and concealing extravagant expenditures under that head. The right hon. gentleman said: You can have no honest, no trustworthy management of the Intercolonial or any other government enterprise until the cap-

ital account is wiped out altogether. So it should be because there is no need for it. There would not be any such capital account in any other country in the world. We charge a lot of expenditure in this country to capital which is not done in other countries. When we build fortifications, we charge them to capital account as well as a lot of expenditure from one end of the country to the other. Just fancy a Dreadnought being built by the British government and charged to capital account or a dock at Malta or Gibraltar. There is no such thing as capital account in the British public accounts, and there ought to be none here. Let us have a plain statement of the expenditure on the road and let us form our own conclusions as to whether that expenditure was judicious or not. The minister has no basis for making a comparison between the Intercolonial and company owned railways in this connection. The directors of railway companies have to provide an income out of which to pay interest on the capital, but there is no interest paid on the Intercolonial and never will be. I am hoping for better things. There has been a little better management than in the past. I believe the hon. gentleman is trying to do something. Let him bend all his energy to obtaining an honest administration of his department, either by a commission or something else. I have no faith myself in commissions, and the hon. gentleman had very little when he appointed this one. The suggestion came from my leader (Mr. Borden), who drew a comparison between the Intercolonial railway and the government railways in Australia and other places, which are managed by commissions and gave good results. He thought that the government railway in this country might be managed by a commission with like good results. Of course we know that the people of the maritime provinces will not allow what they consider a peculiarly maritime interest to be owned by any railway company, but some other method of management might be devised. It might be run in the interests of the three railway companies which connect with it. Or there might be a joint stock arrangement, in which the three different railways interested would pool, each its share of the earnings, and share each the cost of the management. I thought that perhaps something of that kind might be possible, but we should always have a string to that railway. Should Lloyd George's theories prevail in the old country, should the theory of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) on municipal or state ownership of railways and other public utilities take root in this country, it is possible that the day may come when we might take a new departure along those lines. Let us then keep control of something we own, and if we should part with the management ourselves, let us always have a string to bring it back to the people. I hope for better things in the future. I see a bright future because the maritime provinces are progressing wonderfully. They are progressing more than the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec, if we can judge by the amount of freight and passengers carried on the different lines in the provinces by the sea. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick particularly are doing three times the business they formerly did. May that business continue to flourish is the wish of every one on this side no matter to what portion of the Dominion he may belong. That these little provinces down by the sea—that portion of the Dominion of which we are so proud—may prosper and flourish and that the people's railway may be a success is what none desire more ardently than hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Before proceeding with the few observations I have to make on the subject under discussion, let me congratulate the hon. minister (Mr. Graham) on the most admirable statement he has given us this afternoon. And let me also felicitate my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Haggart) on the kindly manner of his criticism and, let me assure him that we deeply appreciate the generous sentiments he has uttered and which are all the more welcome, coming from so old a parliamentarian, one whom we may call the father of the House. I would like at the outset to express the hope that now, when we are about to rebuild the Quebec bridge, the government may see its way to put its construction in the hands of some of our Canadian bridge builders and artisans. If it be possible to find among them men able to construct that work, the government should take every opportunity to give them the preference and entrust to them this great national undertaking. If they should do this, I am sure that there will be much greater satisfaction among our own people than if they entrusted this enterprise to outsiders. Might I also be permitted to remark that while we hear great solicitude expressed by hon. members from all parts of the country regarding the Intercolonial railway, yet in the maritime provinces where we have to use that railway, we may be admitted to have a greater personal interest in its successful operation than can possibly be felt by hon. gentlemen from other sections.

May I be permitted to say that I do not think that the fact that the Minister of Railways was able to announce a surplus this afternoon is any special reason for

congratulation. I do not know whether my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) who is the apostle of public operation in this country believes that it is the duty of a government which is operating a public utility to milk it to the greatest possible extent. If he does, then I am afraid the admiration for public ownership in any portion of the country that had practical experience of it would speedily fade away. There is one thing about this question which most hon. gentlemen forget, and that is that while it is a most desirable thing to make both ends meet, yet, this year when you have a surplus of $600,000 or $700,000 that surplus becomes of no value to the future of that enterprise. It is not like the balance in the profit and loss account of a company operating a railroad, because under the book-keeping system of the government, when there is a surplus at the end of the financial year that money goes into the general revenue of the country, ceases to be available for any purpose whatever in connection with the operation of the road. Hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes complain that expenditures are made on capital account, while on the other hand they insist that the Intercolonial railway should have a surplus. But, the moment a surplus is obtained it is appropriated out of the resources for operating the road and disappears altogether as a factor in the management of that railway. How are you going to provide for capital expenditure? how are you going to provide for these accretions which necessarily must be made to any great public work, unless you resort to capital expenditure? I, therefore, say that the fact that we have a surplus of $600,000 or $700,000 this year has no significance from the standpoint of government operation of railways. If for instance this year you have not done as much track repairing as you might have done if you did not put in as many ties as you might have put in, if as much ballasting was not done this year as the year before, it simply means that next year you will have to provide for what you failed to do this year, and when you come to provide for it instead of having the surplus in the treasury as a company would have, your surplus from the year before has disappeared. If, for instance, there should be a falling off in passengers and freight, where is the government going to get the money to make up the deficit. There will be a deficit, the surplus of the preceding year will have vanished from the transactions of the Intercolonial railway, and those gentlemen who have such great solicitude for the Intercolonial railway, but who never travel over it and know nothing about it, will hold up their hands in holy horror. It seems to me that instead of having large surpluses it would be much better if the country would begin to realize what is the real position of affairs in regard to the public operation of this public utility. It seems to me it would be much better that you should endeavour to provide for the running of your railway, to make both ends meet each year, and to operate it in such a way that deficits would not occur. Referring again to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) and his pet theories, I would like to know from him whether or not this beautiful system of government operation or government ownership of public utilities that he advocates, means that in the operating of the utility there is to be any advantage to the people who are living in the community where the utility is operated?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I will answer my hon. friend in a moment—public ownership means absolutely giving service to the people and not realizing profit on capital, and public ownership is to be judged by the service it gives and nothing else.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. At better rates?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. At better rates, and public ownership will give a better service and better rates if it is efficiently administered, but there must be efficiency of administration.

Mr. GRAHAM. And my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) holds up Germany as an example of public ownership, and yet Germany took out of the people rates sufficient to pay six per cent on capital, and in addition to that a certain stated amount every year.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And under public ownership in Germany they have the best express service in the world.

Mr. GRAHAM. But not the best freight service.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, I will tell you about the freight service later on.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I should have known that if my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) got started on his pet theory I would never be able to get a look in at all, and now I hope to be permitted to continue my remarks. What I desired to know from my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) was whether one of his theories that the people who were to be served by the utility should have the advantage of better rates than if the utility were operated by a private company. If I underestand my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) aright that is his idea. But some of his friends are fond of complaining that lower rates of freight are obtainable on this public utility, the Intercolonial railway, and, therefore, I am at a loss to understand the position of some gentlemen from this larger province who

are such strong apostles of public ownership, but who at the same time are always wanting the Minister of Railways of the day to extract a surplus out of this public utility. It seems to me that when we come to discuss the Intercolonial in this House we forget a good many things. The people of the maritime provinces, at all events those of them whom I represent, are not asking for any exceptional consideration that is not extended to any other portion of Canada, but surely we ought to remember that the Intercolonial railway was constructed for the purpose of promoting trade between the maritime provinces and central Canada. When Canada stretched out towards the Pacific and absorbed the western provinces, Canada pledged her treasury and her public lands for the purpose of providing an interprovincial railway which would reach to the Pacific coast. Canada spent more money on that railway, and it is spending more money from year to year in providing interprovincial communication between the western provinces, than ever Canada dreamt of spending, even comparatively speaking, in the maritime provinces. Therefore, this question should not be regarded in any sectional way, nor should it be considered that those of us who live in the maritime provinces are asking for sectional consideration. We are asking for nothing of the sort. In this connection, let me tell some of these hon. gentlemen some reasons why the Intercolonial does not pay. If a private company were operating the Intercolonial railway to the port of Halifax, whence immigrants come from all countries in Europe, you would have agents of that railway soliciting these people to travel over the Intercolonial railway when they reached Canada. But, is the Intercolonial railway doing that? Is there a single attempt made by passenger agents of the Intercolonial on the continent of Europe or the British isles to sell a single ticket to an immigrant coming to Canada? No. Every other railway is doing it, but yet this Intercolonial railway, which controls the front door of this Dominion for six months in the year through a port which is open all the year around for the arrival of passengers, does not attempt to induce a single emigrant leaving for Canada to utilize that railway. Now, I do not blame the Intercolonial for not doing that; the fault lies in the inherent difficulty in the operation by the government of public utilities which my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is so fond of advocating.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me tell my hon. friend that Switzerland has its agents in America soliciting passengers for the state-owned roads in Switzerland, and there is an answer to his question. What Switzerland does could be done by Canada if we believed in the principle.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is unfortunately not able to speak for all of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not profess to.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If a proposition had been made to this House at any time to appoint agents of the Intercolonial railway in Europe, we would have a loud wail from hon. gentlemen opposite about the extravagance of spending money in Europe on account of the Intercolonial railway. What is the result? The result is that the Canadian Pacific railway takes practically every immigrant that comes into this country from the east. It takes him at St. John and runs him to Montreal and other points west. If they arrive at Halifax, it brings them to St. John over the Intercolonial, and then they get the long haul on the through ticket to all points in the west. That is one point that hon. gentlemen forget in discussing the Intercolonial. Look at the immigration that is coming into Canada. Every week thousands of people have been coming in during the winter time, landing at our seaports, but the Intercolonial does not get any advantage from them. That is one of the reasons why the Intercolonial does not pay. But there is another reason. If a company were in the position in which the government of this country is in at present, they would long ago have imposed upon goods coming from the mother country under the preference, a restriction that they must come into Canada through Canadian ports. So during particularly six months of the year when these goods come to Canada, the railway would have the opportunity to haul them from the eastern ports under that restriction. But that is not done. The fact is that the Canadian Pacific has the full advantage of that preference in hauling the goods. The Grand Trunk runs from Montreal to Portland, and the goods that come to Portland during the winter under the preference, are brought to Montreal by the Grand Trunk, the Intercolonial gets no advantage from them. Yet hon. gentlemen who want this road to show a surplus, who want it crippled by dismissing its employees, will stand up in this House, as I have heard them in the last parliament, and object to the proposition that there should be put in force a restriction that the preference should only apply to goods which come in through Canadian ports.

Then look at another difficulty. This railway was originally constructed as an interprovincial railway and it stopped at Rivière

du Loup. But as the march of commerce proceeded towards the west it was extended. Consider in what an isolated position were the whole of the maritime provinces when that railway terminated at Rivière du Loup. So hon. gentlemen opposite purchased a piece of railway, and purchased the St. Charles branch in addition, and extended the Intercolonial railway to Levis, joining it with the Grand Trunk at Chaudière. Still every part of the maritime provinces was 400 or 500 miles away from the great metropolis of Canada, it had no connection with Ontario, it had no connection with the west, and it was handicapped to a degree that hon. gentlemen can hardly imagine. Where would we have been to-day if this government had not in 1897, purchased the Drummond County railway and extended it to Montreal? It purchased these two pieces of railway, involving a capital expenditure which helped to increase it to the large figure which the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has spoken of. Yet with even all these expenditures, and with the extension of the Intercolonial railway to Montreal, that road is not to-day a transcontinental line, it is solely a local line. Why? I suppose that there has been no industry in late years that has attracted so much attention as has the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, and along with it the Nova Scotia Steel Company, in which a great many people in this part of Canada are interested. These two large industries manufacture in different lines probably more iron and steel products than all the other iron and steel industries of Canada put together. Yet for nearly six months of the year only a small portion of the product of either of these industries passed beyond the city of Montreal. This country imposes upon these products a tax which interfers with their competing in Ontario and points west with products from the United States. When hon. gentlemen complain about the low rates, let me say that while I agree with the minister that in certain schedules the rates are lower for short hauls than they are on company roads, yet in the majority of the schedules the rates for one hundred miles haul and over are as great and when you come to make a comparison in regard to long hauls, the Intercolonial railway charges just as much as do the company roads in this country. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite wish to continue this impost upon our industries in the maritime provinces. We in Nova Scotia are the only people who produce coal east of the Rocky Mountains, but we cannot send a pound of coal west of the city of Montreal and compete with the Americans. Hon. gentlemen talk about Canada for Canadians, about protecting home industries and all that kind of thing, and they want the people of the maritime provinces to be screwed down so that the Intercolonial railway may show a surplus. These are things that ought not to be forgotten in discussing a question of this kind, these are some of the difficulties under which we labour.

But there is another thing. Talk about the advantage of the Intercolonial railway! What would my hon. friends think if the Minister of Railways were to come down with a proposition empowering him to develop industries along the line of the Intercolonial railway? All the other big companies do it. Everybody recognizes that that is one of the advantages of company ownership and operation, that companies are able, by virtue of the facility with which the directors can deal with problems of that kind, to develop natural industries along the line of their railway. The Intercolonial railway cannot do that. So I say that hon. gentlemen opposite do not appreciate the difficulties under which we labour, and which I have indicated. Every session hon. gentlemen hold up their hands in horror because my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has not extracted a surplus from the people who use that railway. If he had extracted a surplus, it could only be by injuring and crippling that railroad for the future. I say that for these reasons the minister has no right to have a surplus of $700,000. All that this country has a right to expect of him, seeing that this road was a special feature of confederation, is that he should make both ends meet, and that the interest of the people who live along that line of railway should have his first consideration. You talk about this being a road in which everybody in Canada is interested; of course it is. But, what would my hon. friends from the further west say if we were to criticise railway development and railway problems up there? They would tell us that they ought to have the first say about their own railways.

Now, I do not think every one was satisfied to hear my hon. friend assure the House that he had not interfered with these gentlemen who compose the Board of Management of the Intercolonial. Down in our country we learned long ago, perhaps before some hon. gentlemen in other parts of Canada did, the advantages of responsible government; and the people expect that when you have a minister of the Crown entrusted with the the operation of a great public utility, he must be held responsible therefor. And my hon. friend is responsible for it, and I do not think that he is assuming his full responsibility unless he intimates to this Board of Management what his ideas are as to how they should act. In a free country like this it is impossible to get rid

of ministerial or governmental responsibility. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) tells us that he thinks he is getting on all right, but unfortunately for the minister, in the constituency from which I come and in the constituencies of other hon. gentlemen along the line of the Intercolonial railroad, it will not do for us to say that the minister never spoke to these commissioners, because they have learned the lesson of responsibility, they know that the representatives of the people and the government are responsible at all times for the proper carrying out of this public utility, and that they have the right to interfere in the best interests of the people. I know the motives that animate my hon. friend in dealing with these matters in that way, but it will not in the slightest degree protect him from the attacks of hon. gentlemen opposite for him to say that he has nothing to do with this Board of Commissioners. I think the minister has the right to interfere with the Board of Management. He has the right to direct the policy of the board, he has the right to say, when they undertake to infringe upon the rights of the people, that these rights must be respected.

The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) intimates that the way to fix the Intercolonial is to dismiss a great army of people. I think that the action of this board, where they dismissed 503 employees and where, I am free to say, they exercised their judgment to the fullest extent that my hon. friend from Lanark could have wished, was not justified by the circumstances. I think that they could have worked out just the same results without making these dismissals. As a matter of fact the lure of the west is calling from our eastern provinces numerous men and they are going to the railways of the west and of central Canada. Hundreds of men every year are going west and it would not have taken very long to have reduced the staff of the Intercolonial railway without dismissing these men. It must be remembered that in 1908 the Intercolonial railway began to feel the effect of the bad times which the great central railways had endured for the two previous years. Every one knows of the lack of prosperity that existed on the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railway in 1908. We began to feel that down there and my hon. friend's board, dealing with this question, summarily dismissed these men. I have no objection to the greatest possible economy being exercised in the operation of the road. I quite agree that there have been abuses in the past—abuses that have come down from the time when my hon. friend the member for Lanark was Minister of Railways and Canals. While he endeavoured in his own way to check the demands that were being made upon him by his political friends in the maritime provinces, he left a condition of affairs that fortunately is gradually disappearing. And, there is no representative of the people of the maritime provinces who would not stand by the minister in every effort he would make to apply the principles of economy to the management of the road by getting rid of unnecessary officials, and so operating the road that the people of the country will have the best service and under conditions where they will be able to do the business in the best possible way.

It will not do to point to some local rates, as the hon. member for Kings-Albert (Mr. McAllister) did the other day. The Intercolonial railway was not built for the purpose of giving a man a local rate on this or that little product to be carried 15 or 20 miles; it was built as a great Canadian enterprise to connect the different provinces of the Dominion together, and the service which it ought to render to this country is that it should break down the barriers which lie between the provinces of the east and the provinces of the west, so that the products of the east may go to the west and the products of the west may be carried to the east. That is what the country expected when it constructed this road, and that is what it ought to get no matter who directs or controls the road. Unfortunately, this problem of the Intercolonial railway which has been so much discussed in this House, comes back to this difficulty to-day that it is purely a local line. We do not share in the great transportation development of the west, in the great prosperity that has come to Saskatchewan and Alberta, with their influx of population, with their increase in grain production and with all the great accretions which have come to this country. The great product of the west is brought down, as far as transportation goes, over the great trunk systems until it reaches the city of Montreal. A little bit of that product trickles down to Nova Scotia and the seaports of Canada, but the great proportion of it switches off at Montreal and goes down to Boston, Portland and other American cities. We only ask that this Intercolonial railway should be regarded as a national work, and that it should be so utilized, either by absorption with the great transcontinental railways or otherwise, that every part of Canada shall share in the development which has come of late years to the western portion of our country. My hon. friend from Lanark need not think that our people by the sea are so wedded to the theory of this railway that we would forego absolutely whatever rights we may have to prevent parliament from making it part of the Transcontinental lines. This rail-

way belongs to the Dominion of Canada, it is owned by the people and apparently it cannot be alienated. But what is this country going to do when the Grand Trunk Pacific comes to Moncton? Inside of two years it will be in operation there. Are you going to let the Grand Trunk Pacific go down to the sea? If you are you must utilize the Intercolonial railway or build a new line to reach the seaports. If the Grand Trunk railway goes there, why should not the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern go there, and why should not the Intercolonial railway be utilized so that in our maritime part of the Dominion we should have centred the national termini of the great transcontinental railways? We would have a oneness and connection that we could not get otherwise. We are apt to regard this question upon narrow lines, to look at it from a contracted view point. We would like the Minister of Railways to exercise his full responsibility and to realize that he must be responsible to the people if he is to act in the best interests not only of the maritime provinces, but of the whole of Canada. Let the whole Dominion of Canada realize that a miserable surplus of a few hundred thousand dollars is no advantage compared with the development of trade routes throughout this country, and if by absorption or connection with other lines the whole of the Dominion can be rounded out as far as trade is concerned in connection with the three great transcontinental lines, you will be doing something which will not only be for the good of Canada, but will to a great degree obliterate these little local distinctions and local discussions which now characterize the consideration of this question.

I have had repeated occasions to speak to the minister in regard to the method of dealing with claims made to the Railway Department from people living along the line of the Intercolonial for damages by fire, accidents to animals and injuries in various other ways. I say to the minister in all frankness and kindliness, and I know that he will appreciate my attitude in that regard, that this part of his administration of the Intercolonial calls for some remedy. It is a difficulty that has always existed in the past, but if there are advantages in government operation, as the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) thinks there is, I wish to tell him that there is one phase of government operation which presses very hardly upon the good people who live along the line of this public utility, and that is the recovery of damages in such cases as I have spoken of. A few years ago a statute was passed providing that if a man's property is destroyed by fire from a railway, the company is prima facie liable, the onus is thrown on the company to show that it is not liable, and claims of that kind can be easily settled in a court of law. I ventured to introduce a Bill and it was carried through parliament, which attempted to apply to the government railway the same extent of liability as other railways, but somehow the claims department of the Intercolonial railway has never discovered this on the statutes, and so far as I have been able to discover since that time, although not only in my own constituency but all along the Intercolonial railway, fires have occurred and the liability prima facie existed under the statute, some one connected with the department or somewhere else solemnly undertook to judge the liability and the evidence and the law and decided that the railway was not negligent. While that is a small matter it causes great difficulty and dissatisfaction to people living along the Intercolonial railway. A rule has been put in force of late that when an investigation is held in regard to the merits of a claim the parties having a claim cannot employ a solicitor to come and see that the claim is properly presented. While we have great public questions to deal with, while I have myself ventured to suggest that we should look at this whole problem from a broad view point, here is a matter of detail by satisfactorily adjusting which the minister will render himself and his management very popular along the line of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been for four weeks trying to work out something along that line, and if I am successful, as I think I will be, my hon. friend will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It is satisfactory to find that my hon. friend is responding so quickly to my suggestion of improvement in this regard. I am sure we will appreciate it. If my hon. friend will realize that it is his duty to tell these commissioners once in a while what they should do and what they should not do, and that he would be really deserving of condemnation instead of praise if he failed to do that, and if he will also realize the importance of the difficulties I have pointed out, and if he does not make the surplus too large next year, I think the whole House will be satisfied because the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. J. Haggart) was especially satisfied to-night.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (Cape Breton South.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great pleasure of the annual philippic of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals in bringing down his statement of the report of the board of management of the

Intercolonial railway. I shall deal with but a few of the points in that address. Until a few years ago, up to the time of my election to represent the county of Cape Breton, we enjoyed on the eastern end of the island of Cape Breton, two trains per day from the capital of Cape Breton to the capital of the province, we had what we called the express and the fast express or flier. Within the last four years during the winter months the fast express was taken off the Halifax-Sydney route and a great deal of agitation took place in the eastern part of the province. It was a matter which affected not only the county of Cape Breton but all the counties from Sydney to Halifax, and it also affected the people of the whole province as well as the people of the upper provinces with regard to mail matter and travel. A great deal of agitation was started with a view to having this train put back on the road and one year ago last month on coming up to the House of Commons here, I spoke to the Minister of Railways in the hope that as there was a pronouncement made at that time that even during the summer months a second train would not be put on the Intercolonial railway from Sydney to Halifax, some arrangement might be made for the benefit of the people in the province of Nova Scotia. There was a freight train leaving the city of Sydney at about six o'clock in the evening which was due at Fort Tupper on the Intercolonial railway somewhere about 11 or 12 o'clock at night. An express train left the town of New Glasgow every morning at about 7 o'clock for Halifax, and I suggested to the minister that a sleeping car should be attached to this freight train which would run on schedule to Point Tupper and that one of the numerous freights between Point Tupper and New Glasgow should be run on schedule to connect with the express from New Glasgow to Halifax. The Minister of Railways stated to me at that time that it was his intention to make some change in connection with the Intercolonial railway, and that as this change would be taking place very shortly he did not deem it wise to put on another train or make any alteration in connection with the administration of the affairs of the road. Some time subsequent to this the new board of railway management and control was appointed. I called on one of the members of the board and submitted the proposition to him. He said that in all probability the proper thing would be to have a regular express train. He said to me: Mr. Maddin that end of the road does not pay. Here I would like to recall a question which I asked the Minister of Railways on the 5th of May, last:

Mr. MADDIN:

1. What were the earnings from freight shipped from the Island of Cape Breton over the Intercolonial railway in 1908?
2. What were the earnings from freight shipped to the Island of Cape Breton over the Intercolonial railway in 1908?
3. What was the revenue from the sale of passenger tickets to passengers going to and coming from the Island of Cape Breton for the year 1908, on the said railway?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Separate accounts are not kept for this portion of the Intercolonial railway.
2. Answered by number one.
3. Answered by number one.

I was told by the board of control that this end of the railway did not pay, and that consequently it was not desirable that another train should be put on for the convenience of the public. I submit that until the Minister of Railways adopts a system of book-keeping which will show what the earning capacity of the eastern end of the Intercolonial is, he is not in a position to tell us that the road does not pay. In discussing the freight earnings of the eastern end of the road with this member of the board of control, I forget whether it was Mr. Butler or Mr. Brady, I pointed out the enormous freights carried for the Nova Scotia Steel Company and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. That gentleman told me that these freights were hauled at practically a loss—that there was a very heavy grade at George's river, and that in order to haul heavy trains over that grade, it was necessary to cut them up into short trains, so that the freight could not be hauled profitably at the rates charged to those industries. He also said, what was quite proper, that it was not the policy of the Intercolonial to increase the rates for moving steel billets from those works, in view of the fact that they received bounties from the government, and it would not be right for the federal treasury to pay bounties for the production of steel and take them away by charging high rates of freight on the product. That is a view which I think all members of this House will readily agree with. But just before this government went to the country in 1908, a pledge was given to the people of Cape Breton that the grades at George's river would be reduced, and the sum of $350,000, if I remember rightly, was placed in the estimates for that purpose. During the passage of the estimates last session, I pointed out to the Minister of Railways and Canals that there was in the estimates a sum of only $50,000, which he said was there for the purpose of purchasing a right of way for the proposed reduction of grades, and owing to the depression of trade in the country he did not deem it expedient to place a sum in the estimates last year for

the work. But in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways and Canals has assured this House that in the supplementary estimates to be brought down at a subsequent date, the sum of $16,000,000 will be placed for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and in view of the further fact that a surplus of $666,388.67 has been declared for a period of nine months operation of the Intercolonial railway, a surplus which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) said the minister should not have declared, it is due to the people at the eastern end of the Intercolonial that a sum be placed in the supplementary estimates for the completion of the promised survey and reduction of grades at George's river in the county of Cape Breton; and I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals now if it is his intention to place in the supplementary estimates a sum to be applied for that purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM. Is there not a sum for it in the main estimates?

Mr. MADDIN. No.

Mr. GRAHAM. Look again, my hon. friend must be mistaken.

Mr. MADDIN. Last year the estimated cost of the reduction of the grade, as given to us by the Minister of Railways and Canals, was a sum exceeding $400,000. I took the ground then that the sum of $50,000 was not adequate. I was told that it was placed there only for the purpose of purchasing the right of way, and that it was not proposed to take any active steps in connection with the matter. In the estimates for this year there is the sum of $100,000; but in view of the statement of the minister that $400,000 will be required, that sum is not adequate for the carrying on of this work, and I ask the minister if it is intended to place a sum in the supplementary estimates sufficient for the carrying out of this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work cannot all be done in one season. We are doing with this work what we are doing with every work, placing in the estimates an adequate amount for the work to be done this season.

Mr. MADDIN. What work was done for the $50,000 which was in the estimates last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. There was considerable work done.

Mr. MADDIN. Well, it seems to me that the Department of Railways and Canals are not exhibiting the same anxiety for the reduction of grades at George's river in the years 1909 and 1910 that they exhibited in 1908, before the elections. In answer to a question put last session, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that the engineer had gone down to make the surveys for the reduction of these grades as promptly as he could after the House closed. Although he hastened down and made the surveys after the House closed in 1908, there has been no actual work done there from that time to the present.

Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has told us with some assurance that there has been no interference from him with the administration of the railway under the board of control. I admire the courage of the hon. member for Pictou, who took the minister to task and told him what his responsibilities in connection with the administration of that railway really are. If the hon. member for Pictou demonstrated anything this evening, it was that he, and not the present incumbent of that portfolio, should be administering the railway in the maritime provinces. I doubt if any hon. member on either side of the House has much ground to complain of interference on the part of the Minister of Railways, either the present incumbent of that office or any of his predecessors. I think the railway has suffered much more from the lack of interference than from interference on the part of the minister. Last year, when the Railway Board was appointed, we were given the strongest assurance through the Liberal press of the country that the railway was now brought out of the range of politics, and that from now, henceforth and for ever, there would be no interference from politicians with the administration of the affairs of the road. People imagined that this was actually the fact, for it was only a short time after the appointment of the new board that 503 heads fell into the basket, the result of the over-manning of the road during the general elections in the fall of 1908. While the Minister of Railways plumes himself on not having interfered with the road, I think it would be much more to the credit of himself and his administration if he could have assured us that there had been no interference with the affairs of the road by men of lesser responsibility than himself.

I wish to point out that in the month of June last, when these 503 men were dismissed, a gentleman by the name of James Edwards, a boilermaker in Sydney, was suspended in the mechanical department at that end of the road. He was told by the foreman that he need not take his tool box away, that he was not dismissed but merely suspended, and that if an opening should occur in that line of work, his services would be required again. But permit me to diverge for a moment to something that took place previous to this. In the fall of 1908, about a week before the general elections in Cape Breton, Mr. Edwards, the boilermaker, was sent for by Alexander Johnson, the Liberal candidate in Cape Breton South, and was invited by him to

the office of the 'Daily Record.' On entering Mr. Johnson's presence, he was addressed as follows:

So you are the man who was cheering for Maddin out in ward 4. You ought to take a tumble to yourself. See if Maddin can get you a job.

This was in the fall of 1908. In June, 1909, this man was suspended along with others. But his tool box remained in the shop, and he was told that when a vacancy occurred and his services would be required he would be sent for. Being aware that there was a vacancy, he went down and sought for re-employment, but his employer said to him: You will have to make your peace with the Liberal party. Edwards said: I thought the commissioners said there was to be no politics or seniority on the Intercolonial. His boss replied: Do you think if I wanted to hire ten mechanics I could go and hire ten of the best men to be found regardless of their politics? No, I would have to go to Mr. Johnson or Dr. Kendall for every one of them. Mr. Edwards then called on Dr. Kendall, the local member, and complained of unfair treatment, and the doctor promised to make inquiries. He met the doctor on the street a couple of days afterwards, and the doctor said to him: Edwards, I understand how it is about your job. You were working for Maddin against Mr. Johnson. See if Mr. Maddin can get you a job. Edwards said: I thought politics and seniority had nothing to do with the railway, that it would be run on a new principle, independent of politics. He said: We will let you see that. And Edwards is still unemployed. If the road were purged of the administration of its affairs by politicians and ex-politicians, those who have graduated from this House, and are taking a post graduate course in journalism and provincial politics—if this road were purged of the operations of these ex-politicians, and a little more attention paid by the Minister of Railways, who is really the one responsible for its administration, there would be fewer complaints.

Something has been said with regard to the Hudson Bay railway, and we are given to understand that this railway is to be taken up by the government and completed. Well, we have had reports to the effect that there is only navigation in that bay for some two months in the year and that in the straits there is navigation for less than two months. As every one is aware, the class of vessel required to go through the drifting ice are vessels of slow speed, high power, sheathed in wood to resist the ice jam. These vessels have to be specially constructed and are unfit for other traffic. If this railway is completed and is going to remove the crop of the west, it will only defer the building of the Georgian Bay canal. The hon. member for Pictou has pointed out that we are only able to ship our coal from the province of Nova Scotia up to Montreal, and cannot ship it beyond that point. But if the Georgian Bay canal were completed, I submit that coal could be shipped from Cape Breton to Port Arthur as cheaply, if not cheaper than it can be landed at Montreal to-day. A great drawback with regard to getting coal into the upper Canadian market is the question of transportation. The vessels built for carrying coal to Montreal are obliged to come back in water ballast, but if the Georgian Bay canal were built they would carry coal to Port Arthur and get return freight so that coal could be landed at Port Arthur as cheaply, if not cheaper, than at Montreal at present. But if this government is going to experiment in millions of dollars expenditure on the Hudson Bay railway, in order to have shipments for a couple of months, that will only delay the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) was opposed to the government rates charged on the Intercolonial railway on traffic coming east or going west. I would like to point out that the hon. gentleman was not complaining about the dearness of the rate, but what he did complain of was that the railway did not pay, although there was no reason why, with the passenger and freight rates that were being charged it should not.

In his address to the House this afternoon, the minister of Railways dealt with the different canal projects and western railway and finally wound up with a report of the Intercolonial. He went into the expenditure and revenue of this road and took a good deal of time to point out that this year in particular, there was a surplus, instead of a deficit. I submit that there should not be exhibited this undue anxiety on the part of the minister in his annual presentation, because the Intercolonial railway was never intended to be a revenue earning railway. The hon. minister has told us that he has great faith in the future of this country. He believes that in the course of the next twenty-five years all the great public works now projected will be completed and that even then we will not have more highway than we require for our freight and passengers. Let me tell him that the Intercolonial railway was projected and built at a period of our history when it required more faith than is required to-day to foresee the benefits bound to arise to this country from its construction. In the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, men were not lacking before confederation who would undertake to build the Intercolonial railway as far as Rivière du Loup. It was not built for the

purpose of earning revenue, but for the purpose of developing the resources of our country down by the sea. It was constructed for the purpose of carrying products of the mines, the forests, the fisheries and the farms to the different markets of the world and to bring in to those provinces the imports required for their development and maintenance.

It was assumed by those who brought this railway into existence that it possibly might be run at a loss; it certainly never was expected that it would be made a revenue paying concern. Let me ask if the Minister of Railways exhibits any very great anxiety year after year because the canals in Upper Canada, which cost the country over $100,000,000, and through which the people of Nova Scotia cannot ship a single ton of coal, are not paying dividends, and yet we all know that the canals were made free and that they were not even expected to pay their way. This $100,000,000 expenditure of canals is practically of no use to the people of the maritime provinces, but do we raise an annual wail because the canals don't pay? No. We realize that our canal system in Upper Canada is necessary to the development of that part of the Dominion, and might we not with some reason be allowed to hope that the railway system in the maritime provinces should be looked upon in somewhat the same light. The Intercolonial railway is to some extent looked upon by the people of the maritime provinces as more particularly an asset of these provinces, just as the canals may be looked upon as an asset of the people of western Canada. Do we hear the members from the maritime provinces complaining about the employment of too many men on the canals or the dismissal of men on the canals? Oh, no, but year after year the government is asked: Are they going to sell the Intercolonial, or are they going to lease it, or are they going to put it under a Royal Commission, or are they going to get rid of the incubus in some way. I submit, Sir, that if the Intercolonial were freed from political influences which yet characterize its management there would be less complaint about it. I shall not draw any comparison between the administration under Conservative rule and under Liberal rule, I am not going to say that political influence did not exist in the days of the Conservative administration, but we all know it is a recognized fact that at the present time political influence is exercised in connection with everything appertaining to the Intercolonial, from the hiring of a common labourer to buying of stores and the making of contracts. It was recognized that patronage and partyism permeated the management of the road throughout, and when the board of management was appointed we were promised that these influences would be got rid of. But let me say, Sir, that so far from this board being now free from external political influences that is not the case, and in that respect their administration has been a failure. Now, coming more particularly to details, I trust the minister will see that the grades on the Intercolonial railway at George's river will be reduced immediately. The minister has now a surplus which is more than sufficient to pay for this work, and the excuse that he made a year ago that the financial conditions of the country do not warrant the expenditure has now disappeared. I trust he will in the near future carry to completion the reduction of the grades at George's river, which will be a great improvement to the system.

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

Railways and canals—capital—Intercolonial Railway—Beresford subway, $6,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to remove a dangerous crossing and build a subway. The cost is estimated at $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the government follow the rule laid down as to the distribution of cost and ask the municipality to pay a share of this amount?

Mr. GRAHAM. This will be all paid by the government. The Intercolonial railway pays no taxes to the municipalities as the other railways do.

Mr. LENNOX. Having regard to the fact that this railway does not pay taxes, and probably for other reasons, you do not propose to ask the municipalities to contribute anything?

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does the Intercolonial pay a frontage sewerage tax to the municipalities as all other land owners do?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that the Intercolonial railway pays no taxes of that kind.

To strengthen bridges, $61,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for strengthening bridges on the line to accommodate the heavier rolling stock.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the whole cost of the strengthening of these bridges charged against capital or against revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount charged up to capital would be, less the amount realized on the material in these bridges.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose you have a wooden bridge which has done service up

to the present you could not tear it up and get anything for it. If you are putting in a steel bridge to replace a wooden bridge it seems to me that at least the service cost of the wooden bridge should be contributed from revenue. What is the general principle upon which the strengthening is proceeded with, in other words, what is the total cost of strengthening all the bridges to which you are going to appropriate this money. Is it $61,000 or is it $120,000, the other half being appropriated from current revenue?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is all being taken out of capital. For instance, if the old rolling stock had remained, very few of these bridges would have needed to be strengthened, unless one of them was worn out entirely, in which case we might have replaced it out of revenue. But where, on account of heavier rolling stock, we have to do away with an old bridge, the bridge becomes useless altogether. It is worth nothing for present use, because heavier rolling stock demands a heavier bridge. It is not like a rail. When you take up a 67-lb. rail you have the rail, but when one of these bridges is removed, it becomes of no value, and I do not see how you could well credit it to anything. It is the common practice of company railways to do that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know the principle upon which roads in the United States, under the commission, operate. There must be some statement of the methods of their operation, which the minister could lay on the table of the House for our information.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get the principle. If it is not in a concrete form, I will work it out and lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an item that appears every year, and I presume will appear for many years to come. May I ask what proportion of the bridges on the Intercolonial have already been strengthened, and how many does he expect to strengthen the coming year?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that the present amount will nearly complete the work this year. If the rolling stock on the line is practically doubled in weight, it will mean that every bridge must be strengthened. There may be two or three bridges in addition to these, but no more. Then if they are renewed afterwards, the cost will come out of revenue.

Chaudière Junction—engine house, &c., $6,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The item has been reduced from $20,000 to $6,000, because we have abandoned the idea of building a new engine house. This is to complete the tracks and signals, fire pumps, &c., which are accessories to the round house.

Diversion of line at Chatham, and branch to wharf, $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a large item. The estimated cost was about $440,000 for building this diversion. I suppose it will be about eight and a half miles. It gets over a heavy grade between Nelson and Loggieville, it shortens the line, and it opens up and gives access to the harbour at Chatham. As a matter of fact, the station is a long way from the harbour, and quite a distance from the town itself. I visited the place, and was much impressed with the fact that there ought to be some means of getting nearer to the harbour. Everything had to be hauled a long distance. It was represented to me by the Board of Trade, by the council and by a large meeting of citizens, that they had in view some great new industries which they would undertake if they could get the railway nearer deep water. I think, in the interest of the road, that would be one consideration. But there was another thing, and that was getting rid of a very heavy grade and shortening the line. We decided to undertake this work about a year ago. The estimated cost is $440,000, of which we have spent about $3,000 on surveys. I have a full estimate of the work in its details. The old road would be abandoned.

Mr. FOSTER. What you are really doing is to build the old railway into the city?

Mr. GRAHAM. To get down into the heart of traffic, and we expect a larger traffic on account of reaching deep water.

Mr. STANFIELD. Why not take the original route?

Mr. GRAHAM. The old Canada Eastern did that, but they did not pay much attention to grades. This is bringing the old Canada Eastern railway down into the town of Chatham. At present, it is not on the Intercolonial proper.

Mr. LENNOX. This is on a line that we acquired a few years ago, and when this is done will you be right down to the harbour? What is the nature of the work that is going to be done now for this estimated expenditure of $150,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to get the right of way, grading, ballasting and track laying. We expect to run along the harbour for one or two miles.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the $440,000 include anything for harbour improvement, or is it all for railway construction?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is merely for the railway. I suppose it will include a station. It will necessitate the removal of the station from its present location to a location in the town.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister at hand a summary of what amount has been spent under the head of capital expenditure on the Canada Eastern railway since we acquired it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that information for my hon. friend, if possible; it is quite a large amount. There has been ballasting, new bridges and that kind of thing. I think last session I gave the full capital expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the opinion of the minister as to the increase in traffic that you are going to get by adding nearly half a million of expenditure on this branch road?

Mr. GRAHAM. There seems to be a prospect for a good traffic in lumber and pulp wood. Strong representations were made that a very large mill would probably be erected at that point if they had proper railway facilities.

Mr. STANFIELD. They have a pulp mill there now.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they have, I know but it is working under a great disadvantage.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they going to build another?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that another pulp mill and perhaps a paper mill would be erected there. But, no matter how good the port facilities are the distance that they have to haul of a mile or a mile and a half between the station and the port is an obstacle. If the possibilities are to be developed at all this is the only way in which we can do it. In addition the heavy grade we have there has made it almost impossible to do any business over that line.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is incurring a very large expenditure on very airy grounds. He has no real certainty of anything. Pulp has been remotely considered or suggested. A paper mill may follow. It does not seem to me that we are justified in doubling the amount that we originally paid for the road and which we were told bought a road which was reasonably well constructed and well equipped. We pay out half as much more and there is no certainty at all that the development and extra business which the minister refers to will result. Railways do not build unless there is some reasonable certainty of securing extra business. We are going to put into a road that we were told would cost us $800,000 something in the neighbourhood of $2,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a good deal of truth in what my hon. friend says. But in the province of Ontario a great deal of the difficulty that we have had with some of our company railways has been that they have built half a mile or so from the town and if it is possible to give any other railway the business we always do it. It is in the interest of the railway that we should develop the traffic there. You cannot have any guarantee at any of those places. You have to look at the possibility of the trade and overcome one of the charges which have been made against this government road that it will not assist the industries of the maritime provinces as other railways would do. In a port like this it is wise to get to the water front so as to get whatever traffic may be there. In addition we make a great reduction in the grade which has been a handicap in attempting to do any business there.

Mr. FOSTER. What service does the Intercolonial railway give to Chatham?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a branch line from Chatham Junction, but the station is a mile or a mile and a half away from the the town.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not get an answer explicitly from the minister. The minister will furnish us with the total amount which has been expended upon capital account on that eastern railway since we acquired it?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. I recollect there was a great deal of criticism as to the wisdom of acquiring this railway at the time we did acquire it. It was the Gibson line and it was represented to us that it was in good working condition, would be a very valuable line and that we would not have to expend any considerable sum of money in order to begin immediately to derive a benefit from it. I think it will be found that we have already expended a large sum upon capital, here is an item of $440,000 and we can assume that it will reach half a million or more before it is finished. There is a good deal in the suggestion that there is a very airy possibility of any considerable advantage to be derived from the expenditure on this line. Although I dislike always to speak of the Newmarket canal it is a good deal on the same line as the construction of that expensive work for the purpose of building up one possible industry. It was said that the Kane Bros., would probably leave Newmarket if we did not build that canal and $200,000

or $300,000 was going to do the whole thing. Now we find that it is running into a very large amount of money. I do not want to obstruct the minister in any of these items, but I think we ought to have pretty full information as to what is contemplated as well as what has been done in connection with this Canada Eastern railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring all the information down.

Mr. FOSTER. Maybe the minister would do just as well to let this item stand and go on with other items, because I think this is rather too important to pass with the information that we have.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will tell me what he wants I will try to get it. There is no information as to the trade except that a man with practical ideas looks over the ground and comes to the conclusion that there is a possibility of very large development there. The other advantage is that we are getting rid of a grade and bringing down to the sea-board a railway that is a mile or a mile and a half away.

Mr. LENNOX. We find $440,000 as one item of proposed expenditure. Is this the total or will we be confronted with other items as we go along?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know but that there may be on this whole length of railway, but this covers everything at Chatham. Anything new that has to be done must be charged to capital account.

Mr. LENNOX. Here is a railway that cost us $800,000, and here is one spot on that railway that is to cost more than half a million in addition to what we paid for the railway. What are we to expect in reference to the rest of it? What was suggested by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was that the minister should let this item stand until we get the information spoken of, and then the minister will probably indicate what other items of capital expenditure are for the construction of this. Of course the minister must know what he contemplates, in addition to this, off-hand.

Mr. RHODES. As I understand the Minister of Railways, this expenditure is justified on the ground that the branch line will increase in efficiency, whereby its earning power will increase so that you can haul more cheaply.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is one of the great reasons.

Mr. RHODES. Then how does the minister reconcile this with the line of policy laid down in connection with the Branch Lines Bill, not to take over any branch lines reported to be not in a good and safe condition? In other words, not to take over a railway that requires expenditure on it.

Mr. GRAHAM. This railway has been taken over and this is absolutely a new road that we are constructing.

Mr. RHODES. I quite understand that, but the principle is there just the same, you are expending money on a road that has been acquired. I am not speaking in a critical way, because in connection with the Branch Lines Bill I believe that the government should take over a railway even if it is only a rattle-trap road if, after it is placed in proper condition, it will be a paying asset to the government. But I ask if, while you are making an expenditure on this branch line to increase its efficiency, you should not do so in reference to any future road acquired under the Branch Lines Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are criticised now for taking over a road on which we will have to spend money, and the Branch Lines Act rather protects us in the future against that criticism. This road has already been purchased and we want to get the best possible results from it. We want to get down into the town of Chatham, where there is a chance not only of decreasing the grade, but of getting more goods to haul.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it had been left entirely to this managing board or to the chief engineer just on the ground of the traffic necessities of the road, would they have recommended an expenditure of $400,000 or $500,000 in order to improve the road for the sake of the haulage over it? Is it not a fact that this is another method of paying respect to very strong party pressure which has been made at certain times? This road was acquired in the first place as a result of a political promise. The House was misled, because we were told we were getting a road well worth the money and in a reasonable state of repair and efficiency. I think that from the debates in this House we could show that the minister became sponsor to the House that it would not land us into very much greater expenditures. Here we are increasing the cost price in one little instance by one-half the whole price.

Mr. GRAHAM. But we are getting a good deal more by the expenditure. This was no political promise, I can assure my hon. friend. If it had been it would have been made to one political party. I visited Chatham and spent some hours there. I met the citizens, I do not know who were Liberals and who were Conservatives. I met the board of trade, the council and citizens generally and I was strongly cen-

sured by the Conservative press there because I did not absolutely promise on the spot that I would do this. I considered it carefully, I had a talk with the chief engineer and the deputy, and while in answer to my hon. friend's question, I think if it were only to improve the haulage for the goods we now have, we would not go to this very large expenditure, it would be worth a large proportion of the expenditure to do that. But, taking into consideration the possibilities of the place, the fact that we are trying to assist the development where we can without too much expense to the railway, feeling that we get a return, I undertook, after full consideration, not as a political promise but as a promise to the citizens and in the interest of transportation and development, to do this work. It is not a political promise in any sense.

Mr. STANFIELD. What are the freight earnings for Chatham?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not those figures with me, there is considerable freight.

Mr. STANFIELD. I do not object to having the line put into the town but it seems a large expenditure, for the exports of Chatham are nearly all lumber and you will not haul lumber over your road, it has to go by water as they have a good harbour and the same thing is true of pulp.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was not so outlined to us by the prominent business men there. They felt that a great deal of traffic would be developed by the road going to the harbour.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of traffic? They must have told the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not follow as a fact that because some hon. gentleman is of opinion that certain traffic will not go by the route, it will not go, because possibly a good deal will be carried.

Mr. FOSTER. You must exercise your judgment.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a matter of opinion, that is all. The men of the city were positive that a great deal of traffic would be done on this railway if it got down to the harbour, and a great deal of traffic and merchandise would go to the harbour that does not now go there because the railway is so far off they cannot make connection.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a road from Fredericton to Chatham. We know the nature of the country through which it runs. It is not a country calculated to throw much traffic into the town of Chatham. What will go to Chatham? The lumber along the streams is taken down the streams to Gibson or Marysville and from there it is shipped on the St. John river. Will this road divert that traffic from that old and cheap route? Most of the lumber must take that route, and will not be shipped on your line even when you add this extra $500,000. Is there much agriculture produce, &c., which will run to the town of Chatham and bring you a return in freightage on that road? That traffic will be very small. What is there in Chatham, now or to come which will find its outlet by way of Chatham over this Canada Eastern to Fredericton and what is to become of it there?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend forgets that this road will work in connection with the Intercolonial railway. It does not necessarily go to Fredericton at all. Traffic goes east and west on the Intercolonial railway. It is a mistake to say that all lumber is shipped by water. A large quantity of the sawn lumber there goes by rail.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it go by rail from Chatham over this road in the direction of Fredericton?

Mr. GRAHAM. A large share of it will go to Chatham junction and be shipped on the Intercolonial railway east and west from there.

Mr. FOSTER. Over how many miles of road will that accretion go? What will be the haulage you get?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Intercolonial railway will get all the haulage when it strikes that line. We get it at the junction and by getting to the harbour it is represented we will get a larger trade than we do now. It does not need to go to Fredericton, it goes to the junction and then to St. John by the Intercolonial railway. It is true that we do not get all the haulage on the Canada Eastern branch. While this is a part of the Canada Eastern branch, it will also be a feeder to the Intercolonial railway at the junction point and the Intercolonial railway will take charge of the traffic there.

Mr. LENNOX. What has been the net revenue from this Gibson road, say for the last year? That information might enable us to judge how this matter will work out. Is the minister of the opinion that this addition of $440,000 would result in a proportionate net increase of revenue or in a deficit?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend must know that this question cannot be answered. In any transportation problem you cannot guarantee that you would get any stated revenue. You look over the ground and hope you will.

Mr. LENNOX. What revenue have we been getting in the past from this road?

Mr. GRAHAM. I answered that question as fully as possible last year, in reply to the hon. member for St. Antoine division,

Montreal. I have not the figures with me at present.

Mr. LENNOX. What was the general result—considerable profit?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I think not. This year, when the year is up, it may be different.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be unfortunate if, with an increase in the expenditure, we had a proportionate increase in the deficit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I happen to know very well the situation of affairs at Chatham, and I can assure the committee that it would be impossible to project any extension of the railway which is more likely to add to the business of the main line.

Mr. FOSTER. In the whole wide world?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, relatively to the business of the main line. As my hon. friend knows, the Miramichi is a very important river, navigable up to Chatham, and even beyond Newcastle. There are important industries there, and the people of Chatham are unanimously of the opinion that this extension along the water front will lead to the establishment of a number of very important industries. They believe that it will give new life to the town, tend to develop large industries and bring to the railroad a great traffic which it could not possibly get unless this connection were made between the water and the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. All of which was said by another gentleman, at a different time, and in almost the same words, with reference to the Newmarket canal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the Miramichi there is 20 feet of water.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is an advantage; there is water there. But there is no plan of this proposed extension; we are entirely in the dark with reference to it. If the minister will gather up some of the information asked for and bring a plan of it when we come to the estimates tomorrow, I think we shall make more progress.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring a plan and lay it on the table to-morrow, although I do not think my hon. friend can form much of an idea from an engineer's plan.

Air-brakes to freight cars, $10,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How many cars is it expected this will equip?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 200. We have a total of 12,779 cars, of which we have equipped 10,801, leaving 1,978 to be equipped. Our cars cannot go across the line if they are not equipped with air brakes, even if we did not have them as a measure of safety.

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose the minister intends to have all the freight cars equipped with air brakes?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. STANFIELD. Why does not the minister have the work pushed through? In the different carshops at Moncton, Stellarton and Halifax, men were laid off. Why were these men not kept at this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are getting along pretty rapidly, having equipped already 10,801 cars.

To exchange drawbars of freight cars, $10,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How many cars will this amount equip?

Mr. GRAHAM. About 200 cars, which will leave a balance of about 493.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this work done in the carshops?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, in our own shops.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the reason for exchanging the drawbars?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to have a standard drawbar, or no other road will accept our cars. On the old-fashioned car there was a link coupling, which is obsolete and only good for scrap.

General protection of highways — Intercolonial railway, $10,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What policy does the minister propose to adopt as regards protection of highways?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to place bells for the protection of highways at level crossways—either bells or gates. Year by year we are taking a moderate amount and are setting the other railways a good example. We are eliminating some level crossings altogether every year and in other places there will be something for overhead bridges.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the minister will adopt some relative basis as regards protection by gates and bells and overhead crossings and subways. I think the minister will be justified in making to some extent the Intercolonial railway an object lesson to the other railways, especially in connection with the safety of the public.

Mr. STANFIELD. Does this include the vote passed last year for the protection of the crossing at Londonderry?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. RHODES. It is my duty to bring to the minister's attention the bad condition of the roadway and also the station yards at Amherst. Amherst is a town of some 9,000 population. The railway track

divides the town in two. There is a level crossing at Main street, which is guarded in the daytime by an old pensioner, who is away at meal hours and at night time leaves altogether. There is a very large block between the main street and Christie's crossing, about half a mile. On the south side of the highway are a number of factories, employing some 1,600 men, most of whom live on the north side of the track, and their only way to reach their homes is to cross the railway. During the past three or four years, there have been a large number of accidents and several losses of life. Only in December last, a twelve-year-old girl was killed. With the shunting and moving about constantly of the trains the cars are not separated, so that there is no passage way and the result is the children crawl underneath, and in doing so this girl was killed. I would urge that an item be placed in the estimates for the building there of an overhead bridge. In the case of the Chatham branch, we are spending $450,000 to improve the line of railway and the station, and the freight and passenger earnings of that branch only amount to $163,000. In the case of Amherst, the total receipts from freight and passenger earnings, as shown by the Auditor General's Report, amount to $563,000, so that on the basis of dollars and cents, the minister should consider this case. But from the standpoint of human life, there is very great need for an overhead bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. An overhead bridge might be built, but as the place is practically level, it would have to be so high that in nine cases out of ten, people would still cross beneath the bridge. At least that is my experience in western towns.

Mr. RHODES. You could build a subway more cheaply, perhaps. Between Christie street crossing and Victoria street crossing, there is a street known as Station street. At that point a subway could be continued to opposite the car works and enable the operators to pass back and forth in comparative safety. I know that three or four losses of life have occurred there in the last three or four years. I think a subway could be built there quite cheaply, as there is no rock and the drainage is good. The subway is not only needed for the employees but for their children who live on the south and go to school on the north.

Halifax—increased accommodation, $52,650.

Mr. GRAHAM. This has been going on for a long while. It is for additional tracks in the yard on the west side of Water street and also for removing buildings in Richmond yard. It is estimated that the pavements will cost $11,500, and the wiring of buildings $5,000.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. LENNOX. There was $180,000 voted last year. That will be all spent by the end of the present year too, I presume, and $52,000 more is wanted. Will those two complete the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would not be honest for me to say that there would not be any more expenditure at a terminal like Halifax, because expenditures will constantly be going on there.

Mr. CROCKET. Are all the works included in this $52,000, under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, except the track laying, which is done by ourselves.

Indiantown and Blackville—to put line into condition for operation, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you mean by putting the line into condition for operation; is it not running now?

Mr. GRAHAM. There has been an expenditure of $168,000 on this Indiantown branch, which includes the building of quite a large bridge, and we have it now in practical running order, and this $2,000 will finish the job. It was not in good running order when we got it.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the length of the line?

Mr. GRAHAM. About eight miles.

Mr. CROCKET. Will trains be run regularly this year to connect with the trains on the Fredericton and Chatham branch?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is a regular train connection there now, but I would not be sure without looking at the time table.

Mr. CROCKET. There was some interest in the question as to whether, when the Indiantown branch was open, a traveller from Fredericton to Montreal might go by way of Blackville and Newcastle, instead of by Chatham Junction.

Mr. GRAHAM. I rather think the through connection would still be made by Chatham Junction.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this the last of this expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Lac au Saumon—overhead crossing, $1,400.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this represent the total cost of this bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, the contour of the land there renders it cheap and convenient to erect this bridge.

Mr. LENNOX. This is an instance of what I have advocated, that where the formation of the land lent itself to an over-

head bridge like this, a bridge should be erected.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so myself.

Mr. LENNOX. The interest upon this expenditure is a mere trifle, and it is much better than to employ a watchman.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is better than a bell and much safer.

Mr. LENNOX. It is an illustration of what I have been contending for.

Loggieville—improvements, $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for improvements at the station.

Mr. CROCKET. What will be the total cost of these works?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total estimated cost is $32,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it the intention to include in the supplementary estimates this year an appropriation for the station at Fredericton? There was an initial vote of $10,000 put in the estimates for 1908, but that vote was dropped from the estimates last year, and it is not included in the main estimates this year. The minister has been to Fredericton and he has recognized the absolute necessity for a new station. The present building is a disgrace to the railway and an eyesore in the community. The board of trade and the city council of Fredericton have taken the matter up, and I would like to hear from the minister if it is the intention to put a vote for a new station at Fredericton in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to say that. But I agree with my hon. friend that the station at Fredericton is not fit for that city. I may go further, and say that I do not think the station at Truro is fit either. But we are going along gradually. There is some question about our property at Fredericton that has been bothering us considerably, and it is not quite clear yet. I would not like to say that I will put an item in the estimates. But every word my hon. friend says about the station at Fredericton is absolutely true; we must have, before long, a new station at Fredericton.

Mr. CROCKET. An initial appropriation was made a year ago. Why was that dropped?

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not know certain things about the property there that I have found out since, and which it would not be wise perhaps to reveal. But the hon. gentleman will not have to wait long for a station. Last year I hoped to make some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific railway, and join them, but unfortunately we cannot do that.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister say whether a site has been decided upon? Because I may say that some of the gentlemen who figure prominently in the Liberal organization there are buying up land, and purchases have been made within a week or two by the gentleman who has the patronage of the Liberal party. I would call the attention of the minister to that fact, so that if they have any particular location in view, they may make their purchase of land from the present owners, and not be called upon to pay large profits and rake-offs to middlemen.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend can rest assured that we will guard against that. If we were to give an intimation of where we wished to purchase, I imagine the price would immediately go up. I have not heard the circumstances which my hon. friend has outlined, but he can rest assured that we will buy the land at the lowest possible price, and if we cannot get it at a price which we think reasonable, there is a process by which we can get it at a fair valuation.

Mr. STANFIELD. Ever since I have been in the House I have advocated a new station at Truro. That station is a disgrace to the road. Amherst has had two new stations since that was built, Pictou has had a good station, Stellarton has had one, Antigonish and some other places. I would like the minister to give me some kind of a promise that we will get that station. I feel sure that if the present deputy had remained—I am sorry to see him going—we would have had an item in the estimates for next year.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know that my present deputy has been studying the question of a station at Truro. Perhaps I may be pardoned if I say something that may sound a little blunt. I think we have designed stations along the Intercolonial, I will not say extravagant but sometimes out of proportion to the needs. My hon. friend has spoken to me about the station at Truro, and we need a new station there. We are studying the question, and it cannot be very long before we shall have to have a new station there, even in our own interest.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to say to the minister in connection with the diversion of the line at Chatham, that if he has not got the information now, I would like him to state, when we return to the item, just what negotiations have taken place with reference to the acquisition of

the right of way, what properties have been purchased, if any, and from whom, and at what prices.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 2, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. MACKENZIE KING moved that the second report of the special committee on hours of labour on public works be concurred in: He said: I might say that in introducing the motion on this subject the other day I may not have explained it to the House as fully as I should have, that this is a report of the committee appointed by the House to inquire into the subject, and that it was as chairman of the committee I presented the report. It was suggested by some members of the House that the appointment of any one to assist the committee was unnecessary, inasmuch as officers of the Department of Labour might be expected to do that work. It is true that we have in the Department of Labour officers who are capable of doing work of the kind; but the work which is required to be done would involve taking these gentlemen off their departmental work to do that which is of the nature of committee work. It was also suggested that this looked like an attempt to get some one a situation. In that connection I have only to say that the motion to retain a specialist for this purpose in the committee was made by an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House, and I am quite sure he had no such idea in his mind when he made the motion. Further, I do not think any member of the committee had in mind anything other than the purpose of securing the best expert advice it was possible to obtain in connection with the furtherance of the work, so that when the report was brought down to the House it would be as complete as possible. Seeing that this is the unanimous report of the committee, I hope the House will concur in it.

Mr. BLAIN. I have nothing to add to what I said in the House a day or two ago. I suppose that remark would apply to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), because he has not added any new reason why the House should adopt this new principle. When the matter was before the House a few days ago the Prime Minister suggested that, as this was a new departure, time should be given to look into it. I hoped that the Minister of Labour would be able to give us some new reasons why the committee should ask that a specialist be appointed to gather information as to the labour legislation of other countries. My hon. friend's department is costing this country, according to the Auditor General's Report, about $112,000 every year; with a Minister of Labour, a deputy Minister of Labour, and a staff of officers, all new within the last few years; and if my hon. friend, after all these years of effort and expenditure, has not in his department now the legislation that is in force in other countries with which Canada has any relations, then I think the Labour Department is a distinct failure. I am not interested as to whether a gentleman on this side of the House or a gentleman on that side moved the motion in the committee. That is unimportant. What I do say is that whatever information is required by this subcommittee should be found in the Labour Department. If it is not found there, then my hon. friend the minister and his department are not doing what the people of this country expect them to do.

Mr. KING. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) I would say that the legislation in question is to be found in the Department of Labour; but that is not what the committee is asking for. Legislation of this character passed by other countries has been the subject of interpretation in the courts, particularly in the United States, and in several states the courts have passed upon the effect of that legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. Could not my hon. friend refer those matters to the Justice Department?

Mr. KING. The decisions of the courts are only one phase of the matter. But referring the matter to the Justice Department would not get over the difficulty of throwing upon a department of the government an amount of extra work which, having regard to the work the department is already doing, it could hardly be expected to undertake. My hon. friend has said that this is a new departure. I think he is mistaken. I am informed that in connection with other committees of the House a like course has been adopted for example in the case of the telephone committee, where the assistance of an expert was obtained. It is simply that the committee may have the benefit of expert knowledge on this very important question. One or two clerks of the department, if given this special work to perform, I have no doubt would discharge it satisfactorily, but to do that would involve their leaving other work

for a considerable time. I take it that this House is anxious, and certainly the country is anxious, that this measure should be furthered as expeditiously as possible, and it is to expedite the consideration of this Bill, and also to enable the House to have the fullest information possible, that the committee has made this recommendation.

Mr. LENNOX. In referring to the expert employed in the case of the investigation in reference to telegraphs and telephones, my hon. friend is somewhat unfortunate. That was a case in which, it is true, we employed an expert, and a great deal of time of the members of this House was taken up in order to ascertain facts which were supposed to be useful to parliament and to the country. But unfortunately no use was made of that, the government remained absolutely idle for two or three years, and when the matter was brought up and discussed in the House, the government saw fit to put up one or two of their well known defenders to make statements which were not justified by the facts, and which were not justified by subsequent investigation. If the action of my hon. friend is on the same line of obtaining expert assistance, and then not availing himself of it, or rather perverting it to improper purposes, it would be unfortunate. For my part, I am of opinion, and have often expressed myself to that effect in the House, that we are far too prone to employ others to do work that we should do ourselves. That remark applies distinctly to this new department of the government, the Department of Labour. It is realized by members of this House, I think, and by the country generally, that this department, at all events, has not too much work to do. It is well understood in the country, and is emphasized by the press, that the peculiar functions assigned to the Minister of Labour have not been very efficiently discharged, in some respects, by that gentleman, and the prediction of the good results that would follow the constitution of a Department of Labour, have not been verified. I think it would be better for the departments to familiarize themselves with the work they have in hand, and to enable members of this House to familiarize themselves with the conditions of the country, by appointing special committees to investigate these matters as far as possible at first hand, than to allow this system to creep in of employing experts, royal commissions, and so forth, to do the work which we could well do ourselves. I see the Prime Minister is in his place and an apt illustration of that will come up later on in the case of the appointment of the special Commission for the Conservation of our Natural Resources. When that proposal was introduced into this House we were told that it would only cost a matter of $20,000 a year or less. I find that the chairman of that commission is about to apply to parliament for a vote of $50,000 for the year's work of the commission. The matter of money is of little account, comparatively speaking, but I called it to the attention of the Prime Minister at the time that we were, by relegating these duties to outsiders, preventing ourselves from obtaining that familiarity with the resources of the country which we require in order to be in a position to prevent these resources from being raided. I venture to make the statement that much of the information acquired by the commission will be utilized for the purpose of enabling those in close touch with the government to make raids upon the natural resources of this country and to utilize them to their own advantage. At the present moment we have some evidence that information which is being obtained by the commission is being exploited by members of this House, and is being turned to their own advantage. It will be a surprise to the country, or to me at all events, if it turns out that much of the money we are spending for the purpose of gathering information and collecting it with reference to our natural resources will not really be used for the purpose of enriching and aggrandizing certain persons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will regret the language which he has just made use of. First of all, it is out of place altogether upon this motion, and it is out of place because he makes an insinuation. If the hon. gentleman has charges to make, he is at liberty to make them. Otherwise, his words have no weight at all.

Mr. MACDONELL. As a member of the committee to which this question was referred, I desire to say that we felt that if we were to properly discharge our duties it was necessary to obtain some outside assistance. The committee asked the hon. Minister of Labour to see if his department could furnish the assistance. He said that it could not, and, having regard to the nature of assistance we required, which was of a semi-legal character, it did not seem unreasonable to the committee that some outside assistance should be secured. That assistance was procured in the person of a gentleman who has appeared before the committee at the various sittings and who, in the opinion of the committee, has given entire satisfaction. It was felt by the members of the committee, eleven in number, that they could not devote sufficient of their time and attention to the work to do it complete justice. Most of the gentlemen were sitting on other select committees, all of them on the general committees, and I, as a member of

that committee, felt that I could not give it that personal attention necessary to investigate the various sources of legislation in other countries that, in my opinion, it required, and the other members of the committee felt that they were unable to give proper consideration to the measure. That being the view of the committee, this gentleman's services were, by unanimous consent, procured and he is performing his work. If it is not usual to procure services such as this gentleman is rendering, well and good; that is another matter entirely, but his services were procured because it was felt by the committee that some such assistance was necessary. He is giving the committee the assistance it had been looking for, and which it requires in order to give proper consideration to the matter referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we have heard from the minister in exculpation of his own department or any sufficient reason why there should be this extra employment. The whole matter seems to be that a rather expensive department, with what we supposed to be an up-to-date minister and staff, is not able to collate and bring before the committee the results of the legislation with regard to labour, so that the committee could have the material upon which to carry on its investigations. I think it is time that we should know what the Labour Department is going to do for the amount of money we are paying, which is yearly increasing. It seems to me that it should have intelligence enough to do this little bit of research and collation which is necessary to put certain information before the committee. I am not raising any objection against a small amount of money being expended for the purpose if it were absolutely necessary; what I am pointing out is that the Labour Department ought to be able to give at fairly short notice certain information which ought to be at the hands of that department at any hour.

Mr. BLAIN. Again I ask the minister if this official who is referred to in the report has been engaged and is at work now?

Mr. KING. I would say, in answer to the question just asked, that Professor Skelton, whom it is desired to retain in this connection, has already been giving evidence before the committee, has been giving the results of some of his researches into this question, and it is proposed that the committee shall ask him to make a special report.

Mr. BLAIN. He has already been engaged by the committee?

Mr. KING. He has already given some of his evidence before the committee. As chairman of the committee I was informed by the clerk of the House that it was not necessary to ask the concurrence of the House in the action of the committee in obtaining this gentleman's services for this purpose, but it was thought better to do it and for this reason this present concurrence is being asked.

Mr. FOSTER. By what authority was a payment of money agreed to without any appropriation or authorization by the House?

Mr. KING. I understand that there is a general appropriation for the purpose of assisting committees in the matter of the evidence which is taken before them, and it was proposed by this committee to deal with this in the same manner as these matters are dealt with by other committees.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not warrant them in employing special help. That is for the witnesses and the like of that.

Mr. KING. If the House will give me an opportunity I will be very glad to show what the Department of Labour is doing in view of some of the reflections which have been cast upon its work. However, at the moment, I will content myself with drawing attention to the kind of criticism that is made of the department and of the unfair nature of the charges that are sometimes levelled at it. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has just read to the House from the Auditor General's Report a statement which he says shows the expenditure of the department to be $112,000 a year. I have in my hand a copy of the Auditor General's Report, and I will read from it just to show how that total is made up. I see here Royal Commission re losses of Japanese residents of Vancouver through riots in September, 1907, $623, and Chinese claims re riots in Vancouver, September, 1907, $27,433.41. That was money paid in settlement of the claims of Chinese for losses occasioned in the riots in Vancouver. something with which the Department of Labour as a department has nothing to do. The item is included but it is not a part of the expenditure of the Department of Labour in any sense of the word. Similarly, we have the Royal Commission re oriental labourers, $1,268.23, the Royal Commission re cotton industry in the province of Quebec, $1,404 and the joint International Opium Conference, Shanghai, China, $5,500. These are all items which are not properly chargeable in any sense of the word to the Department of Labour. If they are deducted from the total it will be seen that the cost of the Department is not anything like what the hon. gentleman would lead the country to believe.

Mr. CROSBY. We started in to discuss the question that is before the House. We have gone into one or two other matters and now we have come to the Chinese question. I think we should confine ourselves to the question before the House.

Mr. HUGHES. May I ask the minister if the item of $112,000 includes the expenditure of the officers of this government who went specially to bring in these Chinese as workmen in the first place?

Mr. SPEAKER. The House should confine itself to the question before the Chair.

Mr. KING. Any digression from the original motion lies with the hon. member who introduced it in the first instance.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. BLAIN. I simply want to ask the Minister of Labour whether or not——

Mr. SPEAKER. I hear a remark from the hon. member from Halton. It is customary in the House to allow a member of the Crown to give the House information, and to answer questions, when it would not be permitted to a private member.

Mr. FOSTER. Give the poor fellow a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER. If there is any doubt on that point I would like to have it settled.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I would extend the privilege to any person in charge of a Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no objection to the Minister of Labour answering questions, but the minister rose time after time when there was no question asked of him, and I was surprised that a minister of the Crown should seek to get privileges in this respect that are not accorded to other members. I was deprived of the opportunity of saying something on this motion simply because the Minister of Labour rose time after time to address the House. I have no desire to in any way interfere with the minister answering questions. I thought this was the Department of Labour, but it seems to me that the object of the department is to shirk labour. We have a minister and a deputy minister and a staff of officials, at large cost, and instead of doing the work they should reasonably be expected to do they simply want to throw that work over on somebody else. I do not know what this committee has accomplished, but it seems to me that the Bill which has been referred to them is not very difficult to decide upon. I do not know what extra knowledge is required to assist the committee. I think this parliament is capable of making precedents for itself without going to foreign countries. If the object is to find out whether a man working on one side of the street on a government job should work 8 hours, while a man working on the other side on a private job should work 10 hours, then I think that any man of ordinary common sense could settle that question without the assistance of even the Minister of Labour. It seems to me that it is quite unnecessary to call in this expert at large expense to the country, and unless the minister can give more substantial reasons for his proposal the House should not agree to it.

Mr. BLAIN. I ask the Minister of Labour whether or not this gentleman has been engaged, and if so, at what salary and on whose authority?

Mr. KING. Mr. Skelton has been giving evidence before the committee. He has come to Ottawa at his own expense, and up to the present time the question of his remuneration has been left open. If the House decides not to concur in this report I suppose Professor Skelton will not be paid for his services. If on the other hand, it is felt that the country would not be justified in taking advantage of the professional services of this gentleman without remuneration, then, if this report is concurred in, I presume the committee will have authority to pay him for his services.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am astonished that the Minister of Labour should have deferred until this moment the acknowledgment that so far as he is concerned, this professor has been engaged and that his services are to be paid for. I am the more surprised, in view of the fact that a report recommending his engagement has been brought down to this House and has been discussed twice, with a week intervening, before the minister thinks it worth while to inform the House that his department, and therefore the government, is committed to the payment of this university professor. I submit that that is not a proper way to use the House of Commons. I submit further that this committee is not charged with any duty which necessitates the calling in of a university professor to give it advice or to convey to it any information as to the working of the eight-hour law in other countries. I agree with the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that this parliament is quite capable of setting its own precedents and making its own laws, and it seems to me that when parliament affirmed the principle of the eight-hour day on government contracts, as it did when it gave this Bill a second reading,

it does not well become this committee to re-open the whole question, to go beyond its commission, and to call in a professor, not to assist it in the duty with which it is charged, viz., that of perfecting the Bill so that it may be precisely what it is intended to be, but rather to give instances from other countries, with the possible result of discrediting the eight-hour movement. It seems to me that the developments have justified the question I put to the Minister of Labour when it was suggested to refer this Bill to a special committee. I then asked the Minister of Labour whether he would tell the House what might be expected from the committee, because I did think that as the committee was virtually chosen by those supposed to be promoting the Bill they would select a committee likely to be in a position to discharge the duties entrusted to it. It seems to me that this House is now asked to be a party to a hippodrome performance in connection with this special committee, and as a member of this House I object to lending myself to any performance of the kind. To my mind the Department of Labour ought to have ample information to deal with this Bill. It has been three sessions before the House, and last session the then Minister of Labour referred at some length to the legislation in other countries dealing with eight-hour laws, thus proving that the Department of Labour at that time was seized of information respecting the operation of eight-hour laws in other countries. What has become of that information between last session and this? Are the archives of the department so formidable that these facts have been lost and cannot be resurrected to make a report to this committee? It seems to me that the only effect of calling in this university professor to make diligent research and advise the committee will be to put this matter off so that it cannot be dealt with this session. I am confirmed in this belief by a statement just now made by the Minister of Labour that if he undertook to prepare this in his own department, it would take the clerks of that department away from their other duties for a very prolonged period of time. I submit that this Bill was referred to the special committee with the idea that it should be reported on this session, and that there was no intention on the part of this House that the matter should be put off until next session by the device of appointing a university professor to make lengthened research into the legislation in other countries.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems to me that this committee was appointed not for the purpose of making researches, but to draft a Bill to replace a Bill which we had before the House and which did not meet with the approval of the House. We referred that Bill to a committee and some of us were bold enough to ask that there should not be too many lawyers on that committee in order that we might get a perfect Bill. Now, we find the committee, without asking permission of this House, have engaged some body to carry on this work. It is customary for a committee to come back and report progress. This committee were not able to report progress and they would not come back and report no progress, saying they had not ability to carry on the work that was assigned to them and they now say they will employ some one else outside of parliament to do the work entrusted to them. During the short time I have been in the House this Bill has been bandied about from pillar to post. Apparently this House is not prepared to deal with it, and it is thought that the best thing to do is to bandy it about among the professors. I am prepared to say that this is a question purely and simply for this government and this parliament. What does this Bill refer to? A general eight-hour day? No, it simply refers to an eight-hour day on the public works of this Dominion, the works controlled by this parliament. That is what the Bill is intended for, and therefore I say that the information should be furnished by the Labour Department, created a short time ago. I must say that we have had more labour troubles since the department was created than ever before. Any one who looks over the Dominion of Canada for the last year will see that we have had a great number of strikes; none of them are finished yet, they are all going on vigorously and the Labour Department was instituted just in time to witness all these strikes. What have they done to relieve the situation? This Bill was intended for no other purpose than the inaugurating of an eight-hour day on the public works of this Dominion, that is the public works being done by this parliament and under the control of this parliament. Surely we need not go to the United States, Germany or Russia, to find out what this parliament should do with a matter under their control. The Labour Department should have every bit of information possible on this subject. If we were going to deal with this in a general sense I could understand the Labour Department asking time, but I cannot understand them asking us to hand over this matter, which has been entrusted to a committee, to some professor whom they have decided to engage. I should like to know if the hon. member who introduced this resolution (Mr. Verville) is prepared to allow this Bill to be kept back for a year or two years. I think he will agree that we are here to try to inaugurate a system that will benefit the workingmen in this country, and in order to do that we want the federal government to undertake a

forward step, to show a good example. I do not wish to have our control referred to any provincial legislature or any foreign country. We should deal with these matters ourselves as they come before us. This session and in previous sessions the effort has been made to put this thing over another year or two, I do not know for how long, but that seemed to be the intention in engaging this expert assistant. Surely if we have a Department of Labour we must have some expert assistants in that department, and the only reason I can see for the Minister of Labour being put on the committee was that he would be able to furnish the expert information necessary. It does not seem to me that a great deal of ability or expert information would be required to frame a simple Bill to be placed on the statute-books of Canada, providing that the public works of Canada should be constructed by men under an eight-hour system. I do not think a great deal of expert evidence is required for that purpose or that a great deal of expert ability is required to draft such a Bill. This House should be prepared, I am prepared, and the House should be, to decide this matter in parliament and not to go outside for any further information.

Mr. VERVILLE. We are anxious that this Bill should be passed in such form that it will give satisfaction to all the members who expressed themselves during the discussion on the second reading. As there were apparent misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the Bill, we called in expert advice, and the reason for bringing it before the House during this session is to enable the committee to do the work it has done and to be in a position to make a full and proper report to parliament. This we will be able to do if we are not obstructed on every occasion. This is not a question of whether a man should work so many hours on one side of the street and another man on the opposite side a different number of hours; it is an attempt to enable men to do all the work possible. I have looked into the laws of many countries and I claim that we have to go to Europe, the United States and other civilized countries for information as to suitable legislation on different subjects. I do not see why we should not go to these countries for information in regard to the labour question just as in regard to other things, and so place ourselves in a position to submit a proper report. For that reason, if this report is adopted, we will be in a position to proceed as quickly as possible with our work. Of course I would be anxious that the Bill should come back to us speedily for discussion.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member (Mr. Verville) states that this specialist should go to the different countries to get experience or information from them.

Mr. VERVILLE. I did not say that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I should understand from the hon. gentleman that that is what he meant. What surprises me is that from the speech he has made, he practically admits that the Minister of Labour does not know his business. I understood that the Minister of Labour was an expert in so far as the labour question was concerned, that he occupied the position of Deputy Minister for some years, that he went to very many foreign countries, to Japan and China, and that he was in England inquiring into the labour question. I should think that the Minister of Labour would be about the best expert we could get, after all the experience he has had travelling around these countries. What work has the Minister of Labour to do? I have been trying to bother my brains and find out what he has to do in his department unless it is something of this kind, finding out what has been done in other countries. We are practically told that the Minister of Labour has to get an assistant to tell him what the labour position is in Canada from one end to the other. We have had a great many strikes in Canada, we have them in eastern Canada and in western Canada. We have had a great many strikes, both in eastern and western Canada, and if my memory serves me right, when the Minister of Labour was Deputy Minister he was sent to these different strikes. But to-day we are told, practically, that the Minister of Labour does not know anything about the position of the labour question in Canada, and he has to get a specialist to instruct him. Now, will the Minister of Labour stand up and declare that he does not know his business, that he does not know anything about the labour question in Canada?

Mr. KING. If the House is prepared to accept the statements in regard to the eight-hour question as given by the Minister of Labour, and to accept them beyond question, the Minister of Labour will be only too pleased to bring down to the House a report of the whole matter. But it is recognized that of all questions that are likely to become subjects of debate in this House, no one will be fought more keenly than this eight-hour question. In order that all appearance of unfairness might be removed in dealing with this question, it has been thought well to bring in a third party, whose opinion one way or the other could not be questioned, and ask him to interpret the decisions relating to this matter that have been given elsewhere. I would gladly give my views to the House, and am prepared to do so, if the House is prepared to accept them; but seeing this is a party

question, a question on which men hold very different views, it was thought more satisfactory to get the opinion of an expert rather than the opinion of hon. gentlemen who sit in this House.

Mr. J. D. REID. I should say that the House would be pleased to have the report of the Minister of Labour, then we could decide whether we would agree to it or not. But the Minister of Labour wants this House, wants every member, to pledge himself that he will agree to this report before he shows us what it is. The minister wants another expert appointed. I understand that he has a deputy minister now, who should be disinterested, he is not supposed to support either one political party or the other. The minister practically tells the House that this is a political question. Well, surely his deputy minister is not a politician, he must be disinterested, and why not let him get us the information? I claim that the present Minister of Labour, after all his experience, must have made some inquiries about this eight-hour question, and surely he could give us that information, and if he has a report, why don't he lay it on the table now? Perhaps, after we see it, we will not require a specialist, the House might concur in the report. I suppose the minister is afraid to let us see the report, and he wants to keep it in the dark until he gets another man to agree with him, a man who will be an appointee of his own, and then he will come in and ask us to agree with the minister. I think the whole thing is a political question, got up by an hon. member who has been moving for this eight-hour day, who had a Bill on the order paper for six or seven years. He would not move it just before the last election, but now he goes ahead in order to make people believe that he is the great defender of the labour men. I believe if the hon. gentleman had brought in that Bill when he first proposed it, instead of allowing himself to be held down by the Prime Minister, we would have had this matter settled long ago. But every one knows that the Prime Minister told the hon. gentleman: Don't bring it on now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Don't bring it on, keep it back. Of course the hon. member was elected as an independent, and has voted independent ever since he came to this House, and he now wants to pose as the great labour man. Now, every man in this House sees through this whole thing. The Minister of Labour and the hon. member who brought in the Bill have put their heads together, and they are trying to concoct some political scheme by which they can pose as the friends of labour. I think a great reflection has been cast upon the Minister of Labour to-day, when he stands up and admits that he does not know anything about the labour question in Canada, or about the eight-hour day question, and he has to get a specialist to come and instruct him, as to what is going on in Canada, Japan, China, India, Africa and all the other places the minister has been to.

Mr. BURRELL. I understood the minister to say that this was a party question, a singular statement to come from a minister. I would ask him to explain what he means.

Mr. KING. There are two great parties to this controversy, Capital and Labour. It is perfectly apparent that on this question there is ample room for debate.

Mr. HUGHES. As long as the Prime Minister kept the young gentleman who now ornaments the Department of Labour as minister, travelling around the country as deputy, and bringing in glowing reports from India, Timbuctoo, China, Japan and various other places, we didn't pay much attention to it. We thought perhaps some of the information might be useful, and we were willing to submit to paying his travelling expenses. In those days we all regarded him and his assistants as only so many political satellites. I know in our district the gentlemen who are connected with the labour organizations have been neither more nor less than political satellites of the government of the day. But when the Department of Labour was formed, and the Prime Minister appointed him as minister of the Crown, then the people naturally began to wonder what was afoot. Then the explanation was offered that this young gentleman was brought in to fill up a gap. We were told that the Minister of Justice had not panned out as expected, he was a failure; that the Minister of Railways had fallen below anticipations, and that this young gentleman was really a prospective Prime Minister. And so other hon. gentlemen who had occupied high positions in the country with a great deal of ability, were supposed to be eclipsed by this young and brilliant luminary, and a new portfolio was created, and this gentleman was foisted into it. We said nothing. The people were willing to put up with a little ornamentation. But when it comes to adding dollar to dollar in the expenditure of this department, when there has been delay after delay in dealing with all these great questions, then the people naturally commenced to wonder what this was for, and we are up against it now. Some one of the right hon. gentleman's friends, I do no know whether it is a prospective minister or not, but some friend wants a committee appointed to inquire into a small Bill that should not occupy our attention more than twenty-five mintues to determine. But forthwith a committee, acting under the hypnotic in-

fluence of this brilliant luminary, is appointed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are some of the hon. member's (Mr. Hughes') friends on that committee.

Mr. HUGHES. That makes no difference, where a question of principle is concerned, as the Prime Minister knows, there is a bandage over my eyes. This committee—and I care not how many of my side may be members of it—without the authority of this House and improperly (if the facts stated to us are true) engaged the services of this young gentleman to do work that any boy could do in a very short time. And if the Minister of Labour has anything like the genius and ability that the first minister has given him credit for in his speeches in this House and throughout the country, he ought to be able to give the House the advice which this young man is to be sent wandering over the country to prepare. I shall oppose the adoption of this report.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. If the motion of the Minister of Labour is made to include instructions to this young man to gather information as to whether the Department of Labour should be abolished, I will support the motion. But if it is to saddle an expenditure on the treasury, which would be opposed by the agriculturalists of this country and three-fourths of the members of this House are, like myself, representatives of agriculturists—then we ought to vote against spending one farthing in this proposed inquiry into whether eight hours should constitute a day's labour on public works or not. I shall vote against the motion purely in the interests of my constituents, for they do not want a dollar spent to ascertain whether the money that they pay to the government should be spent in employing men at eight hours for a day's work when they themselves work for twenty hours a day part of the time. If the government make eight hours a day's work on public works, the farmers will have to adopt the same principle; and I appeal to hon. members representing agricultural constituencies to oppose this expenditure. If the question of abolishing the Department of Labour is to be investigated that will be a different matter, for, as an hon. member said, we have three or four strikes now for one that we had before the department was established. I was interested in one last year, and drew the attention of the Minister of Labour to it. The strike was in a coal mine in Alberta, and the labouring men called upon the minister to repeal his Bill because it was no good and they would pay no attention to it. I put the documents about the matter into the hon. minister's hands. Since the present minister took office, I have recommended the course which ought to be taken in the interest of the labouring man in relation to strikes. Have a commission appointed, like the Railway Commission, and then, in case of labour disputes arising, have the representatives of the two sides go before that commission. There should be legislation against strikes, not to take away from men their right to stop work, but, before they strike, to refer their grievance to the commission, and the commission, after investigating, will settle the matter as railway disputes are settled. The idea of having a minister, a deputy minister and a staff of clerks with a building all to themselves—and no minister has a more luxurious apartment than that of the Minister of Labour—and yet when a little Bill comes forward we must employ a man who knows something to go about the country, and then come back and tell the minister whether there should or should not be an eight-hour day on public works. Representing an agricultural constituency as I do, I will vote against this expenditure.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It is a little difficult to understand how the question before the House should be reduced to a criticism of the Labour Department generally and a very severe personal attack by some hon. members opposite upon the minister who is responsible for that department. As I understand it, this professor was brought before this committee to give evidence as a man of large experience and special knowledge on this question before the committee. That committee was composed of members on both sides, the parties being almost equally represented. After he had manifested to the committee that he had expert knowledge upon this question, it was proposed, not by the Minister of Labour, but by the members of this committee, that it would expedite the business of that committee and make it more possible to get a report before this House this session if the services of this expert were engaged for a short time. The chairman of that committee was instructed unanimously by the committee to ask the House to consent to the engagement of this expert. It is suggested by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Crosby) that the employment of this outside man is a method of shelving the question and making it impossible for a report to be had this session. Why, the only good reason that could be given for the employment of this gentleman for this service is that it will expedite the business of the committee by giving us expert evidence so that the report can be presented this session. In the committee there was no difference of opinion on the subject—Liberals and Con-

servatives were agreed. And the object is to have expert, concise and scientific evidence brought to bear upon the question in order to expedite the business.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. What evidence is this gentleman expected to produce, what vast knowledge of the subject has he, to justify this resolution?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One would naturally suppose, as this subject has been very much to the fore, not only in parliament, but in the press of the country during this past seven or eight years, that the Department of Labour might very well have issued a blue-book on the subject. The Minister of Labour, I understand, thinks that the department is seized of a considerable volume of information on the subject which must be considered by this committee. There is a good deal of force in the criticism made that, if such be the case, the Department of Labour might very well do the work which this gentleman, as I understand it, is to be called upon to do. However, no such information is before the House in the shape of a blue-book or otherwise, and we have the word of the Minister of Labour that it is necessary to employ this gentleman who is supposed to be an expert on this subject, for the purpose of making clear to the committee the working out of similar enactments in other countries. In other words, he is to bring before the committee an analysis of the legislation of this character which has been passed in other countries as well as his estimate of the results of the passing of such legislation. As I have already said it would appear to me that the Department of Labour ought to have its command all information of this kind. But, apparently it has not that information, at least, it has not the information in such a form as can be readily utilized by the committee. Inasmuch as the committee have unanimously recommended that this gentleman be employed for the purpose in order to expedite its work, I would think that the recommendation ought to be accepted by the House, although, as I have said before, there does seem to me to be a great deal of force in the criticism upon the past work of the Department of Labour which has been made by several hon. gentlemen. The subject of the relations between capital and labour is an exceedingly important one in this country, and I am bound to say that the action of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, representing the government of the day, does not very well correspond with the attitude which the government took and which he, as deputy Minister of Labour, I presume, took three years ago when I asked that the Conciliation Bill should be submitted to a committee of this House in order that all parties might be heard. One of the answers made to me at that time by the then Minister of Labour was that the Department of Labour had at its command and could afford to this House every possible item of information in regard to the subject. Well, we have a different tale to-day, but I suppose we must accept the minister's statement of the lack of knowledge in his own department, and as the committee unanimously recommends that this expert gentleman should be employed, it would seem to me, following the usual course of procedure in this House, that the unanimous recommendation of the committee ought to be accepted.

Mr. OSLER. Usually if you want to get an absolutely unreliable opinion, you should go to a young university professor. I do not know this young gentleman, and I have no objection to his being employed to gather statistics, but the Minister of Labour has stated that he was to be employed to give an expert opinion. I do not think it is possible, in any question which arises in business or public life, to get a man who is so utterly useless as a young university professor to give an opinion. That is the experience of every man of business. No matter how clever the young man may be, his enthusiasm carries him away, he runs to one side or the other, and he has wild ideas. To go to a young university professor to get an opinion is to go absolutely to the weakest source possible; his opinion would carry no weight with any man of ordinary ability.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Department of Labour has been a conspicuous feature of the government during the past few years. No question has excited more widespread interest in the country in recent years than the question of the hours of labour. We have had this country flooded from end to end, at a large expense to the Dominion, with literature purporting to deal with questions of labour. The government, through the Department of Labour, have been telling the workmen of this country all that they are doing on their behalf. When this Bill was introduced, passed its second reading and referred to the committee with the unanimous consent of the House, the only objection to it was the fact that it was not properly drawn. It was said that the Bill contained that which was not intended by the hon. member who introduced it. We have in connection with the government not only a Department of Labour, but a Department of Justice, and surely if that is the only objection to the Bill the Department of Labour might have been consulted with the Department of Justice with regard to the proper drafting of the measure. The hon. Minister of

Labour (Mr. King) tells us that he himself is prepared to bring in a Bill at this time, but he thought it was wiser to get expert advice from an outsider. The reason advanced by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) in favour of the recommendation of the committee is that an expert should be employed—and I sympathize with that reason—it is the strongest arrangement that possibly could be made of the Department of Labour. My hon. friend from South Toronto said that when the committee met they found that they were unable to get the necessary expert information and advice with regard to this question. I would like to know what the Department of Labour is for. I quite sympathize with my hon. friend from South Toronto and the other members of this committee. They cannot be expected to take the time from their duties as members of this House and otherwise to gather the necessary statistics and information, but what have the Department of Labour been doing all these years in not having these statistics properly tabulated in order that they may be placed at the disposal of this committee? We were told that this Department of Labour was to do so much for this great Dominion, and particularly for the labouring classes that it was necessary to appoint a separate minister and create a separate department. It is only a short time since we formed it into a separate department of the government. The minister now in charge of the department, and who was for a long time the Deputy Minister, has travelled in foreign countries at the expense of the people getting information to be used in the preparation of laws for the Dominion of Canada. I venture to say that such recommendations as he has gathered in his foreign travels have not met with favour, at least, in western Canada, and I am speaking for the people of western Canada at this time. I am very doubtful whether we will get professors in colleges in the east to deal with these questions in a practical way, or to give us information which will be of any advantage to us. It resolves itself down to this simple question whether the Bill as introduced was properly drawn and, if properly drawn, whether the members of this House are prepared, at this particular time, to pass a Bill providing for eight hours of labour on government work. The question is a simple one, and it is a question for each member to decide in his own mind whether it should be adopted by this country. I do not think that this Department of Labour should act as a buffer, and I venture to say that in this and in other instances the government, instead of using this department for the advantage of the people, are simply making a buffer of it to stand between the workingmen and the government with regard to these difficult questions. I am not prepared to accept the recommendation as brought down by the minister under these conditions, but if we do accept it it will only be because it has been pointed out by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) when a unanimous recommendation of this kind comes in it is usual to accept it. But, I venture to say that we would get very much more information from practical men in dealing with a question of this kind.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am absolutely opposed to this resolution. I understood the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) to say that the committee was unanimous. I understand that the committee was not unanimous. One member of the committee, at least, my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) was opposed to it.

Mr. KING. Will any member of the committee rise in his seat and say that he was not in accord with all the members of the committee on that resolution?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. My hon. friend from Macdonald is not here, but he made that statement to me before he left the House.

Mr. KING. As the hon. member is not here and cannot speak, as chairman of the committee, possibly I might speak for him. I would say to the House that every member of the committee present at the meeting endorsed that resolution. It was on the motion of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that this recommendation was adopted by the committee. My reason for not opposing the resolution of the hon. member for South Toronto was that I was most anxious that the committee should feel that any suggestion coming from the other side of the House would meet with the hearty accord of this side.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Although I am quite willing to accept the statement of the hon. minister, that does not prevent my saying that I am absolutely opposed to any party ground being taken in connection with this matter. Whether intentionally or not, the Minister of Labour referred to it as a sort of party issue. I presume he is a party man, as I am myself; but when I hear such staunch independents as the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Verville) support the measure, that might be some reason why we should support it. I believe that the Minister of Labour ought to have sufficient intelligence, ability and information to settle this matter without any further expert evidence, and I would like to ask what particular qualification this university professor has which the minister has not. From what I have heard it seems to me that it is not for want of information

that the minister is so anxious to have this motion carried, but in order that he may be relieved from the responsibility of making a statement in this matter, which I believe he should be in a position to make.

Mr. J. D. REID. So far as I am concerned, I want my vote recorded against it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I wish to put myself on record, as a manufacturer, in favour of the eight hour day. It appears to me that this labour bureau is something of a cyclone cellar where these problems are relegated by the government when they come up, and the chief party to building this cellar and nailing a tin roof on it is the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville). For several sessions a resolution of this kind has been on the order paper, and the hon. gentleman has always failed to have the courage to put it to a vote, and the motion before us is simply another way of side-tracking the question. I do not see what information an expert can give that will be of any value to the House, or which the House has not already. We have had some experience already in connection with experts. The Department of Militia sent an expert to South Africa to write an account of the war, and we have not yet had his report. Another was sent to Japan and China to give us a report of what was taking place in those countries, but we have never had that report yet. If we appoint this gentleman, his report will probably be as little likely to be forthcoming, and we shall have this matter up session after session and the government will continue to side-track it. It would be best for this House to deal with the matter fairly and squarely and let every member vote according to his conscience and his opinion. As one who has had experience in the matter, I unhesitatingly commend the eight hour day to employers of labour. They will find that their labouring men will do as much work in the eight hours as in the ten. It seems to me that the government should not be behind the great majority of manufacturers who are now coming to realize the advantages of the eight hour day system. I am therefore opposed to any further delay. I do not think the expert we are asked to employ has any practical experience in the matter. In my opinion, the men in this House are sufficiently level headed and well versed in business to deal with the question fairly and honestly.

Mr. RHODES. In employing this expert, is the object to have him pronounce on the merits of the eight hour day or solely for the purpose of assisting the committee in drafting a measure to carry out that system?

Mr. KING. Perhaps I could best reply to the question by quoting the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Mr. RHODES. What I want is the opinion of the minister himself.

Mr. KING. My opinion coincides with that of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The other day in speaking on this question, that hon. gentleman said:

> The specialist's work comes in after you have a collation of what exists and when you want evidence as to the results of that. Then, a specialist, who has made a study of the question, has travelled and has the experience, would be a very great benefit to the committee. I would not be opposed to having the very best we can get in that respect.

That is the motive which has actuated the committee.

Mr. RHODES. The hon. minister has not answered the question I put to him. I asked if, in employing an expert, his object was to have an opinion as to the merits of the eight hour day, or whether the committee were simply calling in this expert in order to have his assistance in drafting a measure to carry out that system.

Mr. KING. The committee, in its report, asks that leave be granted to employ the services of a specialist to assist the committee in its researches into legislation respecting the hours of labour. That makes it perfectly clear what the intention of the committee is.

Mr. RHODES. Have those researches to do with the merits of the eight hour day or merely with the drafting of the measure to carry that out?

Mr. KING. With both.

Mr. RHODES. Then I understand that this expert is to give an opinion also as to the merits of the eight hour day?

Mr. KING. He will go through the discussions on that subject in other countries and the legislation adopted by these countries.

Mr. MAGRATH. Is it the intention of the government to have this Bill dealt with this session? I want to see the matter settled. It is not a party question, but the hon. minister is endeavouring to shunt the Conservative party into it by saying that his views coincide with those of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). But I assume that the minister has views of his own, and if so we ought to have them. I want to know if we are to have the Bill before the House this session, as I want to vote for it.

Mr. KING. The intention is to get the Bill before the House as quickly as possible. Whether the government will be able to carry out that intention depends on the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The reply given by the hon. minister to the question of my

hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) puts the whole question on another footing. I apprehend that the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) when, as a member of the committee, he acceded to the position taken by that committee, did so on the understanding that whatever expert was employed would be employed to procure details for the purpose of drafting a measure rather than for the purpose of deciding on the principle of the Bill. I have a very distinct recollection of the discussion on the resolution when first introduced and a still more distinct recollection of the position then taken by the minister. After one of his supporters had affirmed, in the strongest possible terms, that the minister had acceded to the principle of the Bill, the hon. gentleman took good care not to recede from that position but gave the impression to the House that he had acceded to it and that all that remained to be settled were questions of detail. I put the question to the hon. minister myself the night of the discussion. I said that he had not acceded to the principle and was contradicted by the minister himself. Well, if he has accepted the principle of an eight hour day, in so far as government work is concerned, why employ an expert now? I took the position that night that the reference of the Bill to a committee was simply a convenient method of shelving it for the rest of the session, and I now find that not content with shelving it to a committee, the chairman of the committee asks that it shall be referred to Kingston college. The only purpose the Minister of Labour has in view is to avoid the responsibility of saying now what he was compelled to say then, namely: That he was in favour of the principle of eight hour labour on government works, and so, he wants to shield his responsibility behind the august imprimatur of a Presbyterian professor. I hold that the government of this country must take their stand now and not later on the question of eight hours labour. I challenge the government to now declare whether they are in favour of the principle of the eight-hour day on government works. If the Minister of Labour thinks he was wrong when he spoke during the first discussion of this Bill let him come forward to-day and say that the policy of the government is wholly different now. Let him take that responsibility himself, and let him not pave the way for going before the electors three years hence and saying that the government took the advice of this university professor and are to be congratulated for doing so. I cannot conceive that the member for South Toronto or the member for Macdonald ever took the position that the object of employing this scholarship in the matter was to gain information as to the principle of the Bill. I believe that if they had understood that the Minister of Labour was going to bring the principle of the Bill into question in this House they would not have acceded to that unanimous report. Therefore, this unanimous report of the committee is not entitled to that deference which under ordinary circumstances such a report would be entitled to. I for one will have to cast my vote absolutely against the proposition.

Mr. BURRELL. It seems to me that the position the House is in now is plain and simple. So far as I remember the former discussion on this Bill the difficulty that presented itself was the bearing it would have on large contracts now pending with the government, and a great many hon. members who felt that was a questionable feature in the Bill would have been gratified if that difficulty were set aside and the principle of the Bill applied to the employment of labour on public buildings. That would have been a fair compromise, and I believe that many of us wanted to see the Bill based on that principle. I must confess that we have had an extraordinary exhibition on the part of the Minister of Labour this afternoon. He did not answer the questions put to him by my hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Mr. Rhodes) and his utterances were particularly cloudy and ambiguous. As to the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) surely his experience must tell him that this proposal of the minister is not calculated to expedite the deliberations of the committee or to expedite embodying the principles of the Bill in legislation, but rather to retard it. As the ambiguous utterances of the Minister of Labour goes, they remind me of the lines of Hosea Bigelow:

> For when you've done all your real meaning to smother,
> The darned thing'll up, and mean something or nuther.

I thoroughly agree with hon. members who have said that the Department of Labour which has been for years thrashing out this and similar questions, ought to be if it is not, in a position to give the necessary information to the House to enable them to decide on this Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS. As I opposed the Bill when it was first brought up on the ground that it was contrary to the best interests of the agricultural class I feel that I cannot consistently support the present resolution. I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to put myself on record as being opposed to this Bill as I am opposed to anything which makes in the direction of interfering with the interests of the agricultural classes of our community.

Mr. MADDIN. For information, I would like to know from the hon. member (Mr. Verville) who introduced the Bill; who drafted the Bill in the form in which it was presented to the House.

Mr. VERVILLE. I do not know that I have any right to answer that question.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was it the Minister of Labour?

Mr. VERVILLE. I may state for the information of the hon. gentleman that the Labour Department had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. MADDIN. It is quite evident, Mr. Speaker, that the Labour Department intend to have nothing to do with the Bill yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Many good reasons have been given why the House should not assent to this motion, but there may be other reasons why we should assent to it. The Department of Labour was originally constituted just for the purpose of collating such information as would be useful to parliament in considering a Bill of this kind, and the acknowledgment that the Department of Labour has now to go to the expense of calling in an expert to advise it is an acknowledgment that the Department of Labour is no good. I remember very distinctly the eulogies that were expended upon the Minister of Labour when he first took office. We did not know much about him when he entered the House, but we were told he was an educated man, a man who had shown great ability and industry, a man who had travelled through different countries of the world for the purpose of gaining information of an expert nature on sociological questions, and that he had devoted his life to this work. We were told we could not afford to do without his services, and that for that reason he was brought here and placed at the head of the department. We were told that he had experience as deputy Minister of Labour, that he had published the 'Labour Gazette' for some years, that he had studied these questions in Germany and other parts of the world, and we gave him a large staff of employees to assist him. Now we are told that he is not able to furnish information with regard to a very simple labour problem. This is an admission that all the eulogies bestowed on him were not deserved. If they were deserved, then there must be a strike on in the Labour Department and they wont do their work. Now, the minister seeks to engage the services of a university professor to assist him in the work which he himself ought to do, and I am quite sure that if this professor were not a native of the country the provisions of the Alien Labour Law would be invoked to shut him out. But as he happens to live in the country he may be used notwithstanding. In view of all these admissions from the Labour Department and from members of the government, that if the department is absolutely unable to cope with this important question and incapable of giving the required information let us pass this motion and incur the expense and get some one who will give us the information that is so much needed.

Mr. M. CLARK (Red Deer). I am surprised at the large number of speeches that we have heard on the Conservative side of the House against what seems to me to be a very simple and innocent proposition; perhaps I ought rather to say the large number of times we have had practically the same speech delivered. I am surprised in view of the fact that we are asked to endorse a report of a committee which was unanimous and represented both sides of this House. If I rightly gather what fell from the lips of the leader of the opposition, I think he said that to reject such a report is a very unusual course of procedure. I am surprised further because of the extreme gravity of the question we are discussing. For the House of Commons to take the course of driving a hard and fast iron ramrod into the delicate machinery which should regulate the arrangements between employer and employee is a grave course, whatever measures we may take in regard to it, and something of a new departure in this country. The gravity of this course of procedure being admitted, I think we surely should not take such a course without having the fullest possible information. I thoroughly endorse what has been said by the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Claude Macdonell) that the more information we have on this subject the less likely we are to go astray and the more wisdom we are likely to display in the decision we finally come to.

Mr. STANFIELD. As a member of the committee, I feel it my duty to say a word in reference to the engagement of Professor Skelton. As the House is well aware, the Bill is very broad, it takes in such a large scope that I, as one of that committee, felt it my duty to see that we should have all the information we could possibly gather on the matter. If this was a plain eight-hour day for public works only, it would not require an expert opinion, because I think the majority of the House are in favour of such a measure. But this Bill goes further. It covers sub-contracts and also covers manufacturers, where they come in as sub-contractors. As I said before, this Bill is so broad that in my opinion it is far better to get all the information possible before reporting to the House, and then we will be able to give the House every information it is possible to gather. I shall, therefore, vote in favour of the resolution.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am also a member of this committee, and I realize it is a very serious matter. I think we are justified in getting all the information we can. I am not prepared to say where that information should come from, but I must say that the information we are getting is very valuable to the committee, and I think it is due to the Minister of Labour to say that the committee is entirely to take the responsibility of asking Professor Skelton to undertake this work. The minister, in my judgment, has acted fairly in the matter, and I am quite in sympathy with the course proposed.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE (Quebec County) (Translation): Mr. Speaker I am not a member of the special committee which has this Bill under consideration. However, I have had occasion to express my views in this House when the Bill was first introduced. I was then, and I am still, of opinion that the government should give a fair trial to such legislation as regards public works, I have followed the meetings of the special committee and have realized the difficulties in the way of carrying out such a proposal, and, on the other hand, its paramount importance to all members of the House.

This very day an expert was heard on the subject, and his statement goes to show that there is such a variety of interests concerned in this labour question, that too much care cannot be taken in working out its settlement. I think the conclusion arrived at by those hon. members who make up the special committee, is based on a sound view of the public welfare, and the country as a whole will profit by a thorough investigation of the subject. In that way, will a proper settlement of the question be effected, a settlement which will be beneficial to the labouring classes as well as to all others.

I understood an hon. member to say that the farming community is not specially interested in such a question. I believe, on the contrary, that in determining what are the rights and obligations of the government in a matter of this importance, we are doing something which is serviceable to the farming community, and as representing an agricultural constituency, I cannot but approve of the suggestion made by the special committee.

Mr. BRODER. Mr. Speaker, to my mind it is a question whether it would not have been wise to have first brought in representatives of the manufacturing interests and of the labour interests, to have secured their evidence and then have the expert give his information and answer questions that might arise from their evidence. Anyway, I am satisfied that the members of that committee are approaching the question with every intention of doing everything they can for the public interest, and as far as I am concerned, that is the way I approach it. The labour element does not affect me at all, because I have no manufacturing centres to interfere with my political interests in that sense at all, but the country generally are interested in the outcome of this whole measure, whatever effect it might have. I do not wish to discuss that to-day, because I do not think that it is pertinent, but from what I have seen of the committee and learned, I feel it my duty to at least vote for the resolution.

Mr. DEVLIN. I wish to suggest to the minister in charge of the legislation under consideration that in the study of the labour problem, it will be absolutely necessary that the one who is charged with the work should understand both languages. If he is to study the conditions of labour abroad, he will of necessity have to study the conditions which exist in France, and for that purpose he will have to know the French language. Therefore, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King) that, if possible, instead of naming one expert, a professor from Queen's University, Kingston, he should name two, one an English speaking man, and one a French Canadian, or at the very least, that the one to be named, should be thoroughly familiar with both languages.

Mr. BARKER. I do not wish to vote upon this question without stating in a few words why I am disposed to comply with the unanimous request of the committee. I have had very considerable experience in expert testimony. If anything in this world is not satisfactory, it is the evidence of expert witnesses; and I think that if any evidence could be unsatisfactory, it would be that procured by the expert this committee has, in its wisdom, recommended to collect evidence as to legislation of this character in foreign countries. The committee has recommended that a professor of Queen's University should be employed to do this work. My own conviction is that what evidence he may procure will not have the slightest weight upon the opinions of any people in this country, either labour men or employers, and I certainly think it will not influence the judgment of this House. I do not wish, however, to stand for a moment in the way of testimony being procured. I have no doubt that the minister knows perfectly well the leanings of the particular gentleman he refers to on this question.

Mr. KING. I know absolutely nothing about his leanings.

Mr. BARKER. Then I am very much mistaken in my estimate of the minister's

knowledge of the subject, because I doubt very much whether there is any one in the position of the professor he has referred to, who has formed any opinion or acquired any knowledge or experience in regard to the subject that the hon. gentleman does not know.

Mr. KING. If I understand the hon. gentleman rightly, he has said that I was aware of the leanings of this gentleman. I know of his professional standing and exceptional ability and capacity to deal with this question in a very efficient manner, but I do not know in what way his leanings are.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman in that regard is in just about the same position as he is, in his department, with regard to the subject generally. He is what they used to call in the States, 'a know nothing.' I have no doubt that if the evidence this professor may procure in foreign countries should not be satisfactory to the labour men, they will want another professor employed to get the other side of the question; and if the evidence be not satisfactory to the capitalists they will say that the report is a one-sided one and does not amount to anything. The only question here, outside of the question whether this is a useless expenditure of public money, is whether we should override the unanimous recommendation of the committee. I do not like to vote against such a recommendation, and for that reason alone I shall support this motion.

Mr. CROCKET. Ordinarily I would be disposed to stand by the unanimous report of a select committee of the House, and would have done so in this instance had it not been for the statements which I have heard from the Minister of Labour. Those statements have convinced me that this proposal is simply for the purpose of further shelving this question and of shirking a responsibility which properly attaches to the Department of Labour. For these reasons, I intend to vote against the motion for the adoption of this report.

Mr. RHODES. I wish to place myself fairly on record.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon gentleman has spoken already.

Mr. RHODES. I only asked a question. After the answer given by the hon. minister, I can consistently only vote against the adoption of the report, and for these reasons: When this question was discussed on the second reading of the Bill, the House gave the Bill its second reading unanimously, and referred it to a special committee. I then stated that, in so doing, we had endorsed the principle of an eight hour day. But when the Minister of Labour, in answer to my question, told us to-day that it is the intention of the committee to select an academic gentleman, who will investigate into the merits of the eight hour day, and asked us to agree to that recommendation, he asked this House to stultify itself. After we had affirmed the principle, he asks us to employ an expert in order to find out whether we were right or wrong in so doing. As one who has taken strong ground on the question I would be rather inconsistent if I were to vote for this motion. My hon. friend from Portage Laprairie (Mr. Meighen) has given expression to my sentiments to the letter, and I wish only to add my endorsement to what he has said. For these reasons I propose to vote against this motion.

Mr. BEATTIE. I do not think I would be justified in voting for this motion especially after the declaration we have had from the Minister of Labour. Judging from what he has said, I can only come to the conclusion that the object of this motion is to shelve the question and prevent our doing anything. I charge the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Verville) with rank insincerity. He introduced a similar Bill last year and then withdrew it without giving any sufficient reason for so doing. That hon. gentleman charged me with not keeping faith with the workingmen although he knew I supported his eight hour Bill. Two years ago he travelled all the way from Montreal to London to oppose my election, but the workingmen were so disgusted by his tactics that they would not go to his meetings. At one meeting he managed to collect together some thirty men, although he had engaged a brass band as an attraction, he was no more successful; and the result of his agitation against me was that I was elected by about 1,200 majority, pretty nearly all workingmen. As the object of his motion is evidently to shelve the measure, and thus deceive the working people whom that hon. gentleman pretends to represent, I shall vote against it. If instead of getting a college professor to report on the question of labour, the government would secure six good manufacturers, who had succeeded in building up their business by the sweat of their brow, and six good respectable, honest, mechanics, who are still earning their living by their hard day's toil, I think that these two representative bodies, seated around a table, would be able to come to a satisfactory settlement of this eight hour question without very much difficulty or delay?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It seems to me that if there is one member of this House who should rise and protest against the passage of this question, it is the hon. gentleman

who fathered the Bill (Mr. Verville). One would have thought that no member of this House would dare ask hon. members to adopt a measure which he had not considered sufficiently to enable him to give reasons why it ought to pass. Yet we have the singular spectacle of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Verville) wanting the reference of the eight hour day Bill, which he introduced in this House, to an expert in order that he may obtain from this expert information which will enable him to decide whether the measure he himself introduced is a proper one or not. But perhaps the hon. gentleman is not so much to blame for making blunders of that kind, since evidently it is only from members on this side that any information on the labour question can be expected. We had the right hon. the leader of the House declaring to his own supporters that he could not find any one sitting behind him who was competent to preside over the labour bureau and give an intelligent opinion on questions affecting labour; and to make it more clear and positive to the people that the men behind him do not understand questions affecting labour, the right hon. gentleman brought in an outsider, who was supposed to be peculiarly fitted for the post by a lifetime spent in the interests of the workingmen. We had the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) brought in from the outside and put at the head of the labour bureau. What are the duties of that department? On referring to the statute, under which it exists, I find this laid down:

With a view to the dissemination of accurate statistical and other information relating to the conditions of labour, the minister shall establish and have charge of a Department of Labour, which shall collect, digest and publish in suitable form statistical and other information relating to the conditions of labour.

I find it in the revised statutes of 1906. So that for years we have had a department established for a particular purpose, presided over by a gentleman selected on account of his technical fitness for the position; and yet after all these years, we have the singular combination of a labour representative bringing a Bill into the House, without even having in his own mind any reason to justify it, and we have the Minister of Labour, whose duty it was to collect the very information which should be at the service of the labour representative, actually asking the House to allow him to employ another expert to instruct the House on the very questions he is supposed to know all about. It seems to me, Sir, that the American poet must have had just such a case in mind when he wrote:

In short, I firmly du believe
In Humbug generally,
Fer it's a thing thet I perceive
To hev a solid vally;
This heth my faithful shepherd ben,
In pasturs sweet heth led me,
An' this'll keep the people green
To feed ez they hev fed me.

Mr. MADDIN. I addressed a question to the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) who introduced this Bill to the House. I asked the hon. member who had drafted the Bill in the form in which it was originally presented. I submit that when a Bill of such importance as this is introduced, the member who presents it is responsible to some extent for the contents of the Bill, and if, as in this particular case, he being a representative of labour in this country, presents the Bill on behalf of organized labour throughout the Dominion, he should be able to point with some pride to the terms in which it is drawn. But, strange to say, the hon. member does not feel like taking the House into his confidence and telling us who drafted the Bill. He is only willing to tell us that it was not drafted by the Labour Department. Perhaps by a process of exclusion, he might lead us to infer who really did draw this Bill. Mr. Speaker, the Bill as presented to this House embodies all the objectionable features that have characterized eight-hour Bills in their introduction to the different law-making bodies of the English-speaking world. This is not a new question; from time to time Bills have been brought up in the law-making bodies of this and other countries, from which the objectionable features formerly characteristic of such legislation, have been, to a great extent, eliminated. And I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that this Bill is word for word, the Bill presented to the Congress of the United States, with the exception that the Bill presented in the United States negatived certain cases in which the law should not be operative. In the United States, the Act was not to apply to contracts of transportation by land or sea; it was not to apply to military matters—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon member (Mr. Maddin) cannot discuss the Bill now; the Bill is before the committee and it is not in order to discuss it at this stage.

Mr. MADDIN. I am not discussing the merits of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill having been referred to committee, it is out of the House. The motion now before the House is the only matter that can be discussed in this debate.

Mr. MADDIN. With regard to the resolution now before the House, that an expert be employed to inquire into this Bill, I wish to point out that, as this is not new

legislation, and had the Bill been properly framed and presented, had it been drafted in the light of recent legislation which is within the knowledge of nearly every member of this House—knowledge which every member could gather from the library here or from the ordinary publications of the country—it would perhaps not be necessary to call in an expert in connection with the matter. However, this resolution to appoint a professor from Ontario to cull information for the members of this special committee, leads to but one conclusion. It seems to demonstrate that the Labour Department has failed in the purpose for which it was instituted. I would like to know what object this department has to serve in the interests of the people? We have an industrial struggle going on in the county of Cape Breton, which commenced in July 6, 1909. Representations were made to the Minister of Labour, and his reply has been that, the matter in dispute having been submitted to a board of conciliation, it is not the policy of the government to inquire into a struggle of this kind. The result is that this strike has been continued since July 6, last, and is liable to go on indefinitely. When the Department of Labour washes its hands altogether of industrial struggles and finds its sole excuse for existence in the publishing of the Labour 'Gazette' and compiling statistics pursuant to the statute read by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup)—when that is their only service to their country—the minister has failed in his duty if he cannot submit to this seleect committee all the facts essential to the intelligent consideration of the Bill. As I have said, this matter of the eight hour Bill is not a new matter. For some eight or nine years the gentleman who enjoys the portfolio of labour has been employed in the department and the matter of an eight hour day is not a new thing to him. It has been the subject of consideration by legislatures and parliaments for the last forty or fifty years. Why, it is at least twenty years since the English labourer began to look forward to the eight hour day and when organized labour in England published on their posters and correspondence, the old lines:

> Eight hours for work,
> Eight hours for play,
> Eight hours for sleep,
> And eight shillings a day.

It cannot be said for a moment that the Minister of Labour would be taken by surprise with the introduction of a Bill regulating the hours of labour. Ever since labour was organized to defend its own interests, Bills to shorten the hours of labour have always received the greatest consideration from its representatives. It is a subject that has been formulated in legislatures and parliaments in many countries. I submit that this proposal to shift the responsibility from the minister to a professor is really an avoidance of the issue. This country wants to know, and particularly does organized labour want to know, where the parliament of Canada stands in regard to this question. Do they accept or reject the principle of an eight hour day? Or are they going to shift the responsibility to a professor in an Ontario university when they themselves should assume it, and answer the question, yes or no?

Mr. BARNARD. The discussion to-day has demonstrated to me that the opinion I held when the Bill was up for the second reading, was the correct opinion, namely, that there was never any necessity to send this Bill to a committee of the House. It was done merely to avoid a straight issue raised by some members of the House to the effect that the Bill should be limited to contracts on public works. The very fact that the committee, in order to gain time, is coming now and asking for the appointment of an expert shows that they have had but little difficulty with the subject they were expected to deal with. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) suggests that there should be a second expert appointed. I have not the slightest doubt that if the Minister of Labour finds that the first expert gets through his work before the end of the session, a second expert will be appointed. After hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) with regard to the appointment of this expert, I had an open mind upon this question, but I feel that in his heart he will now agree with me when I say that the evident insincerity of the replies of the minister to the different questions put to him, has shown beyond question that it is the intention of himself and his department to shelve this Bill. Therefore I propose to vote against this motion.

Mr. HUGHES. Before the minister speaks I want to ask him a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. If any other gentleman wants to speak, he must do so before the minister speaks.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the minister in a position to give a definite statement to the House as to the cost of this officer, and how long he will be employed?

Mr. KING. I think the cost will be determined by the committee. I think the intention is simply to retain this gentleman to give such information as he can within a short time. It is not the intention of the committee to send him abroad any where, it is our desire to get the information that he has already in his possession. The amount to be paid him, I am

sure, will not be considered by the House excessive. I presume it will be on a basis arranged after consultation between the members of the committee themselves.

Mr. BOYCE. As the minister says it is not intended that this gentleman shall travel and obtain by actual experience a knowledge of the condition of affairs on the eight hour day question in other countries, might I ask him whether he has not at his disposal now the same information which is obtainable by the services of this so-called specialist?

Mr. KING. Perhaps I have not made myself sufficiently clear to the House. This gentleman has been making a special study of this question for some time, he has all the information at his fingers' ends. The Department of Labour has in its library a great deal of information which will be brought before this House, but it will take an officer of that department considerable time to go through that information and classify it and bring the results to the House in a form as convenient as this gentleman is prepared to do immediately.

Mr. BOYCE. Could not all that be done by the minister's department? He says he already has it at his disposal in the department.

Mr. KING. I think I have answered that question. I explained to the House that the staff of the Department of Labour is not a very large staff, and the work is very considerable. I am sorry to see that hon. gentlemen opposite, apparently, have not looked over the annual report of the department, or they would know how extensive that work is. To take gentlemen of the Department of Labour off the work they are doing at present, would throw into confusion some of the work of the department, which I think it is desirable should be carried on as efficiently as it can be done with the staff we have at present.

Mr. BOYCE. I had not intended to address myself to the question——

Mr. SPEAKER. The mover of the motion closes the debate, and the hon. gentleman cannot speak now.

Mr. BOYCE. I understood the minister was answering questions, I only rose for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The debate is concluded, I cannot allow the hon. member to speak now. The minister is allowed to reply, but I warned hon. gentlemen that if any one wished to speak, he must do so before the minister spoke.

Mr. BOYCE. At that moment the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton rose, and said that before the minister spoke he would like to ask a question. The minister answered that question, and in the course of his answer I took it upon myself to ask his leave to ask him a question. I was not going to address myself to the subject until I heard the remarks he has now made. It does seem to me, after hearing his remarks, that if we had any doubt before, we can no longer doubt now that there is an Ethiopian in the fence somewhere. This Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) and was discussed in the House, and unless I am mistaken, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour committed himself to the principle of this Bill, if he did not in so many words, by allowing it to go to a second reading, and by referring to to a select committee. Now, as has been said by the hon. member for Hastings, what is the position of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, who introduced this Bill, what is the position of the minister, and what position does he ask this House to take? Here is an hon. gentleman who represents the whole labour organizations of Canada, asking this House to commit itself to the principle of a Bill, and then when the minister proposes that the committee be authorized to employ an expert to advise them upon questions relating to the very principle of the Bill, the hon. gentleman from Maisonneuve, the head of the Trades and Labour Congress, sits silent, and allows that motion to go unchallenged. Why does he do it? Why does the member for Maisonneuve consent to that? If he is sincere in his desire for an eight-hour day, if he really intends to push through his measure, why does he consent to have his Bill knocked about from this man to that man, from this select committee to that travelling investigator, with the result, of course, that his Bill will have to go over until another session? I cannot believe, from the attitude of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, that he is sincere. I think he does not want this House to tackle this question upon its merits, he is anxious to relieve the Minister of Labour from difficulty, to shelve this question, to prevent it from being dealt with at this session. How does he try to square himself with the men whom he is sent here to represent? I think it will be difficult for him to go back and tell them that he fought in the House of Commons for the Eight-hour Bill, but was unable to get it through. Now, by some arrangement with the Minister of Labour, by some promise, something that is not made clear, he simply sits quiescent while the minister hands over to a so-called expert the investigation of a principle, the acquisition of information which, if he was worthy to hold the position of the Minister of Labour, he ought to know already.

Mr. VERVILLE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I had a promise or

anything of that kind from the Minister of Labour?

Mr. BOYCE. No, I do not think that.

Mr. VERVILLE. I hope my hon. friend will do me the honour to——

Mr. BOYCE. I think my hon. friend is quite too astute for that, but I certainly think that if there has been no arrangement expressed or implied beween my hon. friend and the Minister of Labour it shows that he is a very tame representative of labour. The position that the minister takes upon this question is absolutely untenable. Upon his own admission, what does he want to do? He is going to employ a specialist, a technical man, to go and investigate and acquire information which my hon. friend admits he has now upon the shelves of the department. There is no question as to what should be done with this motion. With regard to the insurance legislation before the House would the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) accept a similar resolution relegating the Insurance Bill to the investigation of professional experts, who might go around the country, acquire information and give us their opinions? Would such a resolution as that be accepted simply upon the flimsy and miserable excuse that the Minister of Labour puts up, that this man is so well versed in the subject and has such a wide experience upon it that he is in a position to advise the committee? Would the Minister of Finance adopt such a principle, and if he would not—and it applies to any other department of the government, why should we be asked to accept it from the Minister of Labour? This proposal is made for the purpose of assisting the Minister of Labour and the member for Maisonneuve out of some difficulty in which they appear to be. But I say that we ought not to delegate the powers of this House by accepting this resolution.

House divided on motion (Mr. King).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	McGiverin,
Aylesworth,	McIntyre,
Barker,	McKenzie,
Beauparlant,	McLean (Huron),
Béland,	McLean (Sunbury),
Black,	Maddin,
Blondin,	Major,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Marcile (Bagot),
Broder,	Marshall,
Carrier,	Martin (Regina),
Cash,	Martin (Wellington),
Champagne,	Mayrand,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Meigs,
Clark (Red Deer),	Michaud,
Clarke (Essex),	Miller,
Congdon,	Molloy,
Conmee,	Monk,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Nantel,
Daniel,	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Neely,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Papineau,
Doherty,	Paquet,
Douglas,	Pickup,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Ecrément,	Prowse,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Foster,	Ross (Middlesex),
Fowke,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Roy (Dorchester),
Geoffrion,	Roy (Montmagny),
Girard,	Rutan,
Gordon (Kent),	Schell,
Graham,	Sealey,
Guthrie,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Harris,	Sinclair,
Herron,	Smith (Nanaimo),
King,	Smith (Stormont),
Knowles,	Sperry,
Kyte,	Sproule,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Stanfield,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Stratton,
Lavergne,	Templeman,
Law,	Todd,
LeBlanc,	Tolmie,
Lemieux,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lovell,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Macdonald,	Turgeon,
Macdonell,	Turriff,
MacNutt,	Verville,
McCoig,	Warburton,
McColl,	White (Victoria, Alta.),
McCraney,	Wilcox (Essex),
	Wilson (Laval),
	Worthington.—114.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Jameson,
Barnard,	Lake,
Beattie,	Lancaster,
Blain,	Lennox,
Boyce,	Meighen,
Burrell,	Middlebro,
Chisholm (Huron),	Northrup,
Cowan,	Osler,
Crosby,	Reid (Grenville),
Crocket,	Rhodes,
Crothers,	Schaffner,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Donnelly,	Taylor (Leeds),
Edwards,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Elson,	Wallace,
Goodeve,	White (Renfrew),
Gordon (Nipissing),	Wright.—36.
Henderson,	
Hughes,	

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

DOMINION LANDS FOR HOMESTEADS.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What is the estimated acreage of the Peace river, Mackenzie river and other unorganized districts?

2. How much of it is arable?
3. How much of it has been surveyed?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. There are no districts legally known as 'Peace River District' or 'Mackenzie River District.' The portion of country lying generally along and in the vicinity of Peace river and commonly known as 'Peace River District' is wholly within the province of Alberta. That portion of the Northwest territories formerly known as the 'Mackenzie River District' and which forms part of the Northwest territories contains an area of 333,861,760 acres approximately, exclusive of water.

2. No definite information can be given about the proportion of arable land, as the portions of country above referred to are largely unexplored.

3. See No. 2.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What is the total acreage of Manitoba?
2. How much of it is arable?
3. How much of it is under cultivation?
4. How much is held, untilled, by railways, land companies and other private owners?
5. How many acres have been free homesteaded?
6. How many acres are still open to free homesteading?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 41,169,280 acres approximately, exclusive of water.

2. The total area surveyed—25,150,000 acres. No definite figures can be given as to the proportion of unsurveyed land which is arable.

3. 5,061,503 acres.

4. About 10,000,000 acres.

5. 5,475,760 acres.

6. 6,725,837 acres approximately. (Area surveyed and ready for homesteading at the present time.)

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What is the total acreage of Saskatchewan?
2. How much of it is arable?
3. How much of it is under cultivation?
4. How much is held, untilled, by railways, land companies, and other private owners?
5. How many acres have been free homesteaded?
6. How many acres are still open to free homesteading?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 151,900,000 acres approximately.

2. The total area surveyed — 66,600,000 acres. No definite figures can be given as to the proportions of unsurveyed land which is arable.

3. 5,814,723 acres approximately.

4. About 37,100,000 acres.

5. 20,828,320 acres approximately.

6. 21,690,297 acres approximately. (Area surveyed and ready for homesteading at the present time.)

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What is the total acreage of Alberta?
2. How much of it is arable?
3. How much of it is under cultivation?
4. How much is held, untilled, by railways, land companies and other private owners?
5. How many acres have been free homesteaded?
6. How many acres are still open to free homesteading?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 155,400,000 acres approximately.

6. The total area surveyed — 52,200,000 acres. No definite figures can be given as to the proportion of unsurveyed land which is arable.

3. 1,483,400 acres approximately.

4. About 32,760,000 acres.

5. 11,886,280 acres approximately.

6. 21,703,571 acres approximately. (Area surveyed and ready for homesteading at the present time.)

RABIES.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE:

1. How many cases of suspected or identified rabies were reported to the Department of Agriculture during the years 1909 and 1910?

2. Where were these cases reported from, and what action was taken by the government to prevent the spreading of this terrible disease?

3. Were any farms quarantined by order of the department? If so, where?

4. Were any domestic animals other than dogs ordered to be destroyed by the department or its officers to prevent the spread of the disease or danger from infection, under clause 5 of the Animals Contagious Diseases Act? If so, where?

5. Is it the intention of the government to withhold compensation from owners of such animals, thereby putting a premium on the secret spreading of this terrible disease, or will the owners be compensated as provided by section 6 of the said Act?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER:

1. 157 outbreaks involving 760 animals most of which, however, were simply placed in quarantine as contacts but did not develop the disease.

2. From the following electoral districts: Welland, Ont.; Wentworth, Ont.; Hamilton, Ont.; Norfolk, Ont.; Brant, Ont.; Brantford, Ont.; Waterloo South, Ont.; Waterloo North, Ont.; Wellington North, Ont.; Perth North, Ont.; Perth South, Ont.; Huron West, Ont.; Oxford South, Ont.; Middlesex West, Ont.; Middlesex North, Ont.; Kent West, Ont.; Simcoe North, Ont.; Red Deer, Alberta; Assiniboia, Saskatchewan.

Immediately on receiving reports of rabies, or suspected rabies, an inspector was sent to investigate. All animals bitten or known to have been in contact with a rabid or suspected dog were quarantined.

All contact or suspected dogs were isolated and ordered to be securely chained until danger of infection was past.

A bulletin giving a full description of the disease and also including the regulations relating to rabies was freely distributed in each district where the disease was found or suspected. Copies of this bulletin were sent to medical health officers and other medical officers.

The existence of rabies was demonstrated in thirteen cases by animal inoculations from specimens sent to the biological laboratory.

3. (a) Yes. (b) In the localities mentioned above.

4. No.

5. No compensation will be given.

IMPORTATIONS OF MILITARY ARTICLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is the government prepared to favourably consider the importation, free of custom duty, of special articles of uniform, arms, or accoutrements, for the use of the Canadian militia, and for authorized cadet corps, respecting which it is established to the satisfaction of the treasury board that such are not manufactured, and that facilities for the manufacture thereof, do not exist in Canada?

2. What amount of money has been collected as customs duty on Windsor uniforms imported by Canadian Privy Councillors during the five years ended 31st March, 1909?

3. Have any such Windsor uniforms been imported free of Custom duty? If so, under what authority?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. No. The government do not propose any amendment of the law in that respect.

2. Uniforms and other clothing are classified together in the tariff, so that the customs statistics do not show separately the amount of duty collected on any particular uniform.

3. Uniforms of all kinds arriving with the owner have been admitted free of duty as travellers' baggage, under the provisions of tariff item No. 703.

LACHINE CANAL—T. EVERS.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the total amount of money received by T. Evers as expenses, employed on the Lachine canal, from April 1, 1909, to date?

2. What was the nature of the work that brought about those expenses?

3. How many times during the same period was T. Evers called for repairs of telephone, and what was the nature of those repairs?

4. Who is the proper authority to judge of the competence of electricians or any other persons who may have anything to do with electricity on the Lachine canal?

5. Is the government obliged to furnish the light to the establishment of the Inland Navigation Company? If so, on what condition?

Mr. FISHER.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. Thos. J. Evers received from the Department of Railways and Canals the sum of $131 for transportation allowance in connection with his duties. He is allowed a fixed monthly allowance of $15, dated from July 1, 1909.

2. Thos. J. Evers has charge of the repairing and maintenance of the telephone instruments, interior switches, and inside wiring, in connection with the private telephone system, along the entire line of the Lachine canal, also the superintendent's office and government stores, Mill street.

3. Mr. Evers makes the required visits along the line of the Lachine canal whenever his duties demand it; sometimes complaints are made through no fault of Evers, as the telephone wires are strung on the same poles as the electric light and power wires of the Lachine canal.

4. D. O'Brien, the officer in charge of the operating and maintenance of the Lachine canal staff and repairs, certifies to the competency of the electricians on the Lachine canal. All matters requiring expert knowledge in this connection are referred to Mr. John Murphy, electrical engineer, Department of Railways and Canals.

5. The Inland Navigation Company of Hamilton, Ontario, made application in the regular way to have the wire system run through the sheds which are on the lighting circuit of the canal at basin No. 1; this was granted in the interest of canal navigation, and no charge is being made. The other sheds on the Lachine canal are treated in the same manner.

MARITIME DREDGING AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

Mr. CROCKET:

Referring to the answer given by the Minister of Public Works on the 27th January, instant, to a question as to what payments had been made to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for dredging at Gaspereaux, New Brunswick, in which the minister stated, 'No dredging was done by the company at Gaspereaux during the present fiscal year, as by reason of the alleged difficult and exposed location where the work was being performed, they declined to return to it last spring at their tender price of the previous year. They also gave as a further reason for declining to accept an extension of their contract and as evidence of the unusual difficulties attending this work, that one of their tugs had been wrecked, resulting in large financial loss'—

1. On what date respectively was the work of 1908 begun and concluded, for which the payment of $33,969 was made?

2. What is the date of the contract under which the above payment was made?

3. What is the date of the order in council authorizing said contract to be entered into?

4. Did said order in council authorize a contract for work to be done beyond the close of the calendar year 1908?

5. Was the company asked to accept an extension of their contract last spring?
6. If so, was the request in writing or verbal, and by whom and to what officer of the company was it communicated?
7. If in writing, will the minister lay the correspondence on the table of the House without notice of motion?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. Work started August 17, 1908. Dredge ceased operations October 29, 1908.
2. First contract by letter of superintendent of dredging to the company, dated August 10, 1908, authorizing company to commence work provided they would accept the lowest price per cubic yard, scow measurement, to be obtained by tenders, which were then being called for. Formal contract being executed by the contractors. November 6, 1908; by the department November 23, 1908.
3. November 20, 1908. Delay in passing order in council was due to the fact of the chief engineer requiring reports of experts independently of the resident engineer as to the value of the work before recommending the execution of a contract agreeing to pay the tender price of 90 cents per yard. These reports were made by the late W. J. McCordock, superintendent of dredging, and J. K. Scammell, resident engineer at St. John, and were only received in October, the last one—that of Mr. Scammell—being dated October 19.
4. No.
5. The company was asked if they would accept an extension of their contract last spring in case an order in council was passed granting such extension.
6. Verbal. By myself to the president or one of the directors of the company, and, I think, to both.
7. Answered by reply to No. 6.

TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. J. D. REID:

1. What is the name of the contractor or contractors for the extension of the breakwater and work in connection therewith at the eastern entrance, Toronto harbour?
2. What is the amount of contract, or contracts, for said work?
3. What is the name of the sub-contractor, or contractors, of such contracts?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

No contract has been awarded for the extension of the breakwater at the eastern entrance, Toronto harbour; but the department is rebuilding, by day labour, the superstructure of the piers at the said eastern entrance, under the supervision of the district engineer.

SALMON RIVER POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Is there a vacancy in the postmastership at Salmon river, Digby county?
2. If so, when did it occur, and who has since been acting?
3. Has any petition been received signed by residents of Salmon river, asking for the appointment of a postmaster?
4. If so, when was it received, who did it recommend, and why has the appointment not been made?
5. What action does the minister propose to take, when will he act, and upon whose recommendation?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes.
2. The office has been vacant since the death of the former postmaster, Mr. H. C. Perry, on the 16th September last. Mr. Edward T. Doucette has been placed in charge as acting postmaster.
3. Yes.
4. Petitions were received on or about the 9th November last, in one of which a Mr. H. J. Foley was recommended. The other asked for the establishment of a post office at some distance from Salmon river, which would involve either a change in the location of the Salmon river post office or the establishment of another post office in too close proximity to the Salmon river office. No action has been taken on these petitions.
5. A decision has not yet been made in the matter.

WINDYGATES POST OFFICE.

Mr. SHARPE:

1. Why did the government change the post office at Windygates, Manitoba?
2. Was there a petition from the people served at that post office? If so, how many names were on it?
3. If there was not a petition, who recommended the change, and what reasons did they give for asking for a change?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. The post office having been rendered vacant by the death of the postmaster, it became necessary to make a new appointment to the postmastership.
2. A petition containing 34 signatures, asking that the location of the office might not be changed, was received at the department.
3. The change was recommended by Mr. J. F. Greenway, who, having made special inquiry, found that it would be in the best interests of the community.

PURCHASE OF GOVERNMENT VESSELS.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government purchased or agreed to purchase or lease any ships in connection with the proposed Canadian navy?
2. Have any orders in council been passed in connection with the purchase, lease or construction of said ships? If so, at what date or dates?

3. Have any sums of money been paid in connection with the acquisition of ships in connection with the Canadian navy? If so, what sums?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Negotiations have been going on for the purchase of one steamer for the protection of the fisheries in British Columbia and for the purchase of another ship in connection with the navy, the latter subject to the approval of parliament.

2. Order in council has been passed authorizing the purchase of one steamer, subject to the approval of parliament.

3. No money has been paid.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

On orders of the day being called:

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he is able to lay on the table of the House correspondence with reference to the purchase or the proposed purchase of a vessel for the Canadian navy. I understand that the debate takes place to-morrow and I think this correspondence ought to be in the hands of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This correspondence has not yet been completed and it is not therefore in a position to be brought down. I hope to be able to satisfy my hon. friend as to what there is in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the whole thing is not contemplated, but what objection on earth can there be if there is an agreement and that agreement is in form to be brought before the House, to bringing down the correspondence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only objection is that it is a matter not completed on this side, it is subject to the approval of parliament and we cannot pay a dollar until we have brought it before parliament. On the other side it has to be subjected to some authority which I do not know at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not confidential I suppose?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not confidential.

SUNDAY POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. NEELY. I wish to call attention of the House and particularly of the Postmaster General to a matter of public importance brought to my attention quite recently. It affects the people of the west if not of the whole of Canada to quite a considerable extent. An item appears in the Manitoba 'Free Press' of June 31, headed 'Post office will close on Sundays'.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen cannot discuss that question now.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. NEELY. I was going to put a question to get information in connection with this point. The item refers only to the order that had come to the local postmaster of the city of Winnipeg, and I am anxious to find out if all postmasters throughout Canada have received a similar order. If that is the case, personally I am called upon to protest very strongly against the action of the Post Office Department in connection with the matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This question is a very vexed one. During last summer we were asked at the Post Office Department to get the views of the people especially in the western provinces, as regards the partial closing or opening of post offices on Sunday. Feeling exists on the same subject in the province of Ontario. I directed two officers of the department but chiefly one, the superintendent of post offices in Canada, Mr. Ross, to go into this matter very deeply. He went to the west and I must say that the consensus of opinion as gathered by Mr. Ross and my officer in the west is to the effect that there should be a strict Sunday observance in post office matters. However, I have not yet had time to read the whole report, which is very voluminous, and I expect that within a few days I will be able to give the House the decision of the department in the matter. It is a very difficult and a very vexed question, and I must say from what I hear in the western provinces, that the sentiment seems to be practically unanimous in favour of Sunday closing in the various post offices.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister issued any order regarding it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The matter is at present being studied by the department. It may be in some instances the officers may have given orders which I did not know personally, but the ordinary regulations of the department are to the effect that post offices should not be open on Sunday. But, in some cities, where the trains arrive on Sunday it has been found necessary to keep the offices open during a certain portion of the day for the mails. It has been the custom of the department not to interfere in such cases, but even in regard to them, judging by the report I have read, the opinion in the west seems to be against the opening of these offices.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like to ask the minister what evidence he has of that opinion?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the question cannot be discussed now.

Mr. CONMEE. Very well.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Railways and canals—capital—cut-off at Moncton, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimated cost of this is $215,751.

Mr. CROCKET. How is the work being done?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will ask for tenders when we come to do the work.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is this work intended to be a portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will no doubt have to handle some of their business there and this will be a facility, but whether or not we need it for our own business.

Mr. CROCKET. When will it be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will take two years. It is intended to commence during the coming summer.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Grand Trunk Pacific had not been built would this expensive cut off have been constructed in the interests of the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. My information from the chief engineer is that he would advise it in our own interest had there never been any Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. BARKER. Does the recently appointed Board of Management recommend such a matter as this before it is presented to parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact this work was projected and approved of by the House before there was any board. $50,000 was appropriated but we have not yet secured the right of way.

Mr. BARKER. Where you are expending large sums of money on work of this kind which will be for the benefit of other railways an effort should be made to get these other railways to divide the cost.

Mr. CROCKET. Has any portion of the right of way been acquired?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not yet.

Mr. HUGHES. Will this run through the city or outside the city?

Mr. GRAHAM. Outside the city. There are grades in the city and we want to avoid them.

Moncton locomotive and car shops, &c., $343,825.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is intended to complete the very large expenditure at Moncton in this connection. Last year I gave the figures for everything done at Moncton and they amounted to about $3,000,000. This is a very large expenditure, but I think I am safe in saying that while the Moncton shops are not as large as some others on the continent which I have visited, in many respects the lay out of our shops is better than in any others, and there ought to be more economy in doing the work. We have already had some improved results from the new machinery and the general lay out of the shops, even with the small staff of men we have employed.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister tell us how much the machinery cost and how much the building cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not for machinery, but for shops, yards and tracks. There is an item further on for machinery.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand that the shops, yards, etc., exclusive of machinery, will cost $3,000,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, the new shops, round-houses, terminal facilities, and so on, will cost $3,000,000 before they are completed.

Mr. CROCKET. And the machinery is in addition?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. The machinery, I think, will cost, probably, half a million dollars.

Mr. CROCKET. Are the new buildings now completed? There was to be a passenger car repair shop, a freight car repair shop and a number of other buildings. Are they completed now?

Mr. GRAHAM. The ones that were under contract are completed. These are practically additional buildings.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the engine house under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, a contract will be let.

Mr. BARKER. There is now a new commission practically managing the road. Have they any control over expenditures such as are here shown? Does the minister get from them a report recommending estimates, or is that done, as in the past, from the minister's own office?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimates for the Intercolonial are practically all prepared under the advice of the board. The deputy being the chairman of the board, of course, it all comes through him. My experience is that the management, even before there was a board, discussed these matters and recommended estimates. The general manager had a large say in preparing the estimates. The board, while it has no

supreme power, and while we might cut out something it recommends—for people who do not have to provide the money are apt to be liberal in their requests—has much to do with preparing the estimates.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister has not explained what I want to know. It is very important that we should know, for the future, whether everything of this kind that is recommended to parliament, is based upon a formal written report of the board. I can understand, of course, that the minister is not bound to accept their recommendations. But it would be a prudent thing for him to get their recommendation upon every item, and these should be open to this committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that these estimates were discussed before the board. I think the hon. member (Mr. Barker) is right—if we are to have a board that board ought to make recommendations. As the hon. member says, the minister is not bound to accept those recommendations, but the board should make representations, these to be considered for what they are worth. I think that is very reasonable.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, that will be done.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The other day the Minister of Railways spoke of the items charged to capital account. I would like to get from him a precedent, either in the Baltimore and Ohio, the New York Central or the new rules adopted by the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning charges to capital account for a case where a station-house or workshop has been burned down and the cost of replacing it charged to capital.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I can get that for my hon. friend before we get through. At least, I can get cases where these buildings have been pulled down, and I suppose that will be the same thing.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. No. This is a case where the buildings were burned down and the whole cost of restoration is charged to capital.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was not all burned down; there is quite a shop standing and the government still own it.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. This money is supposed to be used to replace buildings that were burned.

Mr. GRAHAM. A good deal more than replace them.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the department abandoning the old buildings left by the fire?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have not done so. There was a proposition to lease them, but it did not materialize.

Mr. CROCKET. As I understand, it is proposed to abandon these shops and do all the work——

Mr. GRAHAM. Far more economical work can be done in the new shops, so that we can soon earn the value of the old shops.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the valuation of the old buildings?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the figures here.

Mr. RHODES. What is to be done with the old building?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, that depends on finding the party of the second part. I thought at one time that we could get an industry to lease this building, but the amount they offered was not worth while.

Mr. RHODES. Is it intended to use the ground space for yard-room, or is it still in the market?

Mr. GRAHAM. Personally, I am a bit averse to disposing absolutely of government property, particularly at Moncton, where, as my hon. friend suggests, we need the land for some purpose—the Grand Trunk Pacific may need it. I am free to say that we have not yet a definite policy on that subject.

Mr. CROCKET. What has become of the property bought from Mr. Lodge? No use has ever been made of that property.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been used, I believe, as part of the old yards.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister will agree that this is a very important matter. I understood him to say yesterday that the Interstate Commerce Commission had laid down principles as to charges to capital, which, after conference with the great railways in the United States, were accepted and are now being acted upon, and I understand that the minister intends to adopt the same plan in connection with the accounts of the Intercolonial. I was glad to hear him say this, because I thought it provided a solution for two things, one the subject of the old controversy that has gone on for some several years as to expenditure on capital and on income, and the other in the interest of honest book-keeping and good accounting. Now, if we can have those principles, so adopted and carried out in the United States and which are henceforward applicable to the Intercolonial, put in black and white where we can get at them, it would be a great benefit, and it would tend to honest accounting. I am not pressing this for the sake of contro-

versy, but I have no doubt that some principle is necessary. I should hope that under the new departure the minister is now willing to enunciate those principles and put them into strict operation on the Intercolonial.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have taken pains to get the decision my hon. friend has spoken of; here it is:

A number of points have been raised by correspondents relative to depreciation that call for the following general statements, all of which bear upon the manner in which depreciation accounts should be treated:—

1. The question of depreciation is fundamentally a question of operating efficiency, or of keeping full the numbers in equipment series.

2. The depreciation rules may be worked either on the basis of the value of individual cars and locomotives, or on the basis of the value of series of cars and locomotives. On this point, accounting officers are at liberty, until advised to the contrary, to follow whichever method seems to them the more appropriate.

3. The basis of accumulation—that is to say, the amount to which the percentage rate is applied—ought, in strict theory, to be the original cost. For the current year, however, accounting officers are at liberty to accept original cost estimated, if not known, record value, or purchase price. The term 'record value' should not be interpreted to mean the value of the equipment as it stands in the capital account unless that account represents the original value of the equipment on hand, but the actual cost or value of all equipment, regardless of where charged when purchased; and in case purchase price be accepted as the basis of the percentage charge to depreciation, the percentage rate should be limited to the rate required to replace the price paid. A second-hand locomotive, for example, is not called upon to provide for its replacement, when abandoned, by a new locomotive. As stated above, it is values and not locomotives with which depreciation charges deal.

4. The application of depreciation charges for the current year and subsequent years must not be influenced by the practice of years past. In case property has been appreciated by excessive charges to operating expenses in years past, the value thus placed on the property must be regarded as a permanent undivided asset to the stockholders. On the other hand, in case property has depreciated on account of insufficient charges to operating expenses in years past, this fact must not be permitted to influence the determination of the depreciation rate for the current year.

5. The monthly charges to operating expenses for 'depreciation' in the several classes of equipment, will, of necessity, create or require corresponding liability accounts to which such depreciation may be credited. To that end, carriers will be required, beginning July 1, 1907, to set up an appropriate liability depreciation account for each of the several classes of equipment upon which depreciation is charged. These accounts should be designated as follows:—

(a) Locomotives — replacements (including both steam and electric),
(b) Passenger-train cars—replacement,
(c) Freight-train cars—replacement,
(d) Electric equipment of cars—replacement,
(e) Floating equipment—replacement,
(f) Work equipment—replacement (except locomotives).

To these replacement accounts should be credited monthly the amount of accrued depreciation on each class of equipment, respectively. Such credits should invariably equal the gross charges to maintenance for depreciation.

To these several replacement accounts under their appropriate heads should be charged, at cost, all equipment purchased, built, or otherwise acquired for purpose of maintaining the value of a carrier's equipment.

The monthly charges to operating expenses for 'renewals' of the several classes of equipment will be similarly treated.

It is not intended that these accounts should be restricted to individual cars or locomotives, or that carriers are not at liberty to renew or replace equipment upon which depreciation has accrued prior to the retirement of such equipment. On the other hand the several amounts standing to the credit of those replacement accounts should be available to carriers for the purpose of replacement of equipment to the extent of such credits; however, all replacements in excess of such credits must be considered as betterments or additions, and charged either to income or capital.

I have also a classification of expenditures for additions and betterments, for steam roads, adapted by the Inter-state Commerce Commission, and which the Intercolonial has adopted as their standard. Then I have a classification of the road and equipment for original construction which we have adopted. I will lay these two statements on the table.

Mr. CROCKET. Is any portion of this amount applied to the payment of the sewer, the contract for which was let to Mr. E. A. Walberg? I understand that there is a claim against the government for something over $100,000 for the construction of a sewer. The work was let under a purely verbal contract, entered into with the local engineer.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is in the courts yet. The referee gave a certain figure, Mr. Walberg appealed to the Exchequer Court, and got another judgment. I have now under consideration the advisability of appealing from that judgment.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are you giving him any more contracts?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think he has any at the present time.

Mr. CROSBY. I want to ask the minister what the department is doing with regard to the Cunard property which they

acquired in Halifax some years ago, and when they intended to make use of it?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are plans under consideration for building a freight shed at that end of the city, and a new wharf, and I think a flour shed on the wharf. But the plans are not yet completed, and we have nothing in the estimates this year. We have a large capital account and we are going as slowly as possible in order not to unduly increase it.

Mr. CROSBY. I think the people in Halifax were willing that the department should acquire this property, but they expected that the department would use it. They expected that within a reasonable time some construction would take place; it was understood that a flour shed and a new wharf would be built. I think the time has now come when the work should be carried on. Can the minister give us some definite intimation as to when this work will be begun? I think the property was acquired six or seven years ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that the front part of the stone building is now occupied by the Cunards under lease, and the other part is occupied by Halifax merchants, and the whole is in use. I understand the property was bought only a short time before I became minister. It was offered cheap; the government thought they would eventually need it, and they took advantage of the opportunity and purchased it. We require it, and we intend to go on and utilize it. But I do not think it was bought with the intention of immediate use.

Mr. CROSBY. Does the minister mean to say that they bought it on speculation, and they are going to keep it for some time? If that is the intention, I am sure it will not meet with the approval of the people of Halifax.

Mr. GRAHAM. Nobody could buy it from us.

Mr. CROSBY. If the Railway Department is going to keep it in the shape they have got it now, we would like to have some use made of it. We don't want the Railway Department or anybody else to come into Halifax and buy up a valuable piece of water front, and hold it without making some improvements. I understand the minister to say that he does not know what they are going to do with this property, they have made no plans; he has not made up his mind what he is going to do with it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think my hon. friend has rather overstated what I said. We bought the property because it was a good thing to buy, and we will need it. The department has of course considered several things in connection with it, but at the present time we have formed no plan, and we are not asking this year for any appropriation.

Mr. CROSBY. Then I will ask the minister something easier. I would like to ask him how much accommodation there is at the round-house for locomotives, and how many they can put in there? I would like to ask the minister if it is intended to do the same amount of work in that shop as has been done in the past. There is quite a large amount of ground although the roundhouse does not seem nearly as elaborate as I would like to see it. I would like the minister to give me some idea of how many locomotives can be stored in the round-house at one time?

Mr. GRAHAM. The roundhouse at Halifax will be used for repairs just as other roundhouses are. There is a car repair shop there as well. Arrangements were made some years ago for the construction of central shops at Moncton, where all the heavy repairs could be done. The board is carrying out that plan which was adopted by the then management and approved by parliament. The roundhouse at Halifax is like the roundhouse at other places and the same kind of work is being done there.

Mr. CROSBY. Will all cars that go into Halifax be repaired there? We are not jealous at all of Moncton, nor are we jealous of any other place, but we feel that we should have what belongs to us and we do not believe that a locomotive or a car should be taken from Halifax to any other part of the Intercolonial to be repaired.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think I can add anything to what I have said. The road is under the management of expert railway men who know more than I do about where these things ought to be done. A very large amount has been expended at Halifax for giving exceptional facilities for shipment, and we have made provision for these heavy repairs to be done at Moncton. I cannot say how big a hole there should be in a boiler before it will go to Moncton rather than stay in Halifax, but we must leave it to the management to look after these details.

Mr. CROSBY. That answer will hardly satisfy me. I am quite satisfied that the minister is going to leave things to the board which he does not want to deal with himself, and take things to himself that he does not want the board to interfere with. While there has been a considerable expenditure at Halifax I am proud to say that with the exception of acquiring the roundhouse site, you have got pretty good value for your money. There has not been any evidence of any money being squan-

dered there except in acquiring the roundhouse site. Of course, I need not tell you anything about that, because you know how you got your friends fixed up in that regard. There has not been very much spent in Halifax for the Intercolonial. The road has its terminus at Halifax, and you have a perfect right to spend a lot of money there to facilitate its operations.

Mr. GRAHAM. How much would my hon. friend call a lot of money? Suppose we spent it in Hamilton. How much does he think has been spent in Halifax for the Intercolonial — $4,379,000? I think that is quite a lot of money.

Mr. CROSBY. Since when?

Mr. GRAHAM. Up to the present time.

Mr. CROSBY. Since 1867?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the date, but we keep the expenditure in every place in Canada. That is a lot of money.

Mr. CROSBY. It might be a lot of money if it had been spent last year, but if it has only been spent since confederation it is not very much. I presume that for every dollar you spent there you have got value.

Mr. FOSTER. Except the Henderson property.

Mr. CROSBY. The minister would not even admit that he did not get value for the Henderson property. But, I am not worrying about the Henderson property; I am worrying about getting fair play for Halifax as a part of the Intercolonial railway. The minister states that there is a machine shop there, and all the equipment necessary for the repair of cars and locomotives, and I want to know whether the minister would be in sympathy with the idea of taking a car from Halifax to Moncton to be repaired. I can quite understand the statement of the minister that they have made provision for construction at Moncton. I want to be fair to the minister, and I am sure he would be as fair to me, and if he has the facilities at Halifax to do the work I want to know if it would not be fair and reasonable to ask that it should be done at Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. No jealousy is allowed to exert any influence upon these matters, even if such a thing did exist. But, the practical work of the Intercolonial railway will have to be left to the men who are employed and paid to give us advice as to what should be done. I think it is fair to say that such repairs as are made in the roundhouse at Halifax, which is not what is known as a machine shop, as the Moncton one is, will be done at Halifax.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps it will satisfy my hon. friend from Halifax if the minister would send to Halifax to be repaired the sleeper that I had the misfortune to come from St. John in the last time I came. I think it would give a good deal of work for a good deal of time at Halifax to put that sleeper in good condition. Either the sleeper was very bad or the roadbed was very bad, and from what we heard from the minister yesterday I presume it would be rather presumptuous to blame it on the roadbed. So, we have to blame it on the sleeper and I would suggest that the sleeper be sent to Halifax, because in this way you will perhaps find it necessary to spend a good deal of money there.

Mr. CROSBY. I will second that motion.

New machinery for locomotive and car shops—$38,700.

Mr. RHODES. What is the nature of this machinery?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will read the list.

1 6-inch. track machine, 1 rivet and track bolt machine, 1 double car axle lathe, 1 cold saw to saw off to 12-inch diameter, 1 100-inch. wheel lathe, 1 48-inch. tire-turning boring mill, 1 42-inch. car wheel borer, 1 6-foot radial drill, 1 6-spindle arch-bar drill, 1 1,200 lb. steam hammer, 1 quartering machine.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to ask the minister whether this machinery is purchased by the purchasing agent of the Intercolonial railway or by tender.

Mr. GRAHAM. It has not been purchased yet.

Mr. RHODES. I would like to put in a plea in favour of having this machinery, so far as practicable, purchased from Canadian manufacturers. I believe the Prime Minister laid down the policy that we should build our own steel ships even though they should cost 33⅓ per cent more than on the other side of the water. Representations have been made me by people who should know, that a very large proportion of the new machinery at present in the new shops at Moncton was purchased in the United States, although a large part could have been purchased in Canada at very little, if any, increased cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. The great bulk is of Canadian manufacture. I agree with my hon. friend absolutely, and perhaps would go further. I have given instructions that we purchase Canadian machinery whenever possible, if anything nearly equal can be got. Some times we come across machinery which our experts require and which cannot be got in Canada, and we have to go outside. But the rule is to buy Canadian machinery whenever possible.

Mr. RHODES. I am pleased to hear this statement, because I was led to believe by competent machinery men that a large pro-

portion of our machinery had been bought in the United States. Of course a good deal was purchased before the present minister took the office.

Mr. CROSBY. Is the minister providing at Halifax such machinery as this item is intended to provide at Moncton?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not doing the work at Halifax for which this machinery is required, and consequently it is not required there.

Original construction, $800.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an item which has been in the estimates from time immemorial. It is for the purpose of meeting land damages and claims not settled.

Mr. FOSTER. What was paid last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think anything was paid out of it last year.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would suggest to the hon. minister a method of getting rid of this $800, and at the same time of doing an act of justice. In 1902, a man was killed in the Truro yards. He was working on the coal chutes when an engine started up and the man got jammed in a coal shed and was killed. The department offered the widow, who has ten children, $100 to settle the claim. Had it been the case of an ordinary company, the widow could have sued and got heavy damages. I would ask the minister to take this case into consideration and see if he cannot do anything. It is certainly one which calls for compensation. The name of the widow in question is Mrs. Charles MacNutt.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know anything of the details, but I should imagine that there was no legal liability and that the $100 paid was for two months salary usually given servants of the railway in such cases.

Mr. STANFIELD. If a cow were killed on the track, the government would give as much compensation as it did in this case. I am asking that something should be done in justice to this poor woman whose husband lost his life in the government service.

Pintsch gas apparatus, $6,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this considered perfectly safe apparatus or is it liable to cause fire? I notice that in the case of the terrible accident out west, two or more cars caught fire. Whether that was due to the Pinstch gas apparatus or not, I do not know. If anything can be done to prevent cars taking fire in case of accident, it ought to be done.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a matter to which I have given some little attention. In every train I go on and every car I enter, I first try to investigate the light. Railway experts tell me that outside of electricity, which at present seems impracticable for general use, the Pinstch gas is the safest light known.

Mr. DANIEL. What caused the cars to catch fire after the accident out west?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know, but that accident occurred in the day time when there was no light burning.

Mr. CONMEE. Was there not a stove?

Mr. GRAHAM. There may have been.

Mr. RHODES. Is this light safer than what is used by the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the same gas.

Mr. RHODES. In travelling by the Intercolonial railway, one cannot read at night. The Pintsch gas system installed on that line is not a good light, and many travellers take the Canadian Pacific railway in preference, because the light is better.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe there is an improved mantle on the Canadian Pacific railway, but we are seeking to improve the system on the Intercolonial railway. We have been studying the question of improving the lighting of the cars. It will make the cars lighter, but there is another feature that with the mantles the consumption of gas is not so great, so that it is an economy.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would like some light on this question of compensation of the widow of whom I have spoken.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know anything about the case at all, but I will go through the files and investigate if my hon. friend thinks I should. It has no doubt been dealt with by the Railway Department and the Justice Department before our day.

Mr. STANFIELD. The unfortunate part is that the accident happened in 1902 and before it was handed over to me it was outlawed. If the minister will allow me I shall send him a full statement and he can take it up.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Has the matter of the lighting of cars by electricity been carefully considered. I understand that it is expensive.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some individual cars are lighted by electricity—generating their own electricity as they move, but it is a bit unreliable, it is expensive, and makes the hauling of the car a little more difficult. It is really impracticable for general use on a whole train.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There is no doubt that as the cars are now lighted there is great danger from fire. In case of accident

where a car, pullman or otherwise, is thrown off the track, fires often occur from this cause.

Mr. GRAHAM. Experts tell me that very few fires can be traced to the Pintsch gas.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I do not know about that, but I think there have been cases where cars have been fired from the light. If there is any means of avoiding fires of this kind it is a matter that should engage the attention of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that is so.

Rivière du Loup—engine house, &c., $63,720.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a revote of an unexpended balance. The proposed outlay was $158,500, but that was reduced to $113,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that cover the whole expenditure for this work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Robinson's Crossing—subway at, $6,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to get rid of a dangerous level crossing at this particular point. Careful estimate makes the cost $5,040.

Mr. BARKER. On a public road?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is on a much travelled public highway in Nova Scotia.

Mr. RHODES. I asked the minister yesterday to have his deputy in passing through Amherst look into the question of a crossing there.

Mr. GRAHAM. We work in our department even more rapidly than that. We have written to get particulars and see if it will be feasible.

Mr. STANFIELD. I asked the deputy minister to look into a crossing at Densmore.

Mr. GRAHAM. The deputy tells me he has some notes, but he will look the matter up and let my hon. friend know.

Side ladders for box cars, $1,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Are not all the cars now equipped with ladders?

Mr. GRAHAM. You can only put the ladders on the cars as you get the cars in the shop, and this is about as many as we can get in during the year. It costs about $2.50 a car, and of course the side ladders go on all new cars.

St. John—to increase accommodation at, $46,150.

Mr. DANIEL. Where is that to be spent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Freight car repair shops, addition to freight sheds, steam heating for office, and granite paving for roadways around station. The expenditure to date at St. John by the Intercolonial railway has been $2,681,941.26.

Mr. DANIEL. Since confederation. That is about one-half the amount spent at Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. We are not a bit jealous of St. John, but I see here you are having repair shops put there. You intend them to repair cars at St. John and not take them to Moncton? That is exactly what I asked in regard to Halifax.

Mr. GRAHAM. While we call it a repair shop, it is only a rough building to enable light repairs to be made that cannot be made in the open.

Mr. CROSBY. Just so that St. John can get in out of the rain; that is all right.

Ste. Rosalie—improvements at, $8,500.

Mr. BARKER. Will that complete?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Sydney Mines—diversion, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the item to which my hon. friend from Sydney (Mr. Maddin) referred yesterday. He was evidently under the impression that we had not an item to provide for this. This is a diversion of some 8¾ miles. It is proposed to run the trains back from George river to Sydney mines. It will get rid of one of the worst grades we have on the line and also of a branch line. The expenditure last year was $2,500 but this year we intend to proceed more vigorously and are asking $100,000.

To increase accommodation and facilities along the line, $38,700.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide for an engine house at Blackville, a station at Little Metis, yards for feeding cattle at Ste. Flavie, a station at Cape St. Ignace, snow fences at several points, a track scale, $2,500.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. Although the hour is rather late, I would ask the indulgence of the committee while I make some observations which I think may properly be made on this particular item. According to a statement made by the minister recently he is giving some consideration to the providing of a remedy to the present system of prosecuting claims for damages against the Intercolonial railway by people living along the line—damages caused by fire, killing of cattle, &c. I understand that I cannot move an amendment at this moment, but what I wish to do is to make a suggestion for the avoiding of useless costs which are specially regrettable in claims for damages to small

amounts. I would sugggest the following amendment to the Government Railway Act, after art. 60:

60a. The action may be taken and decided before the court of the district or the county where damages occurred and having jurisdiction to the amount claimed.

The object of this suggested amendment is to relieve claimants from the necessity of paying law costs in excess of those allowed by the Exchequer Court. At present any one who has a claim of the character I have mentioned must either come to Ottawa himself or be represented by an attorney or by an agent, whose charges will, in most cases, exceed the amount of taxed costs allowed by the Exchequer Court, even should the claimant win his suit. The plaintiff has thus, under the present system, even when he wins his suit, to pay out in costs more than the court allows him; and as claims of this kind are very numerous all along the line, it seems to me that the government ought to provide some remedy to the present system, and I trust the hon. minister will take my suggestion into his favourable consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very pleased to have that suggestion from my hon. friend. The difficulty he points to is one concerning which I am endeavouring to get a satisfactory solution. What he suggests is part of what I have in mind, and the only thing to be decided is whether it can be satisfactorily worked out, as the matter is a little more difficult than it appears on the surface.

The only item left is the one we discussed yesterday with regard to Chatham. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) asked me about the right of way. We have not really purchased any property at all yet along the right of way. We had our man making certain valuations and have outside valuators going over his figures to see if they are approximately correct. If we cannot decide on a proper valuation, we will expropriate.

Mr. CROCKET. Were there two surveys through the town of Chatham?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Were both surveys made by the same engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM. They were both made under the direction of the engineer of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the government determined upon the route to be adopted?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect the plans in two or three days. For all practical purposes, I think the chief engineer has made up his mind as to what the route will be. We shall have to decide in a very few days.

Mr. CROCKET. The reason I ask is that there have been some property transfers taking place in Chatham within a very short time. I understand that one gentleman very prominent in politics there has purchased the old foundry property, anticipating that the government will require it. If the minister is not able to tell what location it is proposed to adopt, some people at Chatham seem to have ascertained the fact and have scooped some of the property the department will have to buy.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have tried to make it clear, and emphasize the point again that we are going to buy these properties irrespective of any transfers that may have been made, and will buy them at their proper value. If the owners do not consent to a fair value, we shall expropriate.

Mr. CROCKET. Have negotiations been had with the present owners of the property?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think an effort has been made to get the several owners of the property to name a price. That is the first step. Some of them have declined to name a price.

Mr. BARKER. I would remind the minister of our experience in the Halifax roundhouse property. The government sent down people to value the property there, and these people would not inquire what had been paid for property within thirty days.

Mr. GRAHAM. We try to bring our best judgment to bear on the opinion of the valuators.

Mr. BARKER. I mean more than judgment. Sitting here, your best judgment on a matter of that kind is not enough. I have found that, again and again, the valuators sent to look into the valuation of property, have declined to ask what a man had paid for the property, even if he had bought it within a month or so.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the valuator who has been sent down?

Mr. GRAHAM. The man originally sent was our own engineer, Mr. O'Dwyer. He has taken the preliminary steps. To make sure that his valuation is right, we will have other valuators check it. The public interest will be protected in every way. We desire to get the property at a fair value.

Mr. BARKER. I hope and expect so, now that you have a board. But it was not so a year ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely, if property has changed hands recently, the actual price paid is the best evidence of value, and it would seem that the best course would be to ascertain the facts concerning such transactions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that the safest way is for the government to expropriate the property, and then there can be no question. We intend to take all the precautions necessary, as we want to get full value. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked yesterday about the expenditure on the Canada Eastern. I gave that information last year. It is quite a long statement, and I hope he will not mind if I send him the number of the page on which it appears in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CROCKET. As to the Chatham diversion, the minister promised to bring down a plan. That can be seen at the department, I suppose?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, we have it.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The Naval Bill.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 3, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1910, and, in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Mr. FIELDING moved that His Excellency's message together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIAL.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the committee ordered by this House to investigate certain matters in connection with Mr. Lumsden's resignation as chief engineer of the National Transcontinental Railway be composed of seven members instead of five, namely, Messrs. Geoffrion, Macdonald, Clarke (South Essex), Wilson (Laval), Lennox, Barker and Crothers.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, if it is the intention to allow this committee to investigate the charges made by Mr. Lumsden of over-classification?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is the intention that the charges ordered to be investigated by the House shall be investigated.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Prime Minister did not state the other day definitely whether his resolution really referred to the charge of over-classification, as made by Mr. Lumsden.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I have not succeeded in convincing my hon. friend of what I meant I am afraid that anything I might add will not do so.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

BRANDON AGENCY.

Mr. LAKE:

1. How many persons are employed in the office of the inspector of agencies at Brandon?
2. How many days were they absent from the office during the period commencing 1st April, 1907, and ending 31st March, 1909, on duty and on leave, respectively?
3. How many days was the inspector of agencies absent from his office during the same period on duty and on leave, respectively?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. 3.
2. As the duties of the inspector are chiefly outside the office no account is kept of the period of their absence.
3. Answered by No. 2.

THE BANKING ACT.

Mr. BEATTIE:

1. Is it a fact that the Banking Act of Canada will expire shortly?
2. If so, has the government obtained any reliable information regarding the Banking Acts of other countries? If not, will the government endeavour to secure such information in the near future?
3. Does the government intend to allow that portion of the existing Banking Act to remain in force, by which the banks of Canada are said to issue nearly one hundred millions of dollars of currency; thereby making, as alleged, enormous profits, for which privilege the people of Canada do not receive one cent of interest in return?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. It is contemplated to provide a Banking Act during the present session. I cannot add anything to that statement at present.

PRE-EMPTIONS AND HOMESTEADS—ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What was the total acreage of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads sold in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, from the 1st November, 1909, to the 31st December, 1909?

2. What total amount of money receivable by the government does this represent in each province?

3. How much has been received by the government on account of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads in each of the provinces from the date of the passing of the Dominion Lands Act, 1908, to the 31st December, 1909?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Alberta, 153,600 acres; Saskatchewan, 287,360.

2. Alberta, $460,800; Saskatchewan, $862,080; exclusve of interest and entry fees.

3. Alberta, payments on pre-emptions, $50,114.75; payments on purchased homesteads, $82,515.30; Saskatchewan, payments on pre-emptions, $71,838.96; payments on purchased homesteads, $208,618.96.

Exclusive of entry fees (these figures show an increase over those furnished on the 18th January, in answer to Mr. Foster's question of that date, which is accounted for by the fact that the complete returns for the month of December, 1909, had not reached the accounts branch when the answer to Mr. Foster's question was prepared).

BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY BILL—TITLE TO STREAMS.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government leased to any person the right to take gravel from lot 379, on Coquitlam river, at New Westminster Junction, British Columbia? If so, to whom, for what period and on what terms?

2. Does the government claim title to the beds of non-tidal and non-navigable, except for canoes, streams in the railway belt of British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. No.

2. The government is advised that so far as the beds and banks of rivers in the railway belt in the province of British Columbia are Crown property, they are Dominion lands, and may be administered by the Department of Interior.

POST OFFICE, NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Is the post office at New Westminster about to be placed on the basis of a city office, with appointments to the staff directly from the government rather than from the postmaster?

2. If so, to whom should applications for employment be addressed, and what endorsement is required to secure consideration by the department?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. and 2. No. The office is, however, being changed to a semi-staff basis by which the salaries of the clerks will be paid by the department direct. Applications for employment should be addressed to the Postmaster General. The endorsement required is qualification and ability to do the work of the office.

STANLEY BARRACKS.

Mr. WALLACE:

If the Baby farm is to be sold, is it the intention of the government to buy other property in or near the city of Toronto on which to build a new barracks in place of Stanley barracks?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

SOUTH AFRICAN PATRIOTIC FUND.

Mr. WALLACE:

1. Has the government any control of the South African Patriotic Fund? If not, who has?

2. Have any complaints been made to the government that certain persons who are entitled to receive benefit from the fund, have not received any consideration?

3. Has the government any knowledge of how much was paid into this fund?

4. What persons have received benefit from this fund, and what amount in each case?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) No. (b) It is controlled by the Canadian Patriotic Fund Association.

2. No.

3. No.

4. The government has no information on this point.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada. He said: When, three weeks ago, I had the honour of presenting this Bill to the House, I entertained the hope that by this time my hon. colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr Brodeur), would be sufficiently restored to health to permit him to undertake the duty which now devolves upon me. To my deep regret, this hope has not been fulfilled. It is the misfortune of the House that it has to be deprived of the wealth of information, attention and care which had been accumulated by my hon. colleague in the preparation of this measure and for the exposition of the policy of which it is the expression, from its basic principle to the minutest detail. Perhaps the House will agree with me at the outset that it would not be amiss to cast a retrospective glance

upon the attitude which has been maintained up to the present by the two parties that now stand face to face on this question. In so far as the present government and the Liberal party are concerned, that question arose for the first time at the imperial conference of 1902. At the conference the subject of defence was very carefully discussed. The discussion revealed the fact—which indeed was not unnatural, which had often taken place before—that between the advisers of His Majesty the King in Great Britain and His Majesty the King in the dominions beyond the seas, there was a divergence of views. The Secretary of State for War requested—or I should say suggested—that the dominions beyond the seas should equip and maintain a body of troops for Imperial service, which, in case of war, would be turned over automatically to the war office. Some of the Dominions, through their representatives, to this agreed; others disagreed, among the latter being Australia and Canada. The Secretary for the Navy suggested—I don't say requested—that the dominions beyond the seas should contribute yearly to the maintenance and equipment of an imperial navy. Most of the dominions there represented to this agreed, but the ministers who represented Canada could not give their assent to this proposition. They gave expression to their views respectively before the conference, and embodied them in a state paper with which the House and the country have long been familiar. They recognized at once the obligation of Canada to relieve to a large extent in so far at all events as the means of Canada would allow—the burden which has hitherto been on the shoulders of the British tax-payer alone. They declared that as Canada increased in wealth and population it would go further in the matter of defence, and that in everything that we would undertake in that direction, whatever might be done would be done in co-operation with the imperial authorities, but always and ever under the control and responsibility of the Canadian authorities, in accordance with our right to self-government in this as in all other matters.

This was in 1902, nearly eight years ago, and for eight years this policy of the present government has been before the country. From this policy the present government has never deviated. This policy we affirmed again at the imperial conference of 1907. We affirmed it again last year in this House when the question came up for concrete and immediate action. This policy is embodied in the Bill now before this House, and by this policy the present government stands or falls. But fall we shall not. This policy is in the best traditions of the Liberal party. This policy is the latest link in the long chain of events which following the principles laid down by the Reformers of the old times, Baldwin and Lafontaine, step by step, stage by stage, have brought Canada to the position it now occupies, that is to say, the rank, dignity and status of a nation within the British empire. This policy is the full maturity of the rights asserted, the obligations assumed, by Canada, which inspired the imperial poet whom, after Canada had given a preference in her markets to the products of the mother country, he put in her mouth these proud words:

> Daughter am I in my mother's house,
> But mistress in my own;
> The gates are mine to open,
> As the gates are mine to close,
> And I set my house in order.

Sir, if we adopt to-day this policy, if we have put it in the form in which it is now before the country, it is because we lay it down that Canada is a nation, but a daughter nation of England. Such has been the strong and consistent course of the Liberal party from the time this policy was initiated.

And I may ask now, what has been the policy of the Conservative party? I think I am not offensive or unjust to the Conservative party when I say that upon this question their attitude has been what it is to-day—divided in counsel and divided in action. So far as this House is concerned, our policy more than once has received the assent, at least, the tacit assent, of the members of the Conservative party. It has been more than once reviewed or commented upon, but never challenged or dissented from. Outside of this House it has received the open commendation of the best and most experienced minds in the party. I am bound to say at the same time that it has been censured and criticised — severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party boast of their imperialism, who carry abroad upon their foreheads the imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty. Was it, Sir, because of the proddings of these very zealous and very officious men that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) brought up this question of imperial defence last year? I know not? But on the first day the House met my hon. friend gave notice of a motion designed to bring the matter in concrete form before parliament and the people. I understood the motion of my hon. friend to be an endorsation of the policy which we had always pursued, and in so understanding it I do not think I did him an injustice. I

meant to pay him a compliment. At all events, this is the motion he offered:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibilities and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great sea ports.

I repeat that as I construed the language of this motion—unless my hon. friend is a disciple of Tallyrand, who said that language had been given to man to disguise his thoughts—this meant nothing but an endorsation of our policy. It was so interpreted on the other side of the House. If we are to believe the tardy disclosure that we heard the other day from my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who told us that this motion created some stir in the ranks of the party, and that he at once had taken the position that he could not support it. Whether it was for this or some other reason, the fact is that my hon. friend from North Toronto, whilst he had been hasty in putting this motion on the notice paper, was very slow to move it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows exactly the reason why. Will he state it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know; perhaps my hon. friend will tell me.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend knows quite well that the motion was postponed from time to time because of conference with my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that my hon. friend—

Mr. FOSTER. Then my right hon. friend had better refresh his memory before he makes the statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pardon me—I have not finished my sentence. I am not sure that my hon. friend ever spoke to me about it, but if he did, it was simply to suit the convenience of the House, and not because there was on this side any opposition to his motion.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say there was.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Neither did I imply anything derogatory of my hon. friend because he postponed moving it. But the fact is that he postponed it for two months; I do not know what the reason was. My hon. friend suggested to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that if they agreed the matter could be put over.

Mr. MONK. My right hon. friend's memory is evidently deceiving him in saying I opposed the motion. I stated the other day that I thought it was inopportune.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and my hon. friend is still of the same mind. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier thought it inopportune, my hon. friend from North Toronto thought it opportune, many other members on that side of the House thought it opportune, and we on this side of the House all thought it opportune. Be this as it may, it is not worth while having any discussion on this point, why the motion was not moved at the first opportunity. The fact is that it was not moved for two months, until the 29th of March. At that time the atmosphere had become very much charged with electricity. A debate on the condition of the British navy had taken place in the Imperial House of Commons; attention had been directed to the armament going on in Germany, and the news had been flashed across the ocean that New Zealand had made the offer of a Dreadnought to the imperial government Then it was that for the first time we heard in this House the suggestion of an offer of a contribution to the imperial navy. That suggestion came from my hon. friend from North Toronto, but it came in a very mild and tentative manner. I will give to the House the very language my hon. friend used on that occasion. This is how he spoke:

To-day peril stands at the gateway. It is not for me to say how great it is, but I cannot brush it aside. To-day it impresses itself upon the greatest statesmen of the old country; to-day it appeals to Australia until public subscriptions are taken, and the government is being importuned to do even more than its settled policy to meet the emergency; to-day little New Zealand gives one Dreadnought and offers a second, and to-day Canada faces that position of peril and emergency. Let me say to my right hon. friend, that if after careful consideration he proposes to this parliament a means for meeting that emergency adequately, now and as it should be, whether it be by the gift of Dreadnoughts or the gift of money of this country, this side of the House will stand beside him, and stand for Canada in supporting that measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This was not very effective language coming from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), it was not as incisive as his sentences generally are. I do not think he had yet found his sea legs. My hon. friend spoke rather tentatively, simply suggesting a contribution, and adding that if we proposed it he would agree. We did not think it was advisable to depart from the policy we had laid down. We said that we would maintain the position we had taken, and after some consideration the

House agreed by a unanimous resolution upon the line of our policy of 1902, and in order that there may be no misgivings or misunderstandings upon that, in view of the cheers from the other side a moment ago, I shall once again read this motion:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

When this resolution was moved, and accepted by a unanimous vote, we believed that it would be binding upon the other side of the House as it is binding upon this side, but in this we made a mistake. We supposed when this resolution had been solemnly adopted, gentlemen on the other side of the House who had given their assent would at least have the small merit of consistency, but in this we were deceived. It never entered our minds that men on the other side of the House would go back on the opinion they had solemnly recorded. In this again we made a mistake. We paid them too great a compliment. The session had hardly closed when the terms of this resolution were attacked and challenged by gentlemen who had voted for it, attacked in the press, attacked in conversation with reporters, attacked on the public platform. Thus the summer went on, everybody, almost, on the other side spoke upon this resolution, discussed it and controverted it. The leader spoke, his first lieutenant spoke, the rank and file spoke, and they all spoke together and all spoke differently, their fiddles were singularly out of tune.

This was the condition of things when this House met on the eleventh of November and we were the witnesses of a curious spectacle. The men who had been so loquacious during the recess suddenly became dumb, the men who had discussed and debated this resolution, the moment they passed that bar yonder, the moment they came into this House at the time and place appointed for debate, became as mute as oysters. With a demure face and without a smile they told us they could not debate or discuss this question until they knew what had taken place at the conference at London, until they had all the papers, although during the recess, without knowing what had taken place at the conference, without having the papers, their nimble tongues had been wagging, wagging, wagging, in all the tones of the gamut, and in resonant cacophony. This sudden prudence and caution after so much extravagance of language did not deceive anybody; it was very transparent, although a somewhat clumsy attempt to hide the difficulty which, it had been apparent to all observers, would meet them as soon as they came together. When they were talking among themselves, one here and one there, one in Alberta, the other in Winnipeg, one in Toronto and one in Quebec, they could all speak differently, each one trying to appeal to the passions and feelings of his immediate audience; but when they came here they had to try to speak to the country, and speaking to the country, they had to speak something at all events like unanimous language. There was the difficulty. Hence the silence, hence the demand for papers, and in the meantime they met and deliberated. They deliberated in the morning, they met in the evening and again deliberated and the result of their meetings and their deliberations, if we are to credit the reports in opposition newspapers, although they are not always the most reliable, was the appointment of a committee with the object of trying to frame a policy, trying to reconcile the irreconcilable, trying to find a platform or something on which the bold lion from East Grey and the gentle lamb from Jacques Cartier could roar and bleat in unison. The task was rather a difficult one and how far the committee succeeded we know by what took place within three weeks, when this Bill was introduced for the first time. Three members of the opposition then spoke and all three spoke differently. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), if I understood his speech aright and I think I did, agreed to the principle of this Bill, but thought it did not go far enough. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)—there was no hesitation as to what he meant, he is opposed to this Bill and to everything of that kind. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson) also spoke; I do not know that I exactly apprehend his meaning, but

I think he was not so very sure of his ground and he wanted to have a referendum.

Sir, the result of all this is plain: on the other side we have a House divided against itself. At one end we have the negative extremists represented by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. On the other end we have affirmative extremists, those who desire a navy, but an imperial navy to be maintained by contributions from the self-governing dominions, those who believe that if we have a navy it should pass automatically, in time of war, under the jurisdiction of the admiralty; those who believe one project of a navy is not sufficient, that we should also vote an emergency contribution.

Sir, all these forms of opinion are simply different forms of a respectable, though misguided, imperialism. And it is to that view I wish to address myself at first. If I may say so,—if I may be permitted to speak of myself personally—I do not pretend to be an imperialist. Neither do I pretend to be an anti-imperialist. I am a Canadian, first, last and all the time. I am a British subject, by birth, by tradition, by conviction—by the conviction that under British institutions my native land has found a measure of security and freedom which it could not have found under any other regime. I want to speak from that double standpoint, for our policy is an expression of that double opinion. Let me say at once to gentlemen who differ from me, to those who pretend to be imperialists, to those who pretend that the British empire must be the first consideration that, in my judgment, the policy which we advocate, the policy which I have the honour to place before the House at this moment, is in better keeping with the true spirit upon which the British empire was founded, upon which it exists, and upon only which it can continue to exist. There is a difference of opinion upon this, and it is to this difference of opinion that I desire to address myself at this moment. This is not the first time in history that men who have conceived a new idea and have felt very strongly upon it have made a sad failure when they have attempted to carry it into effect. Peter the Hermit preached the first crusade, and his voice aroused Europe. Under the influence of his impassioned words, men abandoned their avocations and took up arms for the deliverance of the tomb of the Saviour from Mohammedan desecration. But Peter the Hermit proved to be a most unfortunate leader. Thousands of men flocked to his banner, but the eloquent preacher was unable to direct their movements. Under his direction, the expedition of which he was in command moved on from disaster to disaster. And so it is with the shortsighted men who believe that their policy of centralization would unite the British empire. Mark the difference. Their policy is centralization; our policy is autonomy. And let the tale of the past tell the tale of the future. Sir, of all the phenomena of history, I do not know any that carries with it a greater lesson than the existence of the British empire, composed of young nations scattered all over the earth, with no force binding them, but attached to the motherland simply by their own devotion. If, in the days of the Emperor Augustus, when Rome had reached the summit of her power, when after generations of conflict that empire had at last reached a condition of peace, when her dominions extended all over the basin of the Mediterranean, but when thirty legions were necessary and were kept moving all the time from one end of the empire to another to keep in subjection rebellious races—if then some one had said to the strong Roman statesmen of that day: The time will come when the small island of Britain, now the most distant of Rome's possessions, will itself establish an empire which will extend to the confines of the earth and will be maintained, not by force but by a new principle discovered by her people, the principle that government must rest on the consent of the governed, these great Roman statesmen would have laughed at the idea; they would have said: That is Utopia; force and force alone, can build and maintain an empire. If, without going so far back, we go no further back in history than the first year of the reign of the late queen when Upper Canada annd Lower Canada were in the throes of rebellion, if some one had then said the day will come when these two provinces, now kept in subjection and obedience by force of arms, will reject force, will become obedient and devoted subjects, and will extend the Dominion of the Queen from ocean to ocean—the answer would have been that it was the maddest of all conceptions. Well, Sir, this maddest of all conceptions has become the reality of the present day. And now, Sir, I pause to ask: What is the principle, what is the inspiration, what is the one thing that quelled rebellion in Canada, that brought Canada to the position that she occupies to-day ?—what is the principle, the inspiration which has made Australia what it is, which has made New Zealand what it is, and which to-day, in South Africa, torn by war only ten years ago, is building up a nation under the British flag? What is it, but the principle of autonomy, the principle of self-government? Yes, it was when Lord Durham, speaking from Canada, then still in the throes of civil war, said that the only manner in which the colonies could be kept loyal and

devoted was to give them self-government—it was then that the principle was announced upon which the British empire is founded. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the other day, in his speech on the first reading of this Bill, said that the British empire is of recent date. He is right, it is of recent date ; the date was the day when the principle was adopted of self-government for the colonies. Consider, for a moment, what would be the position of Canada if we had continued to be governed, as we were in 1837, simply by irresponsible ministers in Downing street—irresponsible, I mean, to the people of this country? Should we have content, devotion, loyalty? No, we should have to-day what we had then—discontent, and dangerous dissatisfaction. Sir, the history of all countries which have had colonies is the same, with the exception of Britain in the nineteenth century. In every case there arose in the colonies a class of different interests from that of the mother country; the mother country would not yield; discontent crept in and led at last to estrangement. Lord Durham was the first statesman of all the ages to recognize this truth. And he proclaimed it boldly. And bolder yet was the remedy he suggested—give to the colonies the same rights and privileges and powers as are exercised by British men in their own islands, the power to govern themselves according to their own rules and notions The conclusion of Lord Durham was so strong that there was nobody to combat it. But it was so much at variance with the practice of all the ages that there was no one to apply it. When the constitution of 1841 was ostensibly established upon the report of Lord Durham, there was no acknowledgment of the principle of self-government, and the instructions given by Lord John Russell to Mr. Poulett Thomson, the first governor under the new system, was to govern, not according to the views of ministers responsible to the people but in the manner directed by himself alone. And this is the manner in which Poulett Thomson carried out his instructions. In a letter to a friend he said:

> I am not a bit afraid of the responsible government cry. I have already done much to put it down in its inadmissible sense; namely, the demand that the council shall be responsible to the assembly, and that the governor shall take their advice, and be bound by it. In fact, this demand has been made much more for the people than by them.

It was not until there was sent from England a man as broad in genius as Lord Durham himself—Lord Elgin—that, with the assistance of Baldwin and Lafontaine, we had responsible government in this country. And it was from that date that the British empire started upon its triumphant march across the ages. I again pause to ask: When these great men, Durham, Elgin, Lafontaine and Baldwin, laid down the principle of responsible government in this country, did they set a limit upon its potentiality ? No, they launched it out, untrammelled and unfettered, to inclose the earth in a bond of union and liberty. They did not tell the people that the principle could be trusted for a certain distance, but that it would have to be abandoned the moment they came to the ultimate result of its operation.

But now we are told that in matters of naval defence we are to abdicate the principle of responsible government; we are told that we can have responsible government in everything else, we can make our own laws, we can administer our own affairs, and even have control of our land forces, but that in matters of naval defence we should have no powers of our own. I need not say that this principle is one to which we on this side of the House cannot agree. We are told that the only way in which naval defence can be carried on is by contributions to the imperial navy. I have to submit that this idea of contribution seems to me repugnant to the genius of our British institutions; it smacks too much of tribute to be acceptable by British communities. The true conception of the British empire is the conception of new, growing, strong and wealthy nations, each one developing itself on the line of its own needs and conditions, but all joining in the case of common danger, and from all points of the earth, rushing upon the common enemy. But, Sir, the point is no longer arguable. The point has been settled at the last conference.

Many and many a time upon the floor of this House, in the press of this country, we have been assailed, and our action has been compared with the action of Australia, who, in 1902, agreed to give a contribution for the maintenance of the imperial navy. But, Sir, let us look and see what has recently taken place in Australia. Australia has abandoned the position it took in 1902, and it has come to the position taken by Canada. Australia to-day, like Canada, is building a fleet of her own. And, Sir, there is something still more significant; it is not Australia which is paying a contribution to Great Britain for the purposes of the Australian navy, it is Great Britain which is paying a contribution to Australia for that purpose. Need I say more? All the best men, even in the ranks of the Conservative party, who have given any attention to this question have come to the way of

thinking of the present government. That veteran statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, once the pride and strength of the Conservative party, has given unqualified adhesion to our policy. Need I say more? If there is an imperialist of the imperialists now living, it is Lord Milner. Lord Milner was here last fall, and you will pardon me, Sir, if I recall to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite what were the opinions of Lord Milner upon this question. In Vancouver he spoke as follows:

I have said that Canada is not unique in being a great country. But she is unique in being one of a group of countries, which has a strong foothold in every corner of the world. That group only needs to hold together and to be properly organized, in order to command, with a comparatively small cost to its individual members, all the credit and all the respect, and, therefore, all the power and all the security which credit and respect alone can give a nation among the nations of the world. No doubt Canada, if she is to take her place in such a union, will have to develop, as I believe she will desire to develop, her own fighting strength. But not to a greater extent than would be necessary in any case for the adequate development of Canadian self-respect, or beneficial to the manhood of her people, and certainly nothing like to the same extent as would be absolutely inevitable if she desired to stand alone.

Again at Toronto he made use of language even more significant:

But no doubt the general position would be much stronger if all the self-governing states were to adopt the course which Australia seems disposed to adopt of creating a national militia, and laying the foundations of a fleet. And I for one should welcome such a policy, wherever adopted, not as affording relief to the United Kingdom, but as adding to the strength and dignity of the empire as a whole, its influence in peace as well as to its security in case of war.

It is not a question of shifting burdens, but of developing fresh centres of strength. For this reason I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and navy of the United Kingdom, though as evidences of a sense of the solidarity of the empire such contributions are welcome, and valuable, pending the substitution of something better. But I am sure that the form which imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take, and ought to take, the form at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union, is the development of their several defensive resources, in material and in manhood. I know that it may be argued—it has been argued—that individual strength would make for separation. But I have no sympathy whatever with that point of view.

Later he goes on:

The profession and technical, not to say the strategic, arguments for a single big navy of the empire are enormously strong, so strong that they might conceivably overcome, as they have to some extent overcome in the past, the political objection. But without wishing to be dogmatic on a subject which requires a great deal more careful study on all hands than it has yet received, I must say that, speaking as an imperialist, I feel the political objection very strongly.

If the self-governing states were going, under our present constitutional arrangements, merely to contribute to a central navy, whether in money or better still, in men and ships. I do not think they would take that interest and pride in the matter which it is essential they should take. They would continue, as now, absorbed in their local affairs, and, even if they felt their obligation to the empire as a whole, they would rest content to have discharged it by such a contribution. The contribution, under these circumstances, would probably not be large, but that is not really the weakest point in such a system. Its fatal weakness is that the participation of the self-governing states in imperial affairs would begin and end with the contribution.

Now, Sir, from all this I think I can safely conclude that the true policy which should be followed, even from the primary point of view of the British empire, is not a contribution, but the development of our naval strength, as we contemplate to do under this Bill.

This point being settled, I now come to another which has been a source of strong objection made against us, that is to say, who should have control of our navy. Upon this point I stated the other day that the parliament of Canada would have control of the navy, and would declare when it should or should not go into war. Upon this point we have been assailed right and left, assailed in Quebec and assailed in Ontario. We have been assailed in Quebec because there it is said that under no circumstances should Canada ever take part in any war of England, assailed in Ontario, because there it is said that under all circumstances Canada should take part in all the wars of England. The position which we take is that it is for the parliament of Canada, which created this navy, to say when and where it shall go to war. The other day when introducing this measure, I stated that when England is at war we are at war. In saying that I have shocked the minds and the souls of many of our friends in Quebec.

Some men tore their hair and their garments as if I had uttered blasphemy, as if I had uttered some new and fatal proposition which never had been heard before. The truth is that in making the statement that when England is at war we are at war, I was simply stating a principle of international law. It is a principle of international law that when a nation is at war all her possessions are liable to attack. If England is at war she can be attacked in Canada, in Australia,

in New Zealand, in Africa, in the West Indies, in India, and, in short, anywhere that the British flag floats. If France is at war she can be attacked not only in France but in her possessions in Cochin-China. If Germany is at war she can be attacked not only in Germany but also wherever the German flag floats. It does not follow, however, that because England is at war we should necessarily take part in the war ; I will come to that presently. But, as that proposition which I laid down has been challenged in some parts of my native province, may I be permitted to recall to the memory of the members of this House an incident which is hardly ten years old? In 1898, the United States declared war upon Spain. The object of the war was to free Cuba from Spanish domination. The Cubans had been insurgent for many years. The congress of the United States decided to come to their assistance and they sent an army to Cuba in order to help the Cuban insurgents to free Cuba from Spanish domination and they did free Cuba from Spanish domination. But, at the same time, they sent a squadron to the Philippine Islands in the Pacific, a Spanish possession, and took possession of those islands. The same thing can be done again. If England is at war we are at war and liable to attack. I do not say that we shall always be attacked, neither do I say that we would take part in all the wars of England. That is a matter that must be determined by circumstances, upon which the Canadian parliament will have to pronounce and will have to decide in its own best judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Can it be that there are men in this House so lost to the sense of responsible government that they will deny such a proposition? Let me illustrate my point by history. I appeal to history and I trust that I will be able to satisfy every hon. gentleman in this House. During the nineteenth century England has been more than once threatened with war. In 1861 she was nearly at war with the United States—luckily Providence averted it—when the United States ship 'San Jacinto' took from a British mail steamer the two delegates, Slidell and Mason, who had been sent to Europe as the agents of the southern confederacy. It was an act of war on the part of the United States, so interpreted and rightly interpreted, but luckily the United States gave way and war was averted, If war had been declared immediately we would have been drawn into it and it would have been our duty at once not only to defend our territory but to help England in that struggle. There was another instance. England was at war in the Crimea with Russia. For myself I do not hesitate to say that if that war were to be undertaken by England under similar circumstances, I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent that we should take part in any such war if conditions were the same as they were then. But, they are not the same now as they were then because at the present time we have British Columbia to look after and if war were declared between Great Britain and Russia our first duty would be to look after British Columbia which might be attacked by Russia from the Pacific ocean.

I am well aware that for expressing the opinion which I did express the other day and which I repeat on the floor of this House I have shocked many and many a good Conservative mind. I was accused of treason. Charges of treason are familiar to me. I have heard them in my own province time and again, and I have heard them in the province of Ontario. Charges of treason are very easily manufactured. The other day I was speaking in Toronto. I was saying that we were British subjects, subjects of His Majesty the King, and in speaking of the sovereignty of the King I called in the use of the word suzerain and in doing this I find that I shocked many a tender soul. I shocked the tender soul of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for one. When reviewing my speech a few days afterwards, he spoke as follows:

> Some rather foolish, even mischievous talk, has been indulged along these lines. It has been asserted that we have wrested our fiscal autonomy, our political autonomy, even our naval autonomy, from Britain, and the latest addition is practically our autonomy in our international relations. After this, all we have to do in bowing our knee and saluting King Edward is to call him, not sovereign, but suzerain. It is a mistake which creates false impressions.
>
> If these utterances are merely for the sake of rhetorical adornment they are but foolish. If, however, they are studied and serious, they are revolutionary. We cannot have absolute autonomy in any of these and remain in the empire.

Well, is my hon. friend in this, merely playing on syllables? If I had said 'sovereign' that was all perfectly loyal, but I said 'suzerain' and that smacks of disloyalty! Sir, I am sorry to say to my hon. friend that I rather rubbed my eyes when I saw his criticism. I do not pretend to be a master of the English language, but I think I know something of it, and I have always understood that if there is any difference between 'sovereignty' and 'suzerainty' it is merely a shadow and that it is used by men of greatest eminence indif-

ferently as applying to the same condition of things. I am sorry that I have to ask my hon. friend to brush up his classics. Would he be satisfied with the authority of Sir Walter Scott? Would Sir Walter Scott satisfy his literary aestheticism, or would he be satisfied that Sir Walter was sufficient of a Tory not to harrow his imperial soul? Let me ask my hon. friend, as I said a moment ago, to brush up his classics. Let me ask him to read again 'Quentin Durward' and he will find on the same page Sir Walter Scott using the expression 'sovereign' and 'suzerain' as applying to the same condition of things and to the same man. In the thirty-fifth chapter of 'Quentin Durward' my hon. friend will find that Lady Isabelle, addressing the Duke of Burgundy, uses this language:

'My lord, duke and sovereign,' said Lady Isabelle, summoning up all her courage, 'I observe your Grace's commands, and submit to them.' . . . 'My submission,' she said, 'only respected those lands and estates which your Grace's ancestors gave to mine, and which I resign to the house of Burgundy, if my sovereign thinks my disobedience in this matter renders me unworthy to hold them.'

Again:

'My Lord, 'she replied, still undismayed, 'I am before my Suzerain, and, I trust, a just one.'

I think that after this I can be freed from the hypercritical fastidiousness of my hon. friend both in point of philology and imperialism.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you let me see the 'Durward' extract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The great mistake which is made by those imperialists of the school of my hon. friend is to confound the condition which exists in Great Britain with that which prevails in the colonies. England belongs to the circle of nations which is known as the European concert, it is one of the four or five nations of Europe that are always watching one another. There are no public works to carry on there, and she can devote herself and her resources to armaments. But, the colonies are not in that condition. Our chief consideration is public works, to develop the resources of our country, and therefore I say that this is a mistake which should not be made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House? They are not the first ones to make that mistake. England made the same mistake in the eighteenth century when she tried to force the American colonies to contribute to her armament by taxation. They protested, but their protests were not heeded, They protested again and at last, though they were a loyal population, they were driven to distraction and they severed the tie that connected them with the mother country. Benjamin Franklin was one of the leaders of the movement in the colonies at that day, yet it is on record that he was a most devoted loyalist. He went to England to try and prevent the mischievous course which was being followed by the British government, but his visit was to no purpose. He was heard before the bar of the House of Commons. There the question was put to him whether or not, in case of war the colonies would contribute to assisting England and this is what he answered:

I do think they would so far as their circumstances would permit. They consider themselves as part of the British empire, and as having one common interest with it. They may be looked on in here (in London) as foreigners, but they do not consider themselves as such. They are zealous for the honour and prosperity of this nation; and while they are well used, will always be ready to support it, as far as their little power goes.

If I quote this language, it is not because there is complete analogy between the conditions which exist to-day in the self-governing colonies of Great Britain and that which existed in her American colonies of that day. There is no danger to-day that England would impose taxation on her colonies without representation, or that her colonies would go into rebellion, but I read this because there are men here, who, like the Bourbons, have forgotten nothing and learned nothing, and who do not appreciate the present conditions existing between England and her colonies.

There is another point to which I should give some attention. Great objection has been taken in the province of Quebec because there is in this Bill a provision, that, in an emergency the Governor in Council may call out the fleet and put it at the disposal of the War Office. Section 18 is in these words:

In case of an emergency the Governor General in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

Section 19 is in these words:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the naval service or any part thereof on active service, as provided in the preceding section, if parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of parliament within fifteen days, and parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

Great objection has been taken in my province because the power is there given the Governor in Council to call out the fleet before summoning parliament. It is said that this is a derogation from the rights of parliament and that parliament should exercise its control first. Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is obvious. The conditions may be such that the government may be forced to take immediate action. Parliament will be called immediately to approve or disapprove, but the conditions may be such as to compel us, without the loss of a minute, to avail ourselves of all our resources in order to come to the rescue of a part of the country which might be threatened. British Columbia, for instance, is exposed to attack from the Orient. I do not think there is any danger at present, because British diplomacy has secured us an alliance with Japan. Nor do I think there is any reason to fear an attack from Russia, because Russia has been crippled by her war with Japan. But all these things may change. Japan may cease to be an ally, Russia may recover her strength; and if we have to wait until parliament meets before we can act in conjunction with the British forces, the results may be disastrous. Circumstances may be such as to force us to do what Japan did—strike the enemy before the enemy strikes us.

I now come to the composition of our fleet. Here again we have not had the good luck to satisfy our friends opposite. It is said in the press, and no doubt will be repeated here, that we should have followed the advice of the admiralty and put a fleet unit on the Pacific ocean. Is there a man who will blame us because we said to the admiralty that we could not agree to put all our forces on the Pacific ocean, that we have also a large sea-board on the Atlantic and must divide our forces between the two. But we are asked why did you consent to such an insignificant navy as the one you propose. Well, we thought it prudent, for reasons I shall explain in a moment, to commence moderately. Two plans were proposed to us. One was to have a fleet of seven ships and another a fleet of eleven ships. The seven ships were to be composed of three Bristols and four destroyers; the eleven were to be composed of four Bristols, one Boadicoa and six destroyers. For the reason that we have to protect our coasts on the Pacific and the Atlantic and consequently to divide our fleet, we thought it better to have eleven rather than seven ships. In this we acted on the advice of the admiralty. Still we are blamed because we are not to have an armoured cruiser of the 'Dreadnought' type. Perhaps I can quote an authority on this point which will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. Those staunch imperialists will not be satisfied unless we have a 'Dreadnought' in our navy. While that view is respectable, it does not compare with the opinion of a competent man qualified to speak on the question. I am sure every one will agree that I could not quote a better authority than the old tar, Lord Charles Beresford—as good a sea-man as there is in the British navy. In an interview published in the 'Times' of last summer, Lord Charles Beresford said:

> His view of the situation was that our great Dominions could best help us, not by spending two millions on battleships to serve in British waters, but by making proposals for defending themselves.
>
> But he questioned the wisdom of their putting money into torpedo vessels and submarines and sending a large amount over here to build a battleship, the life of which was only twenty years, with luck, and might be only twenty months. If they invested two millions in home defence, and in having cruisers which could go out and protect their trade routes, he thought it would be a better investment than in helping to defend the shores of this country.

That, Sir, is what we are doing under this Bill. In another interview, also in the 'Times,' Sir Charles Beresford spoke as follows:

> For the colonies, cruisers are much better, as the idea of protecting Britain and weakening the defence of the colonies is all wrong.

These were the reasons which actuated us, and I think they are of such a character as will command the approval of this House.

With regard to our scheme, as I stated on the first reading, it is our intention to build eleven ships—four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers. I have given the character of these ships. It is our intention to have them, if possible, built in this country. That will cost a little more and we are prepared to pay a little more provided the difference is not extravagant. We intend to call for tenders as soon as this Bill becomes law, in order to see whether we can have this plant put in this country with the view of building these ships. I have been asked also how long it would take. I must say that I am not able to-day to give these details; I shall be better informed when we come to the committee stage. My colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has been unwell, and I have not been permitted, to have as many interviews with him as I could wish; but giving the matter the best attention that I can, I may say that it would take probably one year to complete a plant for building the ships in this country, and then probably four years to complete these eleven ships. As I said at the first reading of the Bill, the cost of these ships would be a little over $11,000,000, and the total cost of mainten-

ance, including upkeep of hulls, machinery, sea stores, fuel, interest and depreciation is estimated at $4,253,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand my right hon. friend clearly. Do I understand him to say that it will take one year to construct a plant which will be sufficient to build this fleet, and then four years to complete the vessels?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. The Prime Minister gives that to the House, of course, as sufficiently certain, to base the judgment of the House upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we really want.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It would be difficult to give more than an approximate idea upon that until we know exactly the proposition made to us. Then we can speak accurately. I give these figures as the result of the best inquiry I can make, no more.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the authority upon whom my right hon. friend depends?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give that to my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. We might get into the same difficulty we did in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. We want to avoid that, if possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is no doubt a laudable object; but I am sure that my hon. friend himself would not regret the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific even if it cost more than it has, and I think perhaps it will be the same with the navy.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have my right hon. friend take silence as consent. I am altogether opposed to that view. Can he tell what the plant which would be suitable to construct these vessels would probably cost?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not able to give my hon. friend more information than I am giving to-day, I am discussing this matter from a general point of view. When we come to the committee stage, I will endeavour to satisfy his curiosity as to these details.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? The interpretation clause of the Bill says that 'emergency means war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended.' If it requires one year to construct the plant and four years to construct the navy, what would he do if such an emergency arose in the meantime?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we are getting pretty far from the question we have in hand just now.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? It is simply this: does that plant include machinery for the manufacture of guns and machinery? —because seventy per cent of the cost of these ships consists of guns and machinery.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think ships and guns are different things. But I am only at present giving a general outline of the policy; I do not think the details are a part of the present discussion on the second reading of the Bill; they can all be asked for in Committee of the House. I may say that it is the intention of the government to establish a new department for this service—not under a different minister, but to have a deputy minister charged with the duty of looking after this naval expenditure and this naval construction. On this point I will give further explanations when we are in committee.

There is one other observation I should make. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the course of his observations the other day, if I understood him aright, whilst approving of the principle of this measure, thought it did not go far enough, but that we should also make an emergency contribution on account of the apprehended danger to Great Britain from Germany. I do not know whether I have apprehended rightly the position taken by my hon. friend on this point. I think I did. At all events, if he did not take this position, it has been taken very generally by the press of the country speaking for the other side of the House. For my part, I do not see any cause of danger to Great Britain at the present time. Let me say further that if Great Britain were engaged in such a contest, a wave of enthusiasm to assist her would sweep over this country and all other British countries. It is true, Germany is creating a navy, but I see no reason whatever for supposing that Germany is creating a navy for the purpose of attack or that England is increasing her navy for the purpose of attacking Germany. The fact is that all the nations of Europe at the present time are arming: England is arming, Germany is arming, France is arming, Austria is arming; but I do not believe any of these nations is arming with any intention of attacking its neighbour, but all are arming simply because they are afraid that they will be attacked by one of their neighbours. I was impressed by one statement of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. though I do not share in the conclusions which he implied from it. He said that if war came between England and

Germany, it would come within the next three or four years. I have not been able to get any satisfactory answer to this query: what is the reason for supposing that war from Germany is to come within the next three or four years? Germany commenced to build a fleet in 1900; but, as my hon. friend rightly said, no European nation, commencing with nothing, as Germany has done, can create a fleet inside of fifteen or twenty years. If that be so, it is not to be expected that Germany will be in a position to attack England within the next three or four years. What will be the position of things in 1912? The figures of comparison between the German and British navies will be as follows: The total tonnage of displacement of the British navy will be 20,000,000 tons, and that of the Germany navy 890,000 tons, a difference of 1,100,000 tons. Under such circumstances danger is not to be apprehended within three or four years. Moreover, I call attention to this fact. No one knows exactly what is in the minds of the German government, but everybody knows that between the people of England and the people of Germany there is no cause of war. They have always been fast friends so far back as contemporary history goes. In the Seven Years' war England and Prussia were fast allies; in the Napoleonic wars Germany and England were fast allies. And there is another feature; democracy is coming to the front in all the countries of the world, and all the democracy of the world is opposed to war, because it is well known that war falls upon the masses of the people. War may come, I do not say it will not come, but I was impressed by a statement made the other day by my hon. friend opposite. He stated that England had subsidized the nations of Europe time and again to enable them to defend their liberty or their independence, or their autonomy against foreign aggression. England subsidized Prussia under Frederick the Great, when Prussia was engaged against France and Austria in the Seven Years' war. England subsidized all the nations of Europe during the Napoleonic war when all the nations of Europe were defending their autonomy, their independence, against the Colossus. She was able to do so, why? Because, of all the nations of Europe, England was the nation which had spent least upon armaments. She had never spent any of her resources as the other nations did, purely upon her armies. she had extended her trade and her commerce, she had developed her resources, and in time of war she was able to assist other nations with money, which, as we know, is the nerve and sinew of war. Napoleon, in a fit of anger, called England a nation of shop-keepers. No higher compliment was ever paid to England than this, if it were meant as an insult, because it was these same shopkeepers who grappled with the Colossus and were able to bring him down and make him bite the dust. For Canada, for my country, I would desire no better title than also to be called a nation of shop-keepers—and to be able to supply the sinews of war.

Sir, up to this moment I have endeavoured to meet the arguments of those who in this controversy say that our policy is wanting in the duty which we, as part of the British empire, owe to England. But, Sir, there are also on the other side of the House those who arraign our policy because, as they say, we sacrifice by it the interests of our native land to the interests of the empire. There are the two extremes, they are there, sitting together, side by side, cheek by jowl, blowing hot and cold. I have endeavoured up to the present time to deal with those who blow hot; let me try a word now with those who blow cold. Need I say that this applies chiefly to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and to those who think with him upon this question. The policy which they have taken in the province of Quebec is that our attitude at the present time is uncalled for and unnecessary, that it is a surprise upon the country, that we never had a mandate to carry it on. Sir, is it possible that such an argument is heard in this House? Have these men been asleep for eight years? Are they Rip Van Winkles? Must I call their attention to the policy we laid down, which has been communicated to this House and to the people and which for eight years has been before the people of this country? At the conference of 1902 we laid this paper before the conference:

> At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well.
>
> On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of those men, and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.
>
> In conclusion the ministers repeat that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that those expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the tax-payer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears, and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers, so far as is consistent with the principle of local self-government which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

This paper has been before Canada for the last eight years, and we are told in the province of Quebec that this policy of ours is a new departure. Canada has progressed since 1902. We stated in 1902 that, as Canada advanced in wealth and population, we would advance in our defences. The population of Canada in 1902 was 5,400,000 souls; the population of Canada in 1910 is at least 7,400,000 souls. The revenue of Canada in 1902 was $58,000,000; the revenue of Canada in 1910 is at least $100,000,000. We, therefore, think that the time has come when, as was stated in 1902, we should take a step forward, and this is what we are doing. Upon this men can differ, although in my opinion they should not differ; but to tell us that this is something unheard of, a new policy, is simply trifling with common sense. But, Sir, that is not all. They took another position, that the naval service is absolutely uncalled for and unnecessary. Why do we ask parliament to vote for this naval service? It is simply because it is a necessity of our condition and the status we have reached as a nation. Do these gentlemen forget that, as I stated a moment ago, the revenue of Canada is to-day $100,000,000, and the population over 7,000,000? Do they forget that our country extends from one ocean to the other, and from the American boundary to the Arctic ocean, not on the map only but in actual and ever-increasing settlements? Do they forget that there are growing up on the Pacific coast, cities fast approaching in strength and wealth, eastern cities, that Vancouver to-day has a population of 100,000, that Victoria has a population of 40,000? Do they forget that Prince Rupert is also fast advancing to the front? Do they forget that we are going to build a railway from the interior to Hudson bay? Do they forget that we have gold mines under the Arctic circle? Do they forget that Canada is expanding like a young giant, simply from the pressure of the blood in its young veins? Are we to be told under such circumstances that we do not require a naval service? Why, Sir, you might just as well tell the people of Montreal, with their half million population, that they do not need any police protection.

But that is not all, there is something coming yet, and the position is taken by gentlemen on the other side of the House, speaking in the province of Quebec, that we are not to risk one man or one dollar for the maintenance, the preservation of British supremacy on the high seas. We took the position last year that we should endeavour and we would endeavour to maintain British supremacy on the high seas. We are told in the province of Quebec that we are not to risk one dollar or one man in order to carry out this object. Sir, I have only to say this, that this service will not be compulsory. No one on the other side of the House, no one in any part of the country will be bound to serve in this navy of ours. It will be the free will of any body who wishes to risk his life for his King—it is his privilege, and who will deny it to him? Those who object will not have to lift a finger if that fleet is called out. Their part will be simply to enjoy the security, the ease, the comfort, gained for them by the sacrifice of other and better men. We are told that we should not risk one dollar for such a purpose. Sir, if it be the will and wish of the parliament of this country that this navy of ours should engage in war, whose liberty will be affected by it, whose right jeopardized, whose privilege interfered with? This is a constitutional country and the majority have the right to speak and to dispose, and it is the part of the minority to agree and to accept, unless, of course, rights, privileges and liberties are interfered with; but there is no question in this policy that any man's liberty will be interfered with or his rights endangered.

There will be Canadians of French descent in that fleet. And if, which God forbid, this fleet should ever engage in war, my hope is—nay my certainty is—that these men will fight for the King of England, as their ancestors fought against the King of England when under the gallant Montcalm they repelled attack after attack, when, in the summer of 1759, they kept at bay for three long months on the rock of Quebec the flower of the British army and the flower of the British navy under the command of the young hero, Wolfe. Later, on this same rock of Quebec, they fought for the King of England against American invasion. And, still later, on the banks of the Chateauguay river, they fought under that true soldier, Salaberry, to keep the flag of England floating over their homes. All these many events have had their part in making my country what it is. And now, when I review the long conflicts between the French and the English, I follow the events without any sense of shame or humiliation. For history attests that my ancestors fought with all the prowess of their race, a prowess equal to that of their opponents; and, if they lost, they lost because England was at that time under the leadership of one of the ablest men of that generation, the first William Pitt, whereas France was under the influence of the King's mistress. My ancestors lost on that occasion, but it simply transferred their allegiance from one sovereign to another. They lost in the final the battle, but they did not lose anything of their independence, of their liberty, of their rights and privileges; and to-day the sun in his daily career

does not shed its light upon any people on the face of the earth enjoying more liberty than my fellow countrymen of French extraction. And my last words to the doubters, to the scoffers, is that freedom is worth fighting for and worth dying for.

But, Sir, these men will not be reached by any noble sentiment; perhaps we can reach them by appealing to their selfish interests; perhaps they will be found sensitive in their pockets if they are not sensitive otherwise. What would be the condition of Canada to-day, and of the province of Quebec in particular, if England were to lose the supremacy of the seas? Canada to-day is a prosperous country. Quebec is a very prosperous province; but is not that prosperity due to our trade with England? Let the market of Great Britain be lost—and it would be lost if the British supremacy on the sea were lost—and the prosperity of Canada and the prosperity of Quebec would be affected for years, if not for ever.

Sir, in the settlement of political problems it is very seldom that a solution can be reached on pure abstract principles. When a conclusion is arrrived at, it is reached by taking into consideration several points of view and a common ground has to be found upon which the different schools of thought, the different prejudices and passions, and the different shades of public opinion can be united. That is true everywhere, it is truer in Canada perhaps, than in any other portion of the earth. I stated a moment ago that it was the report of Lord Durham which had been the foundation of the system of local self-government. It may be considered a singular fact that the report of Lord Durham was received by the French Canadians of that day with pained surprise. The reason is known to those who have studied the history of that period. Friend of liberty as he was, broad as he was in his conceptions, farvisioned as events showed him to have been, Lord Durham himself did not appreciate the whole effect of liberal institutions. Coming to Canada at a time when the very atmosphere was reeking with rebellion, he formed a hasty judgment upon the French population of that day, which he expressed in vehement and somewhat haughty language. He thought they could not be reconciled to British rule, and stated in his report that the conditions were such that the two provinces should be united, so that French Canada should be ruled by the stern and relentless hand of an English-speaking majority. It is not to be wondered at that when the report was made known in Canada it not only caused, as I have said, pained surprise, but produced a feeling of injustice and wrong. Sir, I repeat that Lord Durham, friend of liberty as he was, did not realize the full force of free institutions, did not perceive, as other men perceived at that time—men who, on this subject had a better conception of things than he had—that there are principles superior to race feeling, that there are principles that can unite men or all origins in a common aspiration for the welfare of their common country. Such a man was Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine; such a man was Robert Baldwin. When the provinces were united, Lafontaine, speaking of the Act of union, characterized it:

> As unjust and despotic in this that it was imposed on us without our consent; in this that it deprives lower Canada of its legitimate number of representatives; in this that it deprives us of the use of our language in the proceedings of the legislature against the justice of treaties and the pledged word of the Governor General; in this that it forces us to pay against our consent, a debt which one had not contracted; in this that it allows the executive power to take illegal hold, under the name of civil list, of an enormous portion of the revenues of the country.

This was a severe arraignment, and unfortunately it was only too true, but what was the conclusion arrived at by Lafontaine? Did he say that the French Canadians should not accept the Act of union? No. Men there were at that time who immediately started an agitation for the repeal of the union, and those men were joined some years afterwards, when he came back from exile, by Papineau, a strong man, an eloquent man, a man of intense nature, and whom the very intensity of his nature always carried beyond the point into impracticable conclusions. Lafontaine was a different man, he was a broad man, he understood the situation. The Act of union was not satisfactory to his fellow-countrymen, he thought it was an injustice, but he accepted it, because principles there were by which every injustice could be rectified. It is upon those principles, Mr. Speaker, that we rely. In the address which I have just read, addressed to the electors of Terrebonne, he continued as follows:

> The reformers in the two provinces are an immense majority. . . . Our cause is the same. The interest of the reformers in the two provinces is to meet in the legislative ground, in a spirit of peace, of union, of unity, of fraternity. Unity of action is more than ever necessary. I have no doubt that the reformers of Upper Canada, feel, as we do, the need of it, and that in the first session of the legislature, they will give us unequivocal proof of it, which, I hope, will be the pledge of a confidence both reciprocal and durable.

Sir, in these noble sentiments he found an auxiliary in that other great and true Canadian and British subject, Robert Bald-

win. The confidence which he had looked for, he found; it turned out to be as he expected. It was not only reciprocal and durable. Above all it was fruitful. That policy obtained for the French-Canadians the restoration of the rights of which they had been deprived by the act of unions; it removed the dissensions, which up to that time, had rent the land; it introduced amity and concord among the different races and branches of the Canadian family; it established a permanent and ever-growing prosperity; it increased loyalty to the Crown and brought it to its highest pitch of enthusiasm and devotion; it brought up Canada, step by step, stage by stage, to the high position which it occupies at this moment; and as I said at the beginning, so I say in conclusion, this is the last and crowning effort of the policy which was then happily inaugurated. Sir, we must advance, we cannot remain stationary. We must advance. To remain stationary in this age is to retrograde; we must advance. And again on this occasion, as in the days of Lafontaine and Baldwin, we appeal to moderate men in all parts of the community. We appeal as they did appeal, in a spirit of amity, of union, of fraternity; we appeal, as they appealed, in the highest conception of the duty which we owe to our country and to the mother country. It is the tradition of these great men, which is our supreme inspiration to-day in turning this page of the history of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I join most sincerely in the regret which has been expressed by the Prime Minister at the continued illness of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which prevents him from addressing the House upon the second reading of this Bill. However, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has taken up that task. He has addressed to the House a very long speech, more than three-fourths of which had absolutely nothing to do with the subject which is now occupying the attention of the House and of the country. The right hon. gentleman seems to think, for some reason, that this is the year 1837. This is not the year 1837, and we are not engaged to-day in a discussion as to whether this country shall have autonomous rights and privileges. That question was settled 75 years ago. It is significant that when my right hon. friend finds himself in circumstances of peculiar difficulty with his own party, he always goes back to the days of 1837, and quotes to us, not only from the speeches of Lord Durham, but from the eloquent orations of Mr. Lafontaine and Mr. Baldwin. It is an old piece of tactics on the part of my right hon. friend, and I sincerely condole with him to-day in the circumstances in which he finds himself. Why, Sir, he told us in the first place, that he had an absolutely united party behind him; and then, not very long afterwards, we found him dealing at great length with criticisms which had been made upon his course in the province of Quebec, and presumably from members of his own party.

The right hon. gentleman has seen fit to introduce a great subject most profoundly affecting, not only Canada, but the whole empire, in a highly controversial and partisan spirit. He has indulged in what he calls a retrospective glance, accompanied by observations more or less dignified as to the supposed divisions in the ranks of the Conservative party. Well, Sir, there is no attempt to gag any one in the Conservative party, and there never will be, I hope.

But my right hon. friend has invited some remarks which otherwise I would not have felt impelled to make to-day; he has given us a retrospective glance, but his retrospective glance does not go back to some periods that perhaps he might be well inclined to forget, and he has conveniently forgotten them to-day. He speaks of criticism from the province of Quebec. Sir, I venture to tell him this, that if he has received any criticism from men who, in the past at least, have been his followers in the province of Quebec, that criticism and that feeling are due to himself more than to any other man in Canada. A retrospective glance seems to suit the humour of the right hon. gentleman to-day. Well, Sir, what was his own aspiration in the days of 1891 and 1892? His teaching in regard to this matter in the province of Quebec was summarized in his own hearing, in this House, only three years ago, by one of his own followers, and it was in words which are to be found in 'Hansard' of the 29th of November, 1896. It is the language of Mr. Bourassa, a disciple and follower of the right hon. gentleman; and here is Mr. Bourassa's language, which was not called in question by the right hon. gentleman at the time it was uttered:

> Well, sir, what was the language of Mr. Laurier in Boston in 1891: that Canada would never consent to imperial federation even on commercial lines alone, because the consequence would be the participation of Canada in British wars, and Canada would never consent to participate in British wars.

Was that or was that not the teaching of my right hon. friend in 1891 and 1892? Does he now deny that summary of his position which was given by his own follower in this House and which was not denied by him at that time? Well, Sir, we may go on to a little further retrospect since my right hon. friend is anxious for retrospects.

Here is his own language recorded in the pages of 'Hansard' and I am anxious to observe whether hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who applauded with such vigour the speech just delivered will applaud the words which I shall proceed to quote, used by the right hon. gentleman as the leader of the Liberal party in this country, which,, as he declares has an absolutely consistent record in this matter:

I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence, but, whenever the day comes, it must come by the consent of both countries, and we shall continue to keep the good feeling and the good-will of the mother land. If we are true to our record, we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees, and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

Then, further, in the course of the same remarks——

An hon. MEMBER. What date?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 'Hansard' 1892, page 1142. If any hon. member desires to examine the remarks of the right hon. gentleman he will find them there and further at page 1143:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

As he has invited controversy with respect to the matter, although I had hoped that he would have elevated the discussion somewhat more above controversial lines. I have to tell him that in my judgment, since he has held the reins of government, British diplomacy has more than once got this country out of difficulties in which it has been involved by the blundering of himself and his colleagues. Further, at page 1144, since my right hon. friend desires a retrospect, I find him using this language on the same occasion:

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) no doubt would prefer an English shilling to a Yankee dollar; but for my part I am differently constituted. I am ready any day, whether I am charged with annexation or not, to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling. . . . I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

Well, my right hon. friend may have recanted that opinion. I am not aware that he has ever publicly recanted that aspiration and it would seem to me, having regard to some of the provisions of this Bill that he has not, and, if I may indulge in the tactics of my right hon. friend, rumour reaches us from some sources in the country that this very measure now presented to the House in so eloquent a speech is being held out as an important step in the direction of that independence which was at one time at least the aspiration of my right hon. friend.

Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman declared to us that he has been told from some source in criticism of this measure that aid should be given by Canada to the mother country in respect of the naval defence by means of annual contributions. I have already expressed my opinion on that point, and as I spoke in this House at great length on the first reading of this Bill I shall be enabled to curtail my remarks to-day. As far as I am concerned, while the system of annual contributions might be best, and, no doubt, would be best from the purely strategical standpoint, I firmly believe that no such system could be adopted, but that eventually and permanently the basis upon which Canada must contribute to the defence of the empire will be by employing our own material, our own men, our own resources and the skill of our own people. But, Sir, we have to consider to-day some of the propositions of the government not only as embodied in this Bill, but as embodied in the speech of my right hon. friend. He told us on the first reading of this Bill that Canada must be at war when the empire is at war. Any man who has the slightest acquaintance with international law knows that that is absolutely the case. Yet, my right hon. friend has somewhat receded from that opinion to-day, because he has told us that under conceivable circumstances the rest of the empire might be at war while Canada was at peace. Such a proposition is absolutely impossible. So long as Canada remains in the empire, Canada is at war when the empire is at war. So long as the English flag floats above Canada, Canada is at war when that flag is attacked. The moment a shot is fired or a blow is struck at that flag, Canada is at war with the nation or country which fires that shot or strikes that blow. In view of the fact that the right hon. gentleman recedes, as I understood him to recede to-day, from the position which he took on the first reading of the Bill, we must understand that some very strong compulsion has urged him to take that course, and that difficulties within the ranks of his own party have compelled him to recede from what was in the first place the true and correct declaration of the position of this country. I shall not stop to dwell upon the argument of my right hon. friend based upon the authority of that great constitutional work, Quentin Durward, as to the exact similarity of meaning between sovereign and suzerain. Every one knows that the term 'suzerain' is a term which has come down to us from the old feudal days. I have not had an opportunity of examining the book, but I would not be very much surprised to find that my

right hon. friend, in consulting this eminent constitutional work, has, after all, misread it and that its authority might be turned against him.

Let us look for a moment at the position of affairs to-day. The question which we have to consider is undoubtedly a very important one. It is the question of organizing the forces of the empire for defensive purposes in naval warfare. The question which is before the House to-day is simply as to whether the proposition as embodied in the policy of the government and as embodied in the Bill is one which can fairly recommend itself to the people of the country. In the first place, my right hon. friend has referred to the resolution of March, 1909. I distinctly understood from the clear terms of that resolution that any proposal to this government should follow the suggestions of the admiralty made in the year 1907, and I say without the slightest hesitation that in the most important respect of all, the control of the naval forces of the empire in time of war, the Bill of the government absolutely departs from the suggestions of the admiralty and therefore absolutely departs from the resolution unanimously agreed to in this House in 1909. What was the suggestion of Lord Tweedmouth, First Lord of the Admiralty, on that occasion? The suggestion—indeed it was more than a suggestion, it was an absolute declaration—was that, so far as the naval forces are concerned, there must be unity of control in time of war. It does not require experience, it does not require naval knowledge to understand that in time of war the whole integrity and future of its empire may depend upon that unity of command and control. What did Lord Tweedmouth say in his address to my right hon. friend and the other delegates? He said this:

I have only one reservation to make, and in making it I ask that, as we have proved ourselves successful in the past, you should put your trust in us now. The only reservation that the admiralty desire to make is, that they claim to have the charge of these strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner to resist atack and to defend the empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas. We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence. We want you to give us all the assistance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars; we gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time, if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Could there be anything more definite, specific or emphatic than that declaration. But that is not all. Let us take the declaration of Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty at the recent defence conference to be found in the English state paper brought down, pages 22 and 23:

If the problem of imperial naval defence were considered merely as a problem of naval strategy, it would be found that the greatest output of strengh for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and unity of command. In furtherance, then, of the simple strategical ideal, the maximum of power would be gained if all parts of the empire contributed, according to their needs and resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

Further on he said:

If the fleet unit maintained by a Dominion is to be treated as an integral part of the imperial forces, with a wide range of interchangeability among its component parts with those forces, its general efficiency should be the same, and the facilities for refitting and replenishing His Majesty's ships, whether belonging to a Dominion fleet or to the fleet of the United Kingdom, should be the same.

And I especially invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this:

Further, as it is a sine qua non that successful action in time of war depends upon unity of command and direction, the general discipline must be the same throughout the whole imperial service, and without this it would not be possible to arrange for that mutual co-operation and assistance which would be indispensable in the building up and establishing of a local naval force in close connection with the Royal navy.

I also invite the particular attention of my right hon. friend to what follows:

It has been recognized by the colonial governments that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general directions of the admiralty.

Not only in 1907, but also in 1909 we have the clearest and most specific statements from men who know infinitely more about these matters than any man in this House, that unity of control and unity of command in time of war are absolutely essential to successful action. There cannot be any question about that. There are many continents in the world, but only one sea. That sea is a great highway. It is the highway of British commerce. It is the highway of the commerce of Canada because the greater part of our exports are sea borne. It is the highway of the world and especially of the British empire. That sea is one, and it would be absolutely impossible for the different local units of the empire to cooperate successfully under any circumstance, in time of war, unless there was absolute unity, command and direction.

If the right hon. gentleman had spent more time on section 18 of his Bill, I think he would have better justified the expectation of this House. Clause 18 is as follows:

18. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the naval service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the naval service.

What is the meaning of that? The plain and direct meaning is that the Governor in Council may refrain from exercising the discretion which is there provided for. If the government should so refrain, what will be the result? Are we to be face to face with the condition which the hon. gentleman says is demanded by our autonomy—that Great Britain being at war we shall declare that we are not at war and that our fleet shall not take any part in it. If the clause does not mean that, I would like to know what it does mean. So far as I can understand the English language, it means just what I have said. I have just this to add, that when Great Britain being at war, the Governor in Council shall declare that our fleet shall take no part in it—and they may do that simply by inaction, by standing still, by making no order in council—I say that when that occasion comes then, such inaction or declaration will amount virtually to a declaration of independence.

I have the further objection that unity of organization is not effectually provided for. The Prime Minister of Great Britain used this language in announcing the results of the Defence Conference:

It was recognized that in building up a fleet a number of conditions should be conformed to. The fleet must be of a certain size, in order to offer a permanent career to the officers and men engaged in the service; the personnel should be trained and disciplined under regulations similar to those established in the Royal navy, in order to allow of both interchange and union between the British and the Dominion services; and with the same object, the standard of vessels and armaments should be uniform.

As a matter of fact, there is no unity of training. The men to be engaged in the Canadian navy are to be three-year men; and, if I understand rightly the lessons I have endeavoured to learn in regard to naval training, it takes at least six years to make a sailor efficient in these complicated and mighty engines of war used on the high seas at the present time. So there will be no unity of organization, and apparently there is to be no unity of training, because the officers are to depend for their training, not so much on the British service as on the schools which it is proposed to establish, and I have not observed any very distinct provision in the Bill as to the character of the training which is to be given in those schools.

Now, I would like to read one other extract upon that point. The admiralty most distinctly recommended a fleet unit. It declared:

In the opinion of the admiralty, the Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, in capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

The fleet unit to be aimed at, should, therefore, in the opinion of the admiralty, consist at least of the following:—

1 armoured cruiser (new 'Indomitable' class) which is of the 'Dreadnought' type.
3 unarmoured cruisers ('Bristol' class).
6 destroyers.
3 submarines, with the necessary auxiliaries, such as depot and store ships, etc., which are not here specified.

Such a fleet unit would be capable of action not only in the defence of coasts, but also of the trade routes and would be sufficiently powerful to deal with small hostile squadrons should such ever attempt to act in its waters.

Then in paragraph 11:

As the armoured cruiser is the essential part of the fleet unit, it is important that an 'Indomitable' of the 'Dreadnought' type should be the first vessel to be built in commencing the formation of a fleet unit.

On that I would like to remark that Australia accepted at once the proposal for the establishment of a fleet unit and did it under the conditions which I find set out on page 26 of this blue-book in the following words:

The Australian fleet unit should form part of the eastern fleet of the empire to be composed of similar units of the Royal Navy, to be known as the China and East Indies units respectively and the Australian unit.

So that Australia has not only carried out the recommendations of the admiralty in that regard, but has gone further: it has distinctly declared, if I may rely on the blue-book, that its fleet unit shall be a part of the eastern fleet of the empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Will my hon. friend look at the bottom of page 25, where it is said:

When placed by the Commonwealth government at the disposal of the admiralty as in war time, the vessels should be under the control of the naval commander-in-chief.

It would seem as if the commonwealth government had the power to place them under the control of the admiralty or not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as that is concerned, my position is as distinct as I can make it. I say that any proposals for the establishment of a naval unit of

the imperial navy will be absolutely useless, and worse than useless—I would go further and say dangerous—unless it is expressly stipulated that in time of war there shall be but one navy under one central command and direction. We might repeat in the British navy the history of the 'Invincible Armada,' which was composed of five or six different Armadas of distinct organization, different training, different equipment; and we know what the result was in that case. My right hon. friend referred, for some reason that I could not comprehend, to the adventures and crusades of Peter the Hermit. I could not see the exact line of argument by which he introduced Peter the Hermit, or a great many other things, into his speech; but he could not have given a more apt illustration of the argument I am making. What was the cause of the failure of that crusade? The fact that it was composed of a heterogeneous assemblage of men of different countries, without any unity of organization, without any unity of training, without any unity of command; and the same result which befell the crusade of Peter the Hermit would be likely to befall the navies of the empire if they should be organized on any such basis as that which my right hon. friend has proposed to the House.

What further does the right hon. gentleman propose? He proposes that we should build a certain number of cruisers of the Bristol type and of some other type. What will these cruisers amount to as an effective fighting force in time of war? At the highest you might say they will be commerce protectors. I do not know that you could say that. They might be useful as scouts, or be of some advantage to this country in protecting our fisheries. But what would be the result in time of war? I will tell my right hon. friend what the result would be. An Australian or New Zealand Dreadnought would be called on to protect these Canadian cruisers from attack by the enemy. Surely that would not be a very proud position for the people of Canada to occupy in the day of stress and trial.

As far as any effective fighting force is concerned, it is not supplied by any proposals of the government. I believe the empire is confronted with a serious situation. I gave my reasons for that belief a few days ago, and I will not repeat them to-day. I believe that the duty of Canada is not to be occupied in shaping its policy to meet conditions which are largely the creation of my right hon. friend, but rather to do something immediate and effective in order that we may at least stand side by side with the other great dominions of the empire in the day of trial.

Sir, I have another observation to make.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

We all did agree, at least I did agree, to the resolution of March, 1909, but every man in this House who since that time has given the slightest consideration to this question will realize that when we talked about the speedy organization of a Canadian naval unit of the imperial navy —because that is the way I prefer to express it—we are speaking of something that cannot be brought about in ten, fifteen or twenty years. Why, my right hon. friend to-day has even a vaguer idea of what he proposes to do than he had in respect of the National Transcontinental railway. I did not like to interrupt him; he was being interrupted a good deal; but there was one question which I would like to have put to him, and I shall take the liberty of putting it now. He says these vessels are to be built in Canada. I would like to know whether they are to be built in a private shipyard or in a government shipyard? Has the government come to any conclusion in regard to that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In a private shipyard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I will venture to say that when my right hon. friend intimates that a private shipyard capable of constructing these ships and of providing the guns, armament and all the equipment which are the most essential parts of such war ships, can be established in this country in one year, he convinces me that he has not given very much consideration to the subject. I venture to suggest to the right hon. gentleman that at the very earliest possible moment he should revise his estimate in order that he may not incur criticisms of the character which have been justly made in this House with respect to his predictions concerning the National Transcontinental railway, to which I have just alluded.

I was referring to the resolution of 1909. We spoke about a speedy organization of a Canadian naval force. I do not believe that that force or that service can be brought about, can be effectively organized, in less than 15 or 20 years, probably it will take longer. I say to my hon. friend that inasmuch as he cannot do that in less than the time I have mentioned, there is another consideration which I would like to bring to his attention. My hon. friend has some recollection of the attitude he took in 1899 with respect to the participation of this country in the South African war. In the 'Globe' of October 4, 1899, he expressed himself in this way:

As I understand the Militia Act, and I may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops, to be used to fight for Canada's defence. There is no menace to Canada, and

although we may be willing to contribute troops I do not see how we can do so. Then again how could we do so without parliament granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words we should have to summon parliament.

There was not a very great delay before my hon. friend altered his opinion in that regard, but I would like to interject this observation that a delay such as that which then occurred might spell ruin to the empire if it took place with regard to the employment of our naval forces. I venture to recall to my right hon. friend the reason which he gave in a speech delivered at Sherbrooke, in the province of Quebec, in the month of January, 1900, that was after he had reconsidered his attitude with regard to the participation of this country in the South African war. His words are as follows:

We believed it our duty as a British colony to take part in the war, and permit two thousand Canadian volunteers to enlist in the English army and to fight for the mother country. We did it because we believed it our duty to do it, in response to the unanimous sentiments of the people of this country. We are a free country; ours is a constitutional government, and our duty is to put into execution the popular will, and the moment the popular will was known to us we had but the duty to discharge, and we discharged it of our free will. There was no power to constrain us to act as we did; but in the plenitude of our legislative independence we had the right to reply to the popular will.

I would invite my right hon. friend to-day to respond again to the popular will, and the will of this country to-day is that these different proposals ought to be submitted to the people and the people ought to be permitted to pass upon them before any permanent policy of this kind is engaged in. I think there is a great deal to be said in favour of that course. I am as strong as any man in this country in the belief that it is the duty of Canada to participate upon a permanent basis in the defence of this empire and to do our reasonable share in that regard. But I say that to attempt to force a policy of this kind upon the people of this country without giving them an opportunity to say yea or nay with regard to it, would be one of the worst mistakes that could be made by any man who really favoured that policy. If my right hon. friend was able, in very short meter indeed, in 1899, to respond to the popular will, there seems no reason he should not to-day be equally ready to respond to the popular will upon this question. What the people of this country want, as far as any man can judge who has observed the currents of public opinion, what the people of this country desire, is immediate and effective aid to the empire, and to have any proposals of a permanent character very carefully considered and matured, as they ought to be considered and matured, before any such policy is embarked upon, because there are a great many considerations that must be taken into account. There is the consideration, and not an unimportant one, to which I alluded, in speaking on this subject on the 12th of January, as to the voice of this country with regard to matters of international concern. These matters must be dealt with and considered by the great dominions of the empire before any permanent basis of co-operation by those great dominions in the naval defence of the empire can become thoroughly established. That is a question which must be taken into consideration and must be faced.

Inasmuch as the proposals of the government are weak and ineffective, as they afford no immediate aid and assistance, as they could not be carried out for ten or fifteen years so as to become efficient, I say it would be the proper course to mature more thoroughly those proposals, to take up all matters that concern our relations to the empire in respect to co-operation in imperial defence, and in the meantime to do that which, after all, is the most important thing, stand side by side with the mother country under the conditions which confront her at the present time. The needs of the empire are before our very eyes to-day. We have the splendid example of the other great dependencies of the empire. Are we of less faith and of less courage than they? Shall an Australian fleet and a New Zealand Dreadnought defend the flag which floats above us while our little cruisers are fleeing helpless before an enemy? I do not so understand the spirit, the intention, or the desire of the Canadian people. I believe they are ready to assume their full share of meeting any peril that shall assail the empire, come when it may. Their hearts and their hands are as strong to will and to dare as were those of their fathers before them, and I do not doubt that, as my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has eloquently expressed it, the men of French descent in this country will be as prompt and ready to do their share with the English speaking citizens of Canada, as they have proved themselves in days gone by. Thus, let our aid be prompt and generous, so that it may bring to the motherland the assurance not only of material support but of a courage, a faith and a determination which shall proclaim alike to friend and foe that whether in peace or war, the empire is one and undivided.

I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and, in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war, are ill-advised and dangerous.

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think those of us who have given some attention and some study to the important matter which is now submitted to the House, will readily admit that never, in this or any other parliament since confederation, indeed I might say never at any time since we have possessed the privilege of self government in this country, has any question of this magnitude and of such vast consequences, been discussed in the free assemblies of this country. The Bill in itself outside of section 18 does not present to my mind any very striking feature; it is the extension, if I may use such an expression, of legislation which we have had in a diminished form upon our statutes ever since the mother country called upon us to assume our proper share of the burden of defence. Therefore, I think one may say with the exception I have just pointed out, this legislation is not in any sense extraordinary. But it must be viewed, I submit, under all the surrounding circumstances, and particularly, as a first step towards the execution of a policy or what I called at another stage of this Bill, an agreement arrived at with the imperial authorities. At that time my right hon. friend stated that what he was endeavouring to carry out was not an agreement but a policy, and that statement was covered by the applause of those who sit behind him. But I see no material difference between the two names, what we are doing now, as I understand it, is carrying out a policy of defence, that was laid down at the last imperial conference held during last summer. It therefore seems to me of the utmost importance that we should all understand clearly what is the course upon which it is sought to have the country embark. My right hon. friend might have given that to us in a very few words this afternoon; but so far as I was able to apprehend the meaning of his speech, he confined himself, as he usually does, to brilliant generalities, speaking with the eloquence that characterizes him. But is this a proper occasion, I would ask, on which to deal in generalities? Was it not more fitting, at this important stage of the measure when we are asked to affirm the principle, that he should leave aside those historical allusions to the greatness of the empire, to the long forgotten career of Peter the Hermit, and such things as that, and tell us clearly what it is to which he is now asking us to commit ourselves.

My hon. friend has spoken of differences of opinion in the ranks of the party on this side of the House. They may exist, but they are acknowledged. Let me say to him that, when, on a question of this magnitude, we do not find it possible to see eye to eye on all phases of the question, we acknowledge it openly, instead of trying to cover it with a veil, and to convey in a different manner, in different places, and at different periods, the meaning of a policy which it seems impossible to grasp and to thoroughly understand. Therefore I say it is incumbent upon us to take all proper means that there shall be no mistake on that point. That is the reason why there is, on the ministerial side of the House, that apparent acquiescence and unanimity which, as every body knows, merely conceals the grinding of teeth which otherwise would be apparent among them. How, I ask, are those gentlemen held together? No doubt what the government organs and my right hon. friend himself have stated at different times and at different places, explains it; no doubt, in the confusion which reigns among them, they do not fully apprehend the real aspects of this question, and I have heard muttered here a moment ago that patronage possibly is the explanation. I told my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) a day or two ago that I was sorry I could not be here, through illness, to uphold by word of mouth and

by my vote that very appropriate motion which he presented to this House in regard to the curse of patronage. That curse I think, explains the apparent indifference and the alleged acquiescence which we find among those hon. members who come from my own province of Quebec, because I know what is their private opinion upon this subject. I say more. As long as that curse exists and is maintained by this government, as long as we have here men who hold promises of position, and who have held out to them the prospect of petty grants of money to be made within the limits of their county, so long shall we not see in this parliament that free expression of opinion which we find in the British parliament at the present time.

But, let me particularize, because, although I want to be as brief as possible and merely upon this occasion lay some of my views in support of my opinions before the House, I will not on that account diminish what I have to say upon these preliminary and important points. From the beginning of this controversy the organs of my right hon. friend in the province of Quebec have laid before the public what seems to me to be absolutely the contrary to what this Bill and this policy are. I could quote from the accredited organs of my right hon. friend. I could quote from other newspapers in my own province, which, although they are not the properly accredited organs of the government, have been brought by influences which I suspect, but the extent of which I do not know, to support in a general way the policy of a Canadian navy. My quotations in that respect might be infinite in number. Let me quote an article published a few days ago, on the 29th January last, in 'Le Canada,' my right hon. friend's own organ in the city of Montreal, upon this question, and let the members of this House judge whether this exposition is a truthful one, is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. After enumerating what this newspaper calls the diversified views of the opposition, after having given us the views of the Conservative members from the west, given us their own private, individual view, or what purports to be the view, of the leader of the opposition, and after having given a garbled view, an insincere and untrue aspect, of what it calls the Monk-Bourassa policy, it goes on—I will not detain the House with it—to tell us what is the policy of the government. I will give it in English:

Canada must gradually take charge of the defence of its own territory on land and on sea.

It refers to New Zealand and Australia, and continues:

We are less exposed and we have no business to prepare a defence against attack from the United States, our friends and allies. A powerful hostile fleet could not attack up coming from Europe without having vanquished the imperial fleet—an impossible contingency. Therefore, we are only exposed to raids of hostile cruisers, isolated, or, at least, very few in number, that would have been left outside of any naval concentration to run upon the seas and harass British commerce. Therefore, we must indeed content ourselves with rapid cruisers and torpedo boat destroyers small vessels armed to attack, and whose extreme rapidity enables them to elude pursuit.

I may say to my right hon. friend that what he called some days ago the shivering electors of Jacques Cartier are indignant at this expression.

Therefore, we must do something in order to bear the burden of British defence. This something we will do in full harmony with the British admiralty by constructing ships for our own defence, if needed. These ships will be at our expense and under our control, but if we are asked for them we may——

'may' is marked in specially heavy type.

—lend them to Great Britain. The imperial authorities accept this programme with gratitude, as representing our full share of the imperial defence.

First point.

Our fleet being essentially defensive, we do not cause any damage to anybody, and our act is as far from militarism as the organization of a police force differs from the creation of a permanent army which is destined for the offensive.

Second point.

This navy we are constructing will not in any way cause us any expense to this extent that we will not be obliged to borrow a single cent.

Third point.

Our readers have here, shorn of all useless verbosity, of all declamation, of all appeals to public sentiment, the exact expression of the four policies that have been produced in Canada on this question of an imperial navy.

This has been dinned into the ears of our population for months, and I ask the House again: Is this the true expression of the policy that underlies this Bill along with the authentic conclusions arrived at by the Imperial Defence Conference of 1909 which we are now about to carry out? In the same city, but speaking to different readers upon the same subject, what do we find in another organ of my right hon. friend, the Montreal 'Herald'? Commenting upon the very able speech delivered in Montreal some days ago by a gentleman who was formerly

a member of this House, Mr. Bourassa, it says:

We do not mind confessing that Mr. Bourassa is largely right when he says that the Canadian fleet would almost as a matter of course take part in the empire's naval struggles. In other words, the theory of national control, exercised dispassionately, would in any imperial emergency prove but a fiction. Yet that fiction, like many a legal fiction, would shelter a mine of practical wisdom, and enable us to avoid many of the difficulties that would arise under the application of the more logical suggestion of Mr. Bourassa. For organic union we are not yet ready. But we are ready or should be, to take some share in the naval defence of the empire. By the creation of a Canadian navy we can fulfil our duty in that regard, and at the same time preserve ourselves from all the perplexities, at home and abroad, that would follow either the policy of direct cash contributions to the British navy, or the creation of a federation of British states. Our fleet would be in our own hands, to go or not to go to the empire's wars. That in practice it would no doubt inevitably go to any major war would not destroy the value of the freedom from entanglements that the Dominion would possess under this policy. Under it, the question of participation may be put off for ten, twenty, fifty, or a hundred years, if war should not ensue. Britain has not had a great naval war for a century. The creation of new centres of imperial naval strength in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa may help to make such a war improbable for a century to come.

This is the view presented to the English electors of my own province. But let us look for further differences and we will find some equivocation in a letter which the right hon. the Prime Minister himself wrote to an elector of the province of Ontario who was seeking information upon this subject and who, a farmer, wrote to the Prime Minister disapproving entirely of this expenditure. The right hon. gentleman wrote on the 8th of November last in reply to the very emphatic letter which he had received:

I have very little exception to take to your letter, and I am sure that when our policy has been laid before parliament there will not be much difference between your opinion and ours, and I do not think there should be any.

He did not want any expenditure at all for the construction of a navy, or any contribution. On writing this as his view, the Prime Minister tells him that there is very little difference between them.

I would respectfully call your attention to the fact that you are in error in saying that this is a new matter. On the contrary it has been before the Canadian public since the conference of 1902, when an attempt was made to force us into a policy which you might properly call militarism and against which we dissented. I would draw your attention to the paper which was laid before the imperial conference at the time by the ministers who attended it, that is to say Mr. Fielding, Mr. Paterson, Sir Wm. Mulock, Sir Frederick Borden and myself, and in which we thus declared our policy:—

At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well. On the sea coasts of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

In conclusion the ministers repeat that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which she now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self government which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

You will therefore see that we refused to go in for any larger expenditures than would be warranted by our development as a nation. This policy has been before the people for several years and it has never been challenged so far as I know, by any one.

I overlooked that I am no more in sympathy than you are with militarism in any form, but the question of defence is one which cannot be altogether overlooked.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend the Postmaster General says hear, hear. He has been saying hear, hear, all afternoon. Surely he deserves the knighthood and I hope I will be present when he receives the accolade.

It is the penalty of becoming a nation and which all nations have to bear and which, in course of time, I hope they may dispense with.

Without going any further, because I might multiply these examples, I say it is important to show that in reality there has been an attempt on the part of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his friends to veil and disguise their policy in grandiloquent expressions of all sorts instead of putting it fairly and frankly befor the people. We have, therefore, the right to ask in the first place what is that policy. Now, I lay this as the basis of my argument. It is absolutely impossible to pursue even the very meagre report of the imperial conference, and there can be no doubt that report is incomplete; in fact it was decided at the conference that only such papers as were agreed upon would be put on record—I say it is impossible to read

that blue-book through and have any doubt whatever that the policy is absolutely new and novel, differing in every respect from any policy enunciated or suggested before by either the imperial or this government. There can be no doubt that the policy is entirely novel, and that the people have so far been kept in the dark as to its real meaning and import. Let me point out what in reality is the proposal which was laid before the imperial conference in 1909 and agreed upon by our delegates and the others, and I will do it in connection with this proposition, which it is also necessary in the interests of truth to elucidate, and which is this. A local navy or a contribution of ships and money is attended with precisely the same political consequences, because, in my province at any rate, it has been held out to the people in a deceptive way, that what the government proposes to do is to organize a naval defence uniquely and solely for our own protection, and it has been hinted every where that this was the first step in the direction of a far larger emancipation than we have hitherto enjoyed. I say that in the first place, it is suggested that in the case of the navy we are arming for our own protection. The responsibilities, however, are precisely the same, as far as political consequences are concerned, as if we were contributing in money or ships to the British navy. In the first case, as they are, we are arming for our own protection; in the second, we are making common cause with the imperial fleet for imperial defence. That is the pretension set forth in my own province, this view has been systematically advanced in the province of Quebec by people who are interested in deceiving the electorate. But in either case, the consequences, now I say, are the same. The only variation lies in the mode of assistance. That was what was advanced at every stage of this discussion as far as the British government was concerned. Of course, my right hon. friend did not agree to that. He who makes such terrible attacks on this side of the House, because there are on this side honest and sincere differences of opinion, has differed so often with himself on this very subject that he thinks he can escape by playing the role of the tadpole which throws mud all round it in order to escape. I am prepared under any circumstances to respect the opinions of my fellow citizens on this subject and that does not seem to be the disposition of the right hon. the Prime Minister or the future Knight of the Bath, my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). As soon as he is knighted, he will, like the errant cavaliers of ancient times, put a patch on his eye until he has met with some man of noble blood and slaughtered him.

What I say is that this proposition which I venture to lay before the House was abundantly proved by the proceedings of the conference itself in regard to which if my hon. friend, instead of giving us the story of Peter the Hermit, had explained those things, as he should have done, on the second reading of the Bill, I might have been spared the trouble of detaining the House on this point.

In support of this, let us take in the first instance the declaration of the results of the conference made before the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Mr. Asquith, and set out in the proceedings of the conference—a declaration which was absolutely approved by the conference itself, and after one of our own delegates, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, had moved a vote of thanks to the British government. This is the statement made by the Prime Minister:

> The conference, which has just concluded its labours, was convened under the terms of Resolution I of the conference of 1907. In the invitation sent by His Majesty's government at the end of April to the governments of the dominions, it was stated that the object of the conference would be to discuss the general question of naval and military defence of the empire, with special reference to recent proposals from New Zealand and Australia, and to the resolution passed on March 29, by the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada. It was further stated that the conference would be of a purely consultative character, and that it would be held in private. It follows that all resolutions come to and proposals approved by the conference which has now been held, must be taken, so far as the delegates of the dominions are concerned, to be ad referendum, and of no binding force unless and until submitted to their various parliaments.
>
> I should add, in special reference to the delegates from South Africa, that they did not feel themselves in a position, in regard to either naval or military defence, to submit or to approve positive proposals until the union of South Africa was an accomplished fact. With this preface I will briefly summarize the main conclusions of the conference in regard, first, to military, and next to naval defence.
>
> After the main conference at the foreign office, a military conference took place at the War office, and resulted in an agreement on the fundamental principles set out in papers which had been prepared by the general staff for consideration by the delegates. The substance of these papers, which will be included among the papers to be published, was a recommendation that, without impairing the complete control of the government of each dominion over the military forces raised within it, these forces should be standardized, the formation of the units, the arragements for transport, the pattern of weapons, etc., being as far as possible assimilated to those which have recently been worked out for the British army. Thus, while the dominion troops would in each case be raised for the defence of the

dominion concerned, it would be made readily practicable in case of need for that dominion to mobilize and use them for the defence of the empire as a whole.

The military conference then entrusted to a sub-conference, consisting of military experts at headquarters and from the various dominions, and presided over by Sir W. Nicholson, acting for the first time in the capacity of chief of the imperial general staff, the duty of working out the detailed application of these principles.

I may point out here that the creation early this year or an imperial general staff, thus brought into active working, is a result of the discussions and resolutions of the conference of 1907. Complete agreement was reached by the members of the sub-conference, and their conclusions were finally approved by the main conference and by the committee of imperial defence, which sat for the purpose under the presidency of the Prime Minister. The result is a plan for so organizing the forces of the Crown wherever they are that, while preserving the complete autonomy of each dominion, should the dominions desire to assist in the defence of the empire in a real emergency, their forces could be rapidly combined into one homogenous imperial army.

Naval defence was discussed at the meetings of the conference held at the Foreign Office on the 3rd, 5th and 6th August. The admiralty memorandum, which had been circulated to the Dominion representatives, formed the basis of the preliminary conferences.

The alternative methods which might be adopted by Dominion governments in co-operating in imperial naval defence were discussed. New Zealand preferred to adhere to her present policy of contribution; Canada and Australia preferred to lay the foundation of fleets of their own. It was recognized that in building up a fleet, a number of conditions should be conformed to. The fleet must be of a certain size in order to offer a permanent career to the officers and men engaged in the service; the personnel should be trained and disciplined under regulations similar to those established in the Royal navy, in order to allow of both interchange and union between the British and Dominion services; and with the same object, the standard of vessels and armaments should be uniform.

A remodelling of the squadrons maintained in far eastern waters was considered on the basis of establishing a Pacific fleet, to consist of three units in the East Indies, Australia and China seas, each comprising, with some variations, a large armoured cruiser of the new 'Indomitable' type, three second-class cruisers of the 'Bristol' type, six destroyers of the River class, and three submarine of 'C' class.

Further on:

Separate meetings took place at the admiralty with the representatives of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and general statements were agreed to in each case for further consideration by their respective governments.

Further on:

Mr. MONK.

As regards Canada, it was considered that her double sea-board rendered the provision of a fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present. It was proposed, according to the amount of money that might be available, that Canada should make a start with cruisers of the Bristol class, and destroyers of an improved River class—a part to be stationed on the Atlantic sea-board and a part on the Pacific.

In accordance with an arrangement already made, the Canadian government would undertake the maintenance of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and it was a part of the arrangement proposed with the Australian representatives that the Commonwealth government should eventually undertake the maintenance of the dockyard at Sydney.

Will my right hon. friend or any of the gentlemen who sit behind him, from the province of Quebec at any rate, state that even this has been laid before the people of our province. They have never heard of it, in that shape or in any shape, and have never had any occasion to pronounce their opinion upon so important a matter.

Let us look a little deeper into this matter and see what was laid down in regard to this policy at this conference. The admiralty memorandum—I am now speaking of naval defence—was fully approved by our delegates. I will quote from it as briefly as possible. But I appeal to the good sense and good faith of the House to say whether any man who takes the trouble to read through this blue-book can arrive at any other conclusion than that which I laid down a few moments ago, that under the terms of this agreement we undertook to accomplish the duty that our delegates subscribed to, either by building a fleet of our own, or by contributions of ships or of money. In either case the principle is the same.

In the admiralty memorandum in respect to naval defence, I find this laid down:

Separate meetings accordingly took place at the admiralty with the representatives of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, when the following general statements were agreed to in each case, it being recognized that in the time available it was impossible that all details should be thoroughly gone into and settled. Several administrative and financial points remained still to be decided.

And in the admiralty memorandum, which has our approval entirely so far, this is said at page 23:

2. If the problem of imperial naval defence were considered merely as a problem of naval strategy, it would be found that the greatest output of strength for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and unity of command. In furtherance, then, of the simple strategical ideal the maximum of power would be gained if all parts of the empire contributed, according to their needs and

resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

3. It has, however, long been recognized that in defining the conditions under which the naval forces of the empire should be developed, other considerations than those of strategy alone must be taken into account. The various circumstances of the oversea dominions have to be borne in mind. . . .

4. The main duty of the forthcoming conference as regards naval defence will be, therefore, to determine the form in which the various dominion governments can best participate in the burden of imperial defence with due regard to varying political and geographical conditions. Looking to the difficulties involved, it is not to be expected that the discussions with the several Defence Ministers will result in a complete and final scheme of naval defence, but it is hoped that it will be found possible to formulate the broad principles upon which the growth of colonial naval forces should be fostered. While laying the foundations of future dominion navies to be maintained in different parts of the empire, these forces would contribute immediately and materially to the requirements of imperial defence.

I pass certain paragraphs which go to maintain absolutely the contention which I am endeavouring to support, and I come to the close of the memorandum:

13. Pari passu with the creation of the fleet unit, it would be necessary to consider the development of local resources in everything which relates to the maintenance of a fleet. A careful inquiry should be made into the shipbuilding and repairing establishments with a view to their general adaptation to the needs of the local squadron. Training schools for officers and men would have to be established; arrangements would have to be made for the manufacture, supply, and replenishment of the various naval, ordnance and victualling stores required by the squadron.

14. All these requirements might be met according to the views of the dominion governments, in so far as the form and manner of the provision made are concerned. But as regards shipbuilding, armaments and warlike stores, &c., on the one hand, and training and discipline in peace and war, on the other, there should be one common standard. If the fleet unit maintained by a dominion is to be treated as an integral part of the imperial forces, with a wide range of interchangeability among its component parts with those forces, its general efficiency should be the same, and the facilities for refitting and replenishing His Majesty's ships, whether belonging to a dominion fleet or to the fleet of the United Kingdom, should be the same. Further, as it is a sine quâ non that successful action in time of war depends upon unity of command and direction, the general discipline must be the same throughout the whole imperial service, and without this it would not be possible to arrange for that mutual co-operation and assistance which would be indispensable in the building up and establishing of a local naval force in close connection with the Royal navy. It has been recognized by the colonial governments that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general directions of the admiralty.

All this was fully approved by our own delegates. Their conclusions, their decision as to what was going to be built, are to be found fully given at page 26 of the printed report.

But I have said that in order to fully understand the extent of this new scheme, one must also take into consideration what seems to have been lost sight of, and was never alluded to in any way, so far as I know, by my right hon. friend, a most important part of the conference which concerns military defence. I do not wish to quote at length although I have marked certain parts of what has reference to that portion of the conference. The military memorandum is absolutely agreed to by our delegates, and I say it results clearly from that military memorandum that if it is carried out, before long what military forces we have in this country will be absolutely at the disposal of the imperial authorities in case of war. I do not wish to quote at length. I affirm that even for a layman like myself, it is impossible to read over that military memorandum approved of by our delegates without arriving at the conclusion that the whole of this scheme exhibits the constant carrying out of what has been characterized in a vague kind of way since some years, in this country and elsewhere, as the imperialist scheme, the putting into execution, the carrying out of what has been for a long time the dream of some people to which I shall refer presently, of a political union, practically, of the empire and the abolition of what is most important in the autonomy of the dependencies, reducing them in a certain sense to mere municipal institutions and conferring upon the imperial authorities at home, without any corresponding privilege, without any granting of further privilege to ourselves, of the absolute right of control without any consultative voice on our part whatever. All this is most important, all that is most precious in the privileges of self-government which we have acquired under circumstances of great stress and difficulty years ago—

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not wish to interrupt, but I know the hon. gentleman does not wish to mislead the House. I would ask him to return to the statement made by the Prime Minister of England from which he read a little while ago in which the premier uses these words:

The result is a plan for so organizing the forces of the Crown wherever they are, that while preserving the complete autonomy of each dominion, should the dominions desire

to assist in the defence of the empire in a real emergency.

Etc., they can do so.

Mr. MONK. I read that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, but the hon. gentleman did not apparently heed it, did not seem to have understood it.

Mr. MONK. Oh, I understand it. I intend touching on that point in a moment, but I say at once, in order to answer my hon. friend, that if this scheme of centralization of military and naval power is put into execution, that part of the memorandum upon which the minister lays such great stress will become practically inoperative.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh no, it is the basis of the whole scheme.

Mr. MONK. I can imagine it goes on a par with the lame excuses advanced by the Prime Minister, betraying to my mind his absolute ignorance of our situation, that in case war broke out under these circumstances, with our naval organization brought absolutely under this policy and everything laid down in this blue-book being carried out, the general staff, with its branches all over the empire having fully organized, he will summon parliament to know if our people are ready then to fight. I think I know the people of Canada well enough that, if all this is carried out they will not take refuge under that most unconstitutional argument which is on a par with what my right hon. friend said in Toronto the other day about the King of England being a suzerain. If the right hon. gentleman is correct in that interpretation, what I learned when a boy about the Crown of England, and what I taught in the university as a professor of constitutional law for many years, would have to be taken back as absolutely erroneous. I do not know what the heroine of Quentin Durward, a very pleasant novel, understood by a suzerain. She was speaking at a time of feudal tenure when suzerains existed. I am not aware that they exist now. But, if I understand the rights and privileges of the British Crown, it is subject to no such accident; it is continuous, it is absolute, it is sovereign; it goes on without any special transmission or succession. The King of England is the King of Canada practically. He concentrates in that power which we call the Crown all executive power, all the power that makes the laws, all the administrative power, subject, of course, in regard to the executive power to the limitation that now he acts through ministers who are responsible to the representatives of the people—a very important provision and, though he concentrates within himself the legislative power, and though all laws are really made by him, these laws are made with the consent and advice of both Houses of parliament. The legislative power is in him, as are the executive and judicial powers, and particularly with respect to the armed forces of the Kingdom wherever they are. I speak subject to correction, but I understand that this is a prerogative which has never been diminished in any way. The King is the chief commander of the military and naval forces. The House of Commons, in its widest aspirations, has never thought of depriving him of this special prerogative, nor have the people of England done so, being controlled by that wisdom which has ever characterized them. The King is the master of all armed forces—no suzerain there. But, as we all know—it would be taking up the time of the House uselessly to discuss the matter—the exercise of that power was held under control of the people for a long time in England by the Mutiny Act. This Act was passed every year. Hon. members of this House are familiar with the peculiar machinery which enabled parliament, although the command of the forces was in the hands of the Crown, by this yearly passage of the Mutiny Act to curb and restrain the exercise of that power. This continued until, I think, the year 1881, or thereabouts, when we had in England a regular military law. Moreover, parliament always exercised a very strong control over the military and naval forces by the annual voting of money. To-day, in England, as here, money is voted yearly, and without money you cannot have soldiers or navies. But the right, the prerogative, is in the King. If the King had the money, as he used to have in the old Plantagenet and Lancaster days, he would not require the annual vote of parliament to direct the army and navy as he chose. I may be mistaken, but that is the way I look at it. Therefore, I say this section 18 enunciates a new principle, when it says that the Governor in Council, may if it chooses, place the navy at the disposal of the British government. That is something new. If we could say that it was intended to facilitate the carrying out of the agreement as arrived at in London, if we could say it was in order to remove all doubt with respect to the principle which I enunciated a moment ago, well and good. But my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who is a master of circumlocution and deceit, has, I think, placed this proviso in this Bill in order to be able to say to the people what 'Le Canada' printed in such heavy type, and I cited a moment ago, that in reality we—

parliament—control this naval force and it could only engage in war after it saw fit.

Now, I am extremely sorry to take up the time of the House, and I will not insist further upon that point, though I should like to have done so; not in order to instruct the members of this House—I have no desire to take that position—but in order that the people of this country should see behind this measure, which is apparently rather inoffensive, and see what the policy is concerning which my right hon. friend did not make in those explanations which seemed to me to be due, in the first place to this House, and in the second place to the nation at large. What, I say, are the consequences of this policy? If we have, or are about to undertake that we will build a navy or make contributions upon the understanding laid down in good faith by the British government and by the delegates at this conference, if we are going to move beyond the defence of our own country as a legitimate part of our burden—a part that has never been denied by Canadians, never from the first day, never, even at a time when they had against the mother country most serious grievances—I say, if that is the policy, as I claim it is in the very words laid down in this document, what are the consequences? Let me sum up these consequences briefly:

1. We become more strictly bound by the foreign policy of the British government, its alliances offensive and defensive, for the reason that we engage to support by force the empire's exterior action.

This, I say, is the first consequence: We enter actively into the exterior policy of the British government. We no longer say: We are a dependency; we are a possession; we will not attack, we will continue the role we played for more than half a century and will undertake that burden which will otherwise rest upon you, the defence of this country.

2. If the scheme of the imperial defence conference is approved by us, we are bound to participate as belligerents in all British wars.

I say it is impossible for us, under the agreement arrived at, to avoid this; it is a necessary consequence. My friend, Mr. Bourassa, pointed out in Montreal the other day what a number of wars had taken place even since we had undertaken the defence of our own country. On no occasion, except under the peculiar circumstances of the South African war, was it thought by the mother country that we should participate in those wars. We were entire strangers to those countries, entire strangers to the causes that led up to those wars. Some of them were wars of conquest, I do not say unjust conquest; perhaps some of them were necessary on the part of Great Britain, but we were never asked to take part in them.

3. We become parties to all British guarantees to foreign nations.

Great Britain has undertaken very serious responsibilities, involving possibly very extensive wars, towards those foreign nations. I say that we in Canada, under pain of being branded as unfaithful to this agreement, and worse than that, as cowards, would be obliged to take part in those wars, and in those terrific conflicts which may be occasioned by her guarantees, and which may be brought on at any moment. Let me point out what those guarantees are. They result from treaties which, from time to time, Great Britain has entered into, treaties with which we have nothing whatever to do. But they are binding all the same, and I venture to say that, with my small knowledge of history, and of the circumstances which surround these agreements, they will have to be performed, and they will be the occasions of war, and in those wars we must participate. We cannot possibly and honourably avoid them so long as we are bound by this agreement. Let me refer the House to a work by Mr. Thomas Gibson Bowles, 1856, in which he says:

It is sometimes assumed that the responsibilities of Great Britain begin and end with the defence of her islands against invasion. This is far from being the case. She is in no whit less responsible for the defence of India and of her other possessions and colonies scattered throughout the world. Besides that moreover, she is bound by the most solemn engagements, some of them of great antiquity, with reference to the territories of other countries which she has guaranteed.

She could not allow those guarantees to fail, and we could not allow her to stand alone isolated, after having made this agreement in defence of these guarantees.

Thus she has guaranteed that Belgium shall form an independent and perpetually neutral state by article 7 of the treaty of 1839.

She has undertaken, in case of the attack of an invader, to protect Chusan (an archipelago off the east coast of China) and its dependencies and to restore it to the possession that end, by the treaty of 1885.

She has guaranteed that the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg shall henceforth form a perpetually neutral state, by the treaty of 1867.

She has guaranteed the integrity and perpetual neutrality of Switzerland by the declaration of 1815.

She has guaranteed, as against Russia, the territories of Norway and Sweden, undertaking to furnish naval and military forces to that end, by the treaty of 1885.

She has guaranteed the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman (Turkish) empire in Europe, by the treaty of 1856.

She has guaranteed Greece as a monarchical and independent state by the treaty of 1832 and 1863 and the perpetual neutrality of the Ionian islands also by the treaty of 1863.

She has especially guaranteed as against Russia all the Ottoman (Turkish) possessions in Asia, engaging to defend them by force of British arms, in the treaty of 1878.

She has engaged to 'respect the independence' of the Sultan of Muscat (on the south short of the Gulf of Oman, near the Indian ocean) by the declaration of 1865, and to 'promote the integrity and independence' of Persia by an agreement with Russia embodied in correspondence extending from 1834 to 1888.

And most especially and most repeatedly has Great Britain guaranteed her most ancient ally, Portugal, to defend and protect that country itself as well as 'all its conquests or colonies'—an obligation which seems to extend to Delagoa bay in Africa—by various treaties beginning as far back as 1373 and coming down to 1703.

'Thus,' says Mr. Bowles, 'singly or together with other powers, Great Britain is under the most serious and solemn treaty engagements with respect to Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey, Portugal, Greece, Muscat, Persia and China—engagements which might at any time only be capable of being carried out by force, and for the forcible carrying out of which all her power might not be too much.

I mention these things because, so far as I know, they present a feature of the case which has not been insisted upon during the discussion up to the present moment. Now, I say that we guarantee the integrity of the empire—that is the way I understand this agreement—that is what we do, and why endeavour to conceal the existence of the obligations we are assuming? We receive no guarantee as to the maintenance of the integrity of our own Dominion. Most important of all, we have no voice of any kind in the conduct of imperial affairs, while being bound by imperial obligations towards foreign countries. We become liable to the political and financial results of those obligations, without any representation, or administrative responsibility. I say, therefore, that, by this policy, we associate ourselves with Great Britain as a world power, deeply interested in and responsible for international happenings in every part of the world, and obliged to exercise continual vigilance upon our part. Let me quote to the House what is said on this point by a newspaper of Ontario, 'The Weekly Sun,' of the 26th of January last:

Some points arise out of the discussion that call for special consideration.

The first was contained in the speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; the second in what was said by Mr. Monk.

The premier said that when Britain is at war Canada is at war as well. This has always been true in a theoretical sense, but it will become most emphatically true, in a very practical way, if the proposal to build a Canadian navy is gone on with. During the present generation Great Britain has been engaged in a dozen petty wars without so much as creating a ripple on the surface of things in this country. This was because the scene was far away, and Canada was not directly engaged. So long as we confine our forces to land forces Britain may engage in a very considerable war, with a distant country, without Canada also becoming directly engaged unless our parliament and people deliberately decide that Canadian troops shall be moved to the scene of conflict. If we create a navy the situation will be wholly different. A naval force will necessarily be on the sea; its officers, bearing the King's commission, will be under the same direction and control as officers in the royal navy bearing a like commission. The consequence will be that the moment Britain engages in any future war, that same moment, if a Canadian warship is within reach of the field of operations, Canada will, through her navy, become engaged as well.

The consequences arising from this situation were well stated by Mr. Monk. Canada will thus, without any control whatever over British diplomacy or British treaties, become liable to find herself at any moment plunged into war because of this diplomacy or as a result of these treaties. In other words, statesmen in Britain, who are not responsible to our people, who cannot be called to account at polls held in Canada, will be placed in a position to use forces armed and paid for by this country in any war Britain may choose to wage. We may at any time find ourselves actively engaged in conflict without our consent, and in a conflict, too, of which the Canadian conscience would not approve.

That is possible. The members of this House have heard of the China war which has been called the opium war. It was a war which was waged by England in order to oblige China to open her treaty ports to the opium dealers of India. There may have been some treaty obligation on the part of China, but, at any rate, that was the object of the war. Applying what I have just read to the case would it be with enthusiasm, that, having convoked parliament, the people of this country would engage in a war which must necessarily cost us at the very least some $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 for the purpose of forcing Ching-Ching-Chinaman to eat opium? I doubt it. To continue the citation:

Another consequence will arise from this situation, and one that was not spoken of either by Mr. Monk or the premier. Because Canada will be thus made responsible for British policy the attention of our people will be constantly diverted from our home affairs to British affairs. Canadian people are sufficiently complicated already. We have a wide stretching territory; the interests of one section of Canada are not always in accord with other sections; we have representatives of all races under the sun; we have enormous resources to develop. We require the wisest statesmanship and the most carefully thought-out-constructive policy for the purpose of meeting the problems presented. If we are to be continually distracted by old-world poli-

tics and disturbed by old-world quarrels, it will be impossible to give to the home situation the careful, painstaking attention that situation calls for.

I must quote also from another article from the same paper on the same date entitled 'Part of a General Scheme' for it goes to support what I stated a moment ago as the result of a general view of what had taken place at the conference.

This proposal to create a Canadian navy is but one part of a general plan now being put into operation. It was preceded by a change in the Militia Act giving to the government power, which it did not before possess, to order Canada's land forces on service outside the borders of Canada. It is being accompanied by a reorganization of these same forces which will make these correspond with the organization of the British army to the end that British and Canadian troops may fit in together when called upon for joint action in foreign war. The intention on the part of those behind the new movement, is to gradually develop very considerable naval and military forces in this country that will be part of a world-wide war power, and available on call for service in any country to which they may be called by the central authority.

Such a scheme cannot be carried out in its entirety without effecting a fundamental change in the character and ideals of our people.

The writer goes on to point out very correctly and I think wisely that the whole course of thought, the idiosyncrasy, if I might use the term, the mental structure of the people of this country will be completely changed and this transformation will be from a new world and a young nation suddenly to the old world with all the vices, embarrassment and troubles that attach to that sudden change.

Therefore I say we have no control over the government and no representatives in the parliament which makes and unmakes wars and controls our destiny.

Now I wish to say a word or two in regard to the character of this contemplated change and I shall say it briefly. Up to 1894 and even to a later date the British government never for a moment intended that Canada should do more than provide for its own defence. Never up to 1894 was that contention put forth, although the matter had received the constant attention of the imperial government, and although on more than one occasion that government had given to us in authoritative and official form communication of the conclusions at which it had arrived. With regard to defence, we have never, as I stated before, shirked the duty which seemed to be imposed upon us properly of attending to the defence of this country We gave proof of that in 1776. The right hon. Prime Minister alluded to what we did at that time. We gave further proof of it in 1812 and 1814. No sacrifice was spared by the people of Canada to provide as far as we possibly could against American invasion and we did our full duty at that time as history proves. After we succeeded in obtaining responsible government in 1848, the British government began insisting—I do not say improperly—I say properly—that as a corollary duty of the liberty we then had acquired we should provide for self-defence and that duty should be performed. I stated, that when I, in answer to a call from my electors, gave them my opinion on this question. We took in this country at that time the ground that we must organize our own defence and the attitude of Cartier and his associates is not open to any doubt upon that point. No suggestion was ever made at that time that we should go beyond that. The utterances of Cartier and Macdonald go to prove that. I do not fear to assert that the traditions of the Conservative party, as I read them, point to the fact that that was the policy of the party. It started from the principle that having local self-government we must be ready to assume the duty of self-defence. These statements never went further than that; and when allusions are sometimes made to strong expressions by Sir George Cartier and Sir John Macdonald on the necessity of maintaining British connections, these expressions were always used in reply to the outpourings of friends of the Prime Minister, of the Prime Minister himself, when they ventilated policies such as those my hon. friend the leader of the opposition described to-day, and when they spoke of breaking down the barriers existing between us and the United States and pointed to the inevitable destiny of being absorbed by the great republic which awaited us. But nowhere will you find in the utterances of these great forerunners of the present Conservative party, nowhere will you find in the speeches of Sir John Macdonald or Sir George Cartier or of their successors the formulation of any such ideas as that we should go beyond the maintenance of our actual position. I had the honour, although I was very young at the time, of knowing the late Sir John Macdonald and also the late Sir George Cartier, who was an intimate friend of my family, and of whom I may say with the poet that he danced my infancy on his knee, and I am aware that these men were loyal subjects of the Crown and opposed to any policy which would lead to the severing of the tie that bound us to the mother country and which they deemed so essential to our welfare. But everybody who has studied history, everybody who has read the imperial state papers referring to Canada, from 1860 to 1867, everybody who has read the life of Sir George Cartier knows that he never went beyond that, and

any attempt to prove that he did must necessarily fail.

I said a moment ago that England herself had laid before us in an official way her contentions with regard to defence; I would like to refer to what occurred in this country more than half a century ago at the time of the American war. At that time the Duke of Newcastle proposed to the Canadian government—it was during the union of the two Canadas—that we should do three things. He proposed that we should organize in Canada a force of 50,000 men, that we should place it under imperial direction and vote the necessary supplies for five years. Let me point out how that proposition was received by the Canadian government; and I cannot better do this than by referring to a memorandum prepared by the Canadian cabinet in October, 1862, to be handed to His Excellency the Governor General for transmission to the Duke of Newcastle. This memorandum proves that the men of that day, who are taking part in the conquest of our political liberties, were men who realized better than do those who are now controlling the government of this country, what that demand meant. Let me quote from the memorandum:

Another suggestion embraced in his Grace's despatch is well calculated to excite surprise. Your Excellency's advisers allude to that portion of the despatch in which his great purposes to remove the control of funds required for military purposes from the domain of parliament. His Grace is evidently aware that the proposition wears the aspect of 'an interference with the privileges of the representation of the people,' and it is certain that any measure liable to this construction never will be and ought not to be entertained by a people inheriting the freedom guaranteed by British institutions. The imperial parliament guards with jealous care the means of maintaining the military and naval force of the empire. Its appropriations are annually voted and not the most powerful minister has dared to propose to the House of Commons the abandonment of its controlling power for a period of five years. If the disturbing action of ordinary politics is a reason for removing the final direction of military preparation from parliament, it is in every sense as applicable in England as in Canada. What the House of Commons would not under any circumstances of danger entertain, is not likely to be entertained by the legislature of Canada. Whatever evils are incident to representative institutions, the people of a British province will not forget that they are trivial in comparison with those which are inseparable from arbitrary authority. Popular liberties are only safe when the action of the people restrains and guides the policy of those who are invested with the power of directing the affairs of the country. They are safe against military despotism wielded by a corrupt government, only when they have in their hands the means of controlling the supplies required for the maintenance of the military organization.

'A union for defence' is proposed by His Grace the Secretary of State for the colonies. A union of the British North America provinces for the formation and maintenance of one uniform system of military organization and training, having a common defensive fund, and approved by Her Majesty's government; a union whose details would emanate from the Secretary of State, and whose management would be entirely independent of the several local legislatures. Your Excellency's advisers have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that any alliance of this character cannot at present be entertained.

Your Excellency's advisers now turn to the general principle which underlies the argument of His Grace. That the right of self-government has for a co-relative duty the maintenance of provision for the defence is a proposition which, in the abstract, is indisputable; but it is only indisputable in the case of government of states which are sovereign in themselves, as between a colony and the parent state it cannot be said to exist in the same sense.

The whole memorandum is pregnant with protest against any application of the principle that the military or naval forces of this country should be controlled by any other power than the legislature which established them.

Let me now refer to a memorandum prepared not so very long ago—not by any conference, but by a special committee of the Imperial Privy Council itself. That council itself took this matter into consideration in 1896, and made a report regarding the defences of the empire, to which the Duke of Devonshire alluded when he spoke at the meeting of the British Empire League on the 3rd of December, 1896. This is what the Duke of Devonshire said:

I have found with very great satisfaction on my return to office, after an absence from official life of a good many years, the large progress which has been made in the consideration of the great question of imperial defence. A body is now in existence, and has been for many years called the Colonial Defence Committee, composed of representatives of the admiralty, the war office and the colonial office. That body has made a complete study of the question of colonial defence as it effects every colony of the British empire. It has studied the question from the point of view of each colony, and every colony, whether it be a Crown colony or a self-governing colony, is now in possession of the views of Her Majesty's government as to the nature of the attack—the possible attack—to which any of them may be exposed, and as to the means of defence which it is possible to oppose to such attacks. Every colonial government now knows what the imperial government is prepared to undertake in their defence, and what must be left to themselves to undertake. Now, although the instructions to this committee, and the plans which this committee has prepared, are, and must be, to a very great extent, of a confidential character, yet I am permitted to make a public announcement of the principles upon which

those plans are based; so that not only the public at home, but every one of our colonial fellow-subjects should know how much it is that the government are prepared to undertake in the defence of the colonies, and the duties which in their turn they think ought to be undertaken by the colonies themselves. These principles are as follows: The maintenance of sea supremacy has been assumed as the basis of the system of imperial defence against attacks from over the sea. This is the determining factor in shaping the whole defensive policy of the empire, and is fully recognized by the admiralty, who have accepted the responsibility of protecting all British territory abroad against organized invasion from the sea. To fulfil this great charge they claim the absolute power of disposing of their forces in the manner they consider most certain to secure success, and object to limit the action of any part of them to the immediate neighbourhood of places which they consider may be more effectively protected by operating at a distance.

It is recognized, however, that Her Majesty's ships engaged in hunting out and destroying the squadrons of the enemy may not be in a position to prevent the predatory raids of hostile cruisers on British ports. The strength of such an attack will vary in the different parts of the world according to the strength of possibly hostile navies, the proximity of their bases and the troops that are or could easily be brought there in anticipation of war. It also varies from time to time with changing political combination. But it is improbable that this raiding attack would be made by more than a few ships, nor could it be of any permanent effect unless troops could be landed. In no case could a greater force than a few thousand men be collected and conveyed without such arrangements and preparation as would bring the operations under the category of those which the navy has undertaken to prevent.

Against a raid of the nature indicated, it has been considered necessary to make secure those places which are essential to the navy for coaling, refitting, and repairing. Ports for this purpose have been selected by the admiralty, and imperial resources in men and money available for use abroad have been concentrated on their defence. Apart from the harbours fortified for the navy, there are other ports which, though they do not enter into what may be called the general strategic scheme, are also liable from their commercial importance to predatory raids, and which require measures of defence for the protection of the special interests involved. The resources of places which, in the opinion of an enemy, would justify the very considerable risks which a raid on them would involve, are generally sufficient to admit of the provision of local defence by local means; and where the liability to attack and the resources to resist attack co-exist, it has been held to be the duty of the colony to make provision for adequate defence. In dealing with places of this nature the committee have advocated the creation of sufficient fixed defences to prevent their unmolested occupation by hostile cruisers, but more especially the provision of troops sufficient to deal effectually with such forces as an enemy must put on shore to enable him to secure any permanent advantage from his attack. Troops without works may detect an enemy and frustrate his object. Works without troops are useless and delusive. It is necessary to lay stress on this fact, as fortifications give an appearance and feeling of security which is not justified unless they are fully garrisoned by well-trained men and supported by mobile forces, and because expenditure on defences involving a heavy outlay at one time and little at another, can be more easily fitted into the exigencies of fluctuating budgets than expenditure on troops which must be constant to be effective.

I will not continue this quotation, but it results therefrom that the British government itself, in 1894 or thereabouts, formulated a plan which was based on close application and study; and the Duke of Devonshire stated: 'We communicated officially this plan to the colonies in order that they might govern themselves accordingly.' That was one clearly enunciated plan under which we did not depart from the policy we had always followed of defending our own shores. But there ought to be added to that the proper equipment of dry-docks and coaling stations and such armaments as would enable us fully to defend ourselves against sudden raids. Nobody that I know of in this country is opposed to that, or would deny—because a raid is always possible—that we should guard against any attack of this nature. What I say is this: That at the conference of 1907, which my right hon. friend attended, and in which he denied absolutely that we should accept any scheme of this kind, no very different plan from this very one was laid before the conference. There was a small addition. Lord Tweedmouth, in addressing the conference, stated first and foremost, and as the representatives of the British government had always stated: We demand as a sine qua non the complete control in time of war of all naval forces, whether colonial or otherwise; but he stated there, what the Duke of Devonshire had stated to the British League in 1897, and what he stated also on a memorable occasion in the House of Lords, when questioned by Lord Minto, that all they asked from us was this very thing. Lord Tweedmouth added that we should have light torpedo boats or destroyers, which he said could not cross the ocean under any circumstances, but which might be used as a complement to this scheme of defence. He did not go any further. And let me point out this to my right hon. friend, who used such violent language in regard to myself at the time of the first reading of this Bill—very violent language. In fact, to use the words of the rhymster:

There never was heard such a terrible curse;
But what gave rise
To such a surprise
Was that nobody felt a penny the worse.

What the resolution of the 29th of March last stated was that we should proceed to organize the defence of the empire—how? On the lines laid down at the last imperial conference. Well, the lines laid down at the last imperial conference, with the exception of the light craft to which Lord Tweedmouth alluded, were precisely those of the scheme which was proposed by the Duke of Devonshire, and which I am not prepared to combat. It was a reasonable scheme, I think. At any rate, I am not against our assuming that part of the common defence of the empire. But what we have to-day, I submit, is a totally different scheme, which has never been discussed before in this parliament and never has been discussed before the people. I, therefore, say that it is safe to conclude that this is an innovation, a complete change has been contemplated. And who are the originators of that change? Who, I ask this House, has been so earnest in promoting this gradual advance until at last we are face to face with this scheme, which is totally different from the two others and from the third more ancient, which began in 1862? To my mind it is largely the work, in the first place, of the Imperial Federation Society, which failed because it had no representative character and had proposed boldly in the beginning a scheme for which we were totally unprepared, political union, which is virtually comprised in this present project, and when that society failed and the new one, the British Empire League, was organized, they took it up and the members of that anti-Canadian society, I will call it such, have been ever since moving heaven and earth to bring about this very policy to which many of us at present object. Look at the active members of that league. You will find they are not representative men; they are very respectful men, but if you read their speeches you will find that they have gone to England and stated that this very scheme is popular and accepted with joy throughout the country. What authority have they for that statement? Col. Denison or Mr. Small, at one of their meetings, after congratulating the meeting that it was not open to the press, stated that it was known that war decimates sailors, the British have great difficulty in finding complements of men for their navy, and they could easily recoup themselves here, there were 75,000 men at their disposal as a naval reserve, and the people were anxious to place them at the disposal of the British empire. I say that in making these statements they had no

authority and did not represent the sentiments of our people.

I have alleged and it has been said that this scheme, if it is properly shown to the people, will prove that it bears in its flanks the destruction of our right of self-government. I say in the first place it tends to deprive us of control of our land and sea forces. It binds us to the consequences of the external policy of the Downing street government, which we cannot control or hold responsible. It leaves us, I say, practically with large municipal powers. If you take away from a country, from any nation, the right to control, at any rate as free nations usually do, its relations with other nations, I say you deprive it of one of its most valuable inherent rights as a nation. I say in respect to this policy that it differs from the suggestion which began when we obtained responsible government in 1848; it differs essentially from the Imperial Defence Committee's report and it differs entirely from the suggestions made by Lord Tweedmouth in 1907. It is, in fact, a scheme which might be called the scheme presented to the last imperial conference by the Right Hon. Mr. McKenna, which was far more extensive and was never heard of or discussed by our own people.

There are many other things to be said in reference to this question, and if I am able to do so I shall express those views at the proper time. But I wish, before resuming my seat, to say one word in regard to the reproach which has been addressed to us in all or nearly all the newspapers of this country, a most unjust and unfair reproach, to my idea. We have been branded, those who hold the views I have just expressed to the House, as ingrates, as wretches with no other sentiment than that of selfishness and egotism, and it has been claimed that what is asked from us to-day, this, to my judgment, unjustifiable sacrifice of our liberty, we owe to the mother country. Without them we would be nothing at all in this country, nothing whatever, and I heard it said to-day that if British supremacy upon the sea was to fail we would disappear at once. It reminded me of the old saying of the fates in Rome: 'While stands the Colosseum Rome shall stand; when falls the Colosseum Rome shall fall, and with Rome the world.' I think the members of this House will admit that during weeks of denunciation, a public man cannot with equanimity see himself charged with these grave failings, of ingratitude and selfishness, and although I do not want to open or unduly extend the chapter I would say one word on this subject.

Is our indebtedness so very great? Do we owe all this to the mother country, and have we done nothing for ourselves in re-

spect to external affairs or in respect to our own political development? Have we been like sponges or jelly fish, occupying a merely passive role in that regard, and has everything that could be done been done by the mother country? One word as to that. Look at the diplomatic handling of our affairs by the mother country ever since 1782, to begin at the beginning. I do not pretend that for what was done there was not fair justification. We had an immense territory, we were a small people, and the government of those days had to look after the interests of a vast empire, and it was then, be it said, under the control of foreign nations with regard to its dependencies which it very soon was obliged to abandon, and had it not abandoned that policy and those notions, not one, I venture to say, of those dependencies would have the British flag over it to-day. I shall not allude to what took place in 1782. Most of the gentlemen who sit in this House have read the story of our negotiations with the revolted American colonies, when the British government sent to Paris to meet such men as Adams, Benjamin Franklin and Jay, Mr. Oswald and Mr. Vaughan, who had no knowledge whatever of this country, no diplomatic experience whatever, and who, if they had had their own way—and I think if Lord Shelbourne himself had had his own way—would have taken a course which would have resulted in there being no Canada at all. Had not Mr. Strachey, as every one knows, the special diplomatic envoy of England, arrived at the last moment to save the shreds of British territory which exist on this continent to-day, everything would have gone by the board. Mr. Oswald was anxious to give up the whole of Canada, Nova Scotia and all the rest of it; he called this country the back land, a swamp that was of no value whatever, and when Mr. Vaughan saw that, he ran to Franklin, that keen old fox, and his associates, who were more than a match for these two men, and induced them to give up most valuable territory.

As I say, the two negotiators at that time were anxious to obtain the consent of the British government to give up Nova Scotia and Canada as of no value whatever. I do not wish to enter into details, but they gave up a territory of over four millions of acres, constituting to-day seven of the most fertile and magnificent states of the American union, to which Jay Adams and the others recognized that they had no right whatever. Thus to-day we are deprived of that fertile region communicating with our northwest and are bound to traverse an arid desert which will ever remain a barrier between our fellow citizens in the west and ourselves. They gave up the Indian territory; that is history familiar to all. And when they did that, everybody knew, except these two innocent gentlemen themselves, that the ultimatum of the American congress was reduced to this: Give us independence for the thirteen colonies and ask for no indemnity for the loyalists who have suffered through this war. That was the ultimatum: But Benjamin Franklin and Jay took it upon themselves, as they themselves afterwards explained and as is explained by their biographers, to insist upon this piece of precious territory which had been conquered by our ancestors, which belonged at one time to France and was ceded by France to England. This was given up in spite of the fact that the American congress never wanted it. I do not see anything in that that greatly shows anxiety to protect our rights. If you go further, what about the sacrifice involved in the Ashburton treaty? Lord Ashburton said it was a mere marsh of the state of Maine, and said in the British House of Commons that it would have been absurd to go to war about that territory. Or about the western territory belonging to us, the state of Oregon. If any man wants to know the value of this territory in Maine, let him read the history of the Intercolonial, by Sir Sandford Fleming, and learn what a sacrifice on our part was involved. I say that anybody who looks carefully through these negotiations will arrive at the conclusion that England was governed at that time by principles of expediency and not purely by a desire to maintain integrally the territory that belonged to us and our descendants. And, as to the Washington treaty, is there anybody in this House, who, knowing what has been published since that time, has any doubt but that there was then seriously debated—even when we had acquired importance, when this country was a confederation and was extending westward and intended to cover the whole of the northern part of this continent—is there any doubt in the mind of any man that the question of ceding Canada was discussed as a complete settlement of the Alabama claims and the claims resulting from the civil war? Is there any man who doubts that the British plenipotentiary at Washington—I think it was Sir Edward Thornton—stated that he was ready to give up Canada but did not like to do it without the consent of the people? If it were necessary to prove this, I would take up time quoting the authorities. But we need not go back even so far as this. Everybody knows, as a matter of the present generation, the history of the Alaska difficulty. We abandoned all our rights under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty for valuable privileges at the very time that this Alaska

difficulty was under consideration and when, as was pointed out, I think, by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) we should hold to all these privileges until we on our side had obtained a just and fair treatment of our claims. Everything was given away without equivalent obtained. And I am wondering this evening after what has been told us, if what happened in regard to the Alaska boundary is true. Is it true that Lord Alverstone, after having agreed with our own Canadian representatives as to the judgment that they were about to give, went, the day after to the final meeting of the Joint Commission, and there to the intense surprise of Sir Louis Jette and Mr. Aylesworth, changed his award and gave out two valuable islands—valuable from a strategic point of view—without having re-conferred with his fellow delegates. How can we explain such a thing as that? Certain it is, in regard to that transaction, that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself stated that our representations were ignored, that the three men named by the United States government were not, as the treaty required, impartial jurists. My right hon. friend stated in this House that his government made representations at that time, and yet the British government proceeded to accept the nomination of these three representatives of the United States without paying any attention to our protest. Members of this House will recollect what the Prime Minister said at that time in a moment of, to my mind, just irritation. I merely mention these facts, and have no wish to go into detail. There are many other facts that might be cited to prove this claim that any man who says that we owe a debt of gratitude to the mother country in respect to these many transactions under which our territory has been greatly fragmentized, is speaking of what he knows nothing about. But let us look for one instant at the internal work that has been done here. What of this pretension that if British supremacy is not maintained upon the sea, we cease to exist? I think that is carrying assertion a little far. Whatever we have in this country in the way of economic development or in the way of free political institutions is our own work. We built it up ourselves. And my right hon. friend will admit that, in the early days, we had to wrest concessions from the mother country. The Act of 1774, the Constitution Act of 1791, the responsible government of 1848, the different Constitutional Acts of a later day, confederation itself—were these things originated in England and brought out here for execution? Let us be fair; they were carried out by our own people. Our own people framed the confederation and brought it to England for sanction. Our own people extended the confederation from one side of the continent to the other. And the merit of England is that she recognized, as Spain did not, that, unless she entered upon a Liberal policy with her great dependencies she would have to submit to the fate that ultimately overtook Spain itself.

I would not open the chapter of 1837 as my right hon. friend has done. But I must confess to my friends from the province of Quebec, on the other side, not that I think them more intelligent than my friends of English origin on this side, that it is a surprise to me that they who know what it has cost us in blood, and sacrifices, and money, the liberties which we have earned, should treat so lightly, in such a childish manner, the scheme which has been brought before us to-day, and which, to my mind, inflicts a grievous wound upon the self-government which cost us so dear in the province of Quebec. I say that is to me a subject of surprise. It is not so long ago that men were thrown into jail for claiming just such things. There is not a man in this House who would continue to live in this country if he did not enjoy what was asked for by the ninety-two resolutions. I would not live in a country which did not possess the full enjoyment of what was claimed by those resolutions. Yet men were thrown into jail for claiming that which we could not live without to-day—no accusation, on suspicion, respectable men, honest men, put in jail for more than a year, and then released with nothing against them. Others were sent to the scaffold. I have been intimately connected and related with men who were not French Canadians, the counsel and defenders of those men at that trial, and I can say this from information received from them, men who have obtained a high judicial position in this country, that that trial left upon them many bitter reflections. Think of an officer, being a good hand at sketching, sitting down and sketching with levity a picture of one of those men hanging on a scaffold, showing it to his neighbour, before the trial was terminated. But I do not want to enter upon those events to-day. I will say this, however, that if this system of branding a public man of honest convictions as an ingrate, as a coward, continues, I will reopen that chapter, and say things which I believe will silence them for ever.

In all those discussions at the imperial conferences it has struck me that our representatives seem to have been impressed with the desire of giving every thing and claiming nothing. Whether my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I regret to see is not here,

were hypnotized and put into a trance I do not know. But at those conferences nothing was claimed. You would imagine that people accustomed to British liberty, to British privileges, when proposals of this kind were laid before them, would ask for some correlative privileges, which every Britisher is proud to possess throughout the world. But no. At one conference there is a resolution proposed by an Australian delegate, and carried, to the effect that in so far as diplomatic and confidential relations would allow, it was proper for the British government to communicate commercial treaties to the colonies. Lord Tweedmouth, Mr. Chamberlain, and other English public men, imbued with the broad principle that responsibilities of this kind carried representation, had stated, as Lord Tweedmouth did at the conference of 1907: We dont ask you to do this without inviting you to share in the representation. That proposal was in harmony with British ideas. But on our side nothing was asked, nothing was claimed. I do not mean to say that if these things were in that shape before us, I would adhere to them. I think that 'sufficient to the day is the evil thereof'. But I am impressed with the idea that nothing seems to have been asked, and that we entered into this unlimited scheme of responsibility in such a manner as to distinguish us completely from the British subject who lives in the British isles, and who himself controls the foreign policy of the empire.

Now, I notice that at a meeting of the Women's Canadian club at the city of Quebec His Excellency the Governor General, in a very interesting speech, spoke as follows, after having devoted his attention for a considerable time to a justification of imperialism:

(Translation). Is there in the world a people more privileged than the people who inhabit the fine province of Quebec? Your laws, your language, are under the special protection of the British Crown. In return for so many privileges and advantages, the Crown exacts nothing from you except sentiments of loyalty. The word 'imperialism' does not imply active intervention from England in the government of this country; the word 'imperialism' symbolizes the power of each of the units of the empire and absolute liberty in each of these units.

Now, I do not for a moment apprehend that these remarks of Lord Grey before the ladies of Quebec would have any practical result upon this very important political question. We have not reached that stage which gave rise to the old French saying, 'Le royaume est tombé en quénouille.' But I would be curious to know in what respect this scheme increases the amount of liberty that we enjoy at present, and in what respect it increases the happiness we have succeeded in obaining in this country, and which we at present enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I said a moment ago that I thought from their position and from what I know they know, my friends from the province of Quebec who sit on the other side of the House would look at this question more seriously than they seem to have done. I have been several years in this House and I have been astonished at their conduct sometimes, I am bound to say after what I have alluded to, as to the struggles which took place in our province for the obtaining of the liberties which we now all enjoy and for which I think some credit is due for what was done in the province of Quebec. I have seen these gentlemen in this House vote against the maintenance of the rights that were claimed for the minority in the organization of the new provinces of the west, I have seen them vote against the maintenance of the right which all parties in this House admitted to exist with regard to the French language in these provinces when at one time I moved for the maintenance of the strict right of the French Canadian to speak—only to speak—in that language in both of the assemblies of these provinces. They voted against it when it was admitted in this House by every jurist that that right stood exactly upon the same plane as the right to free education. I have seen them remaining during all these years utterly indifferent to the denial of the rights of the minority in Manitoba after having heard them say what they said in my province before the elections in 1896. I must confess to these gentlemen that their final cheerful adhesion to the scheme now submitted to this parliament is an additional, and I may say, a somewhat painful surprise, I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, although I agree with something that is contained in the motion moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, a subamendment as follows:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion, that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

After the long explanation that I have given I think the House will realize that it is the right of the people of Canada to be consulted upon this new policy. I think it is an infamous denial of the rights of the people to pass on and carry through this scheme without even giving them a chance, they, who are the absolute masters, of expressing an opinion with regard to a policy which is new to us, new to them, has never been even mentioned before the people of this country and upon which they have the right without any doubt of expressing their free opinion

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of emotion that I now rise to give my earnest support to what I believe to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that has ever been introduced into this parliament, since it has been in existence. I hope I will be brief in the remarks which I intend to offer, I hope I will be clear and that I will treat this subject, not with levity, but with the gravity which it imposes upon one. Sir, I have listened with great pleasure to the speeches which have already been delivered by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I have listened to what has been said and I believe that as regards the policy of the government, no clearer, no more eloquent statement could be made than the one which was made this afternoon by the Prime Minister of Canada. Let me say, in justice to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, with whom I may differ, that he has placed himself squarely before the House, and that he has presented in a concrete form, the policy of his party. I have listened courteously, I believe, to the statement which has just been made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, who represents one wing of the Conservative opposition. I say that I have listened courteously to him, as I always do. I can never forget one thing. When my hon. friend speaks, I always remember that he was my old professor at Laval University, and I owe him the courtesy which a pupil owes to his professor. I did not interrupt him when he began his remarks and he should have spared me his sneers when he referred to a knighthood dangling before the eyes of the Postmaster General. Mr. Speaker, remember that this is intended for Quebec consumption; it is not for Ontario consumption. I have only this to say in answer to my hon. friend that he might have offered to his pupil a little more of the milk of human kindness and a little less of the cup of bitterness. Sir, I am a reformer, I do not belong to the party which by divine right is called upon to govern all the peoples of this world. I am a reformer, I am a plain man. Unlike my hon. friend, I am not a seigneur, no blue blood about me. Speaking as such, as belonging to that vast army of common people so well described by the late Abraham Lincoln as the race beloved of God, since they were so numerous on the face of the earth—yes, as a plain man and a reformer, with the deep sense of the duty which devolves on me on the present occasion, let me say to my hon. friend that if, forsooth, I am a knight, I am a knight of labour, nothing more and nothing else. And when I shall have said this evening what I intend saying, my language may be repeated in the smallest hamlet of the province of Quebec. And whether in the province of Quebec or in any of the other provinces, I will tell to the face of my hon. friend, who indulges in sneers at my expense, that let my right hand forget its cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if ever I sell my birthright and that of my fellow countrymen for a mess of pottage.

Sir, we had a right to expect that, on a question of this importance, the two great traditional parties in this parliament would have given to the people of Canada an example of union. This is a matter of the gravest interest, and after the resolution which was adopted unanimously on the 29th March, 1909, one would have expected that we would have united on the principle of a Canadian navy. But the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Liberals have on this, as on other questions, to face the same old opposition. 'Too much' my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) will shout to his faithful electors at Lachine, 'too much' will he shout to the electors of Gaspé, when I suppose he will represent me as being a slave of the King and as having sold myself to His Excellency the Governor General for a knighthood; 'too much' will he shout in the province of Quebec. 'Not enough,' my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) will say in Ontario; 'not enough' will he shout in the English provinces of the Dominion. Sir, it is the privilege of the Liberal party to aim always at a happy medium and to steer through the shoals a middle course in questions of this nature. Of course, the loyalty of that party is always impeached when a policy of this kind is presented before the electors. This reminds me of what happened at the time of the French revolution when that famous lady, Madame Roland, was brought to the guillotine. On her way, as she passed before the statue of liberty, she bowed reverentially, and turning to the people, exclaimed: O Liberty how many crimes are committed in thy name! Could we not with equal reason exclaim, when we hear those shrieks of loyalty from hon. gentlemen opposite: O Loyalty, what many crimes are committed in thy name! Sir, who would seriously impeach the loyalty of the leader of the Liberal party or that of the vast majority of Canadians, who to-day compose the reform party? Were we disloyal when in 1897, of our own free will, as the first act of the Liberal administration, we granted to Great Britain what is called the British preference? At the time of the

South African war, were we disloyal when, in spite of trying circumstances, we sent to South Africa the young men of this country to fight the battles of Greater Britain? Are we disloyal to-day when we are the first in the history of this Dominion to give His Majesty the King a navy, as the Conservative party of old gave Her Majesty the Queen an army? Mr. Speaker, let us not talk of loyalty, but let us practice loyalty. We are denounced as ultra loyal in the county of Jacques Cartier, and as ultra disloyal in the county represented by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule). In the province of Quebec, already, my hon. friend and his allies have started meetings of indignation against what they are pleased to call the great treason of the Liberal leader. The Blue press, which has been quoted this evening by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), is stirring up the worst prejudices of our people against this policy. The leader of the Liberal party is represented as sacrificing his compatriots, the French Canadians, on the altar of Moloch, meetings have been organized and resolutions have been passed protesting against the navy. Sir, it is the same old story. At the time of the Boer war, these shouts and shrieks were heard, as they were again heard when the Autonomy Bill of 1905 was introduced. But, thank heaven, there is a majority in this country of men of common sense.

I shall not delve into old books, I shall not quote to the House what happened fifty or sixty years or a hundred years ago. The privilege of a reformer is to face every difficulty as it presents itself and it is the beauty of the British constitution, that while it is based on precedents, it adapts itself to every circumstance and difficulty. Sir, why a navy for Canada? Because it is a natural evolution of the country. Take the marvellous increase of our population—thanks to the wise policy of the Liberal party, the population of Canada since 1896 has nearly doubled. Thanks to the Liberal party—thanks to Providence first and to the Liberal party afterwards.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There has been an enormous increase in our natural wealth. I have it from the hon. gentleman who presides over the Census Bureau, the Minister of Agriculture, that at the time of the next census, a year from now, the population of this Dominion will be nearer 8,000,000 than it will be 7,500,000. Our vast territories have become the refuge, the happy refuge, of thousands and hundreds of thousands of settlers. Do not our hon. friends opposite, who I verily believe are as patriotic as we are on this side of the House, not agree that it is good policy to instil into the minds and hearts of the new settlers who come from the United States, the idea that this country should defend and protect herself? The financial position of this country is extremely sound. As was stated this afternoon by the Prime Minister, the revenue of this year has reached the high-water mark of over $100,000,000; surpluses have followed each other since 1897, since we established the British preference. Our total trade, which in 1896 was $249,000,000, has reached the enormous figure of $750,000,000. The savings banks deposits, which in 1896 were only $250,000,000 have reached in 1909 the sum of nearly $800,000,000. The production of western grain in 1900 was only 32,000,000 bushels; in 1909 it reached 330,000,000 bushels. The mineral production of this country has also far exceeded our expectations. So I am not amiss when I say that our population has doubled, that our wealth has trebled, that our trade and our industry have increased by leaps and bounds since 1896. To use the language of the Toronto 'News,' I can say:

> Unexampled prosperity has dawned upon this confederacy. Our foreign trade surpasses $700,000,000 annually, our railway mileage is enormous, our prairie lands are filling up rapidly, our financial institutions are strong and vigorous, our industries are growing enormously.

From an economic point of view the Dominion of Canada of 1896 is represented by the value of two Dominions of Canada. It is not, I suppose, contrary to any constitutional doctrine of which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is such a brilliant exponent, to say that Canada has become the leading overseas dominion of the British empire. We make and unmake our tariffs; we control our defences; we practically make our own treaties. Not later than the first of February last came in force the Franco-Canadian treaty, which was negotiated through the diplomacy of our own Canadian statesmen, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Sir, I can repeat the words of the right hon. the Prime Minister, who said in the presence of His Majesty the King in 1897: Canada is a nation within the empire. There was no question at the time as to whether or not the Prime Minister had used the words equivocally, whether he recognized the sovereignty or the suzerainty of the King. On this point let me say one word. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been a professor of constitutional law. It so happens that in the same university I myself was a professor of the history of law, and I happen to know the difference between suzerainty and sovereignty. In England, in France, in Germany, the King is the suzerain—why? Because they were feudal countries. Under the feudal system, barons, mar-

quises and counts had become very powerful, until in France for example, the day came when Louis XIV. became the suzerain of all his grand vassals, the barons, marquises and counts. So it was in England and in Germany. It is silly indeed to pick a quarrel over the use of the word suzerain or the word sovereign. Sir, we are a nation within the empire, and why I pray, should we not have a navy of our own? Does any one dispute the right of this country to have a militia of her own? If there are objections to a Canadian navy, are there not also objections to a Canadian militia? My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier excited the merriment of his friends opposite when he opened his remarks; but I must say that when he concluded it looked as if the other side of the House was rather gloomy. Let me say to my hon. friend that he has not played the game fair. He has represented the thousands and hundreds of thousands of readers of the daily press in the province of Quebec as an ignorant lot. He insinuates that we, on this side of the House, have been bluffing the electorate of the province of Quebec, and he has quoted partially from a leader published in 'Le Canada' newspaper. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had time to translate that leader. Not a word can be found in it that is a reproach to the man who wrote it. It is ably written, and to every word in it any man could subscribe. It is written in French, and my hon. friend translated it into English only partially. I hope that some of my friends who will speak on this question will read the translation of this article. It is headed 'Les Quatre Manieres de Voir,' 'The Four Different Views.' and explain the policy of the Liberal party. as voiced this afternoon by the leader of the government. The editor states that in case of an emergency it is in the power of the Canadian parliament to say whether or not the navy can be used by His Majesty the King. My hon. friend excited hilarity of that side of the House on the word 'may.' 'May,' he said with emphasis, the Canadian government 'may' lend that tin-pot navy to the King of England. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was in the House some years ago when the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) introduced his Bill to revise the Militia Act. Did he play with the words used in that Bill? Had he scrutinized the various clauses of that very important Bill he would have read a clause quite similar to the clause referred to. Clause 69 of the Militia Act reads:

> The Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof on active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mark well: not the House of Commons but the traitors, who compose the cabinet. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we traitors may, if we so choose, lend the militia of Canada to the King of Great Britain. Has my hon. friend read that Act? Did he move any amendment when it was proposed in the House of Commons? Did he notice it? Was he absent? I believe he was not present and judging by the language he used this evening, to say the least, he was deficient in his duty.

Sir, it is of this argument of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, as regards the words: 'They may lend the navy to the King of England' that we shall hear in the present debate, particularly from my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), thundering denunciations, because forsooth the Canadian parliament is to meet and to deliberate whenever an emergency arises. But, Sir, this principle is in the Militia Act: parliament, according to clause 71, must meet when there is an emergency and when our militia is on active service. There are things which are said in the province of Quebec, and others in the province of Ontario and thus, various comments are made on the clauses of the Militia Act. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier referred to the heroes of 1837 and 1838. He appealed to the French Canadian members in the House of Commons, he, the descendant of one who was fighting against the patriots of 1837. In his historical reminiscenses, has the hon. gentleman forgotten that the father of the Militia Act was a great leader and a knight at that, of the French-Conservative party, Sir George Etienne Cartier? Has he forgotten that Sir George Cartier was on the battlefields at St. Charles and St. Denis with the grandfather of the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who signed with his own blood the Magna Charta of not only the French Canadians but also of the English-speaking Canadians of this country? Sir, the Thirty Seveners as they call them in the county of York, did not fight only in the Queen's bush of Quebec, but fought also for the same cause not very far from Toronto. But this is not only a question of sentiment, it is above all a question of business and hard facts and I hasten to revert to hard facts and business. Why should we not have a navy as we have an army? En passant, it is well to remember, that our militia force is not the skeleton of an army. I have heard more praise to the Canadian army during my peregrinations abroad, and from higher authorities than my friend suspects, certainly more praise than I have heard falling from the lips of my hon. friends opposite. Who were the men who thus praised the

Canadian army? His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the old General, the hero of South Africa, Lord Roberts. I say there is a beginning to everything. My hon. friend quoted a French axiom a moment ago. Let me quote another: 'Rome ne s'est pas bâti en un jour.' 'Rome was not built in a day.' The Canadian militia was organized fifty years ago. It is now a fighting force. It is a credit not only to Canada but to the empire, and when the time of danger comes, the Canadian militia will give a good account of itself. Might I not prophesy the same happy results for a Canadian navy? Sir, speaking for my country, I do not shrink at being great. No, I do not shrink at being great. My hon. friend, a moment ago, quoted the words of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in Quebec the other day. He did not say what he had in his mind; he simply gave expression to a few flighty, elastic, pliable thoughts. I know, Sir, what will be said. Nay, I know what is already being said in the province of Quebec by my hon. friend's friends, about His Excellency. He is represented, very courteously, very chivalrously, by my hon. friend's companions and knight errants, as the commercial traveller of the empire. Sir, His Excellency the Governor General took occasion the other day, speaking before the Canadian club of Quebec, to define what the word 'imperialism' implied. I was very pleased to be present to applaud, and to see many of the leading citizens of Quebec, Conservatives and Liberals applauding also and cheering His Excellency. Let me translate into English what His Excellency said on that occasion. It is a lesson which should have been read by my hon. friend for his own benefit, and, now that I translate it, it will be a lesson to all those who misrepresent the attitude of the Governor General of Canada:

> Is there in the world a people more privileged than the people who inhabit the fine province of Quebec? Your laws, your language, are under the special protection of the British Crown. In return for so many privileges and advantages, the Crown exacts nothing from you except sentiments of loyalty. The word 'imperialism' does not imply intervention from England in the government of this country; the word 'imperialism' symbolizes the power of each of the units of the empire and absolute liberty in each of these units.

Sir, speaking the language of the old Normans, which is still spoken in the British House of Commons, I say: J'assente. If that is the bogey represented by my hon. friend to the electors of Lachine and Jacques Cartier, I say: Happy electors of Lachine and Jacques Cartier, to be powerful as a unit of the empire, and also absolutely free as a unit of that empire! Sir, have we not a sea-board to protect? Nay, we have two sea-boards to protect. We have also trade routes to look after. We have a sea-board on the Atlantic ocean with its prosperous and thriving cities; we have a sea-board on the western coast at Vancouver, at Victoria, at Prince Rupert, where, before many years have elapsed, marts of commerce and industry will develop. Not to speak of as possible conflicts with the United States of America—for I may well echo to the sentiment expressed by the Prime Minister of England, when, in a very recent debate he stated that, in his two-standard-power policy he never contemplated the possibility of conflict with the United States of America,—and neither do we contemplate the possibility of conflict with the great nation to the south. We would not, however, be true to ourselves, true to our traditions, if we did not exhibit to the Americans the same traits of courage, the same fighting qualities, that our ancestors have shown, should the hour of danger arise. We desire as a colony—nay, as a Dominion—we desire to be respected: let us begin by respecting ourselves and thus obtain the respect of the great neighbouring republic. But, Sir, not to speak of the United States of America, I say there is on the Pacific ocean a great power—two great powers. There is Japan, whose navy at the present hour—a navy organized by a Quebecker, Sir Archibald Douglas—is second only to that of Great Britain. As the Prime Minister stated this afternoon, fortunately for us, England in her many blunders—if I should use the word of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier—has secured a treaty of alliance with Japan. We have nothing to fear from Japan so long as that treaty lasts. But treaties do not last for ever, they are, so to speak, negotiable instruments: they change hands; and it is well to be prepared lest a change should take place. There is also a great power, China, which is looming large in the world's affairs, which sent, no longer ago than during the month of November last, a dozen picked naval officers to study in England the conditions of the British navy. Therefore, Sir, as I stated a moment ago, every one who does not shrink from thinking of his country being great, should think of our future and not cast aspersions on our efforts to build a navy. Mr. Speaker, I stated a moment ago, that we had trade routes to protect. I notice that some gentlemen are referring to resolutions which were adopted by the Grain Growers and the Grangers against the expenditure for a Canadian navy. Let me say this: I do not wish to lecture the Grain Growers and the Grangers, but some facts should not be ignored. If there is one class of people in this country

who, in case of war, would require the protection of the Canadian navy, iti s the farming community. I speak from a purely material point of view, because from the national point of view, I assume that we would all be happy to defend this country and to co-operate loyally with the imperial navy if need be. Let me give a few figures. In the calendar year 1908, the Canadian farmer sold his products outside of Canada to the extent of about $308,100,000. Briefly, if you took it in bulk to Great Britain in that year, we sold to the value of $97,400,000; to the United States, $3,200,000; to other countries, $7,350,000. In other words, the mother country took from us 90·2 per cent of all our agricultural exports. In view of these figures, does not the security of the British market mean something to us, and especially t› our farming community? Great Britain takes from us nine-tenths of the products of our farms. Those who believe that the farmers will be led astray by the do-nothing policy, are strangely astray themselves. I know that the farmers of this country are intelligent enough, in case of danger, to defend the trade routes, so as to protect the cargoes of food supply conveyed from Canada to the mother country.

Now, what are the objections made to the naval policy of the government?

1. It is stated in the province of Quebec by the friends of my hon. friend, that there is no need of a navy for Canada, because we are protected by the United States through the Monroe doctrine;

2. That we have no obligations towards Great Britain;

3. That the Prime Minister of Canada and his party have not kept their pledge on the question of militarism;

4. That Canada will not control her navy;

5. That there should be a plebiscite before any policy is affirmed.

Let me answer briefly to the objections I have enumerated. It is contended in Quebec that we do not require any protection because in case of war, we will be protected by the Monroe doctrine; if we were attacked, Uncle Sam would come to our rescue.

Mr. MONK. Would my hon. friend mention the name of anybody who has advanced that theory?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I read it, in the first place, in the Blue press of the province of Quebec; in the next place, it was expounded the other evening, during a three hours' speech, by the ally of my hon. friend, the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa. If that is the policy of the little Canadians, how undignified that language is, especially if it is endorsed by a gentleman in whose veins runs blue blood; how undignified it is that we, a free people on this continent, should dream of relying upon the United States for defence in case we were attacked. Mark well, Sir, those who invoke the Monroe doctrine claim that they are better Canadians than we are; they denounce us as traitors to our country and our constitution. What is the effect of the Monroe doctrine? Does it apply to Canada? Every one who has read history knows that between 1811 and 1823 the Spanish dependencies of South America and of Central America declared their independence. That was at the time of the congress of Vienna, quite an historical event, at the beginning of the last century, in Europe. Then, was formed among the large nations of the world what has been called in history, the Holy Alliance. It was feared in the United States that the Bourbon dynasty, which had been ousted from its throne in Spain, might be represented in South America or Central America by one of its descendants. Then it was that President Monroe, backed by the diplomacy of Great Britain, through the strong hand of one of her best diplomats, Canning, issued the famous message which has since become historical. Let me quote from that message to see how it would apply to Canada:

> The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favour of the liberty and happiness of their fellowmen on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers, in matters relating to themselves, we have never taken any part nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. The difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We owe it therefore to candour and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any position of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.

And then the President adds:

> With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere.

So, if the Monroe doctrine is the consolation of the so-called anti-militarist party, let me say to them that in case of the invasion of Canada by a foreign power, we could not rely on the help of the United States. There is nothing

in the message of a nature to guarantee to European sovereigns the maintenance of their American possessions intact against any possible attacks from the others in the event of a European war. There is no warrant is history and it is a simple distortion of the facts to pretend that we are in the least protected by the Monroe doctrine. The acceptance of that doctrine under such circumstances would be unworthy of any true patriotic Canadian. In case of war, say, between Germany and England, we would be belligerents according to international law, Monroe doctrine or no Monroe doctrine. Our young men would enlist, and Canada would be the chief source of food supply to the mother country as she partially is to-day. We all know that the food supply of a fighting nation is contraband of war, and therefore we would find that our ships would be seized or attacked and we could not rely upon the Monroe doctrine to protect these ships carrying the food supplies of Canada to the mother country. There is no warrant in history for the assumption that the Monroe doctrine protects us and it is, I repeat, unworthy of any true, patriotic Canadian to utter such a fallacy. It has been stated that we have no obligations towards Great Britain. My hon. friend said in so many words that what we have secured, we have secured through our own energy, through our own courage, through our own blood and through our own grit. I admit that our ancestors fought, but did they fight against Great Britain? My hon. friend referred a moment ago to 1837 and 1838. The patriots who rebelled in 1837 and 1838 did not fight Great Britain, or British institutions, or the British Crown. They rebelled against the Family Compact. They were only too prone and too happy to claim their privilege of British citizenship and if my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier will read one or two of the first paragraphs of the famous 92 resolutions presented to parliament by Papineau and Bédard he will see that the men of '37 and 38' were only claiming their rights as British citizens. I say, Sir, that we have obligations towards the mother country, that we are interested primarily to see her in the future, as she has been during the last century, the mistress of the seas. We are interested primarily in maintaining her supremacy, because we know that that supremacy has been the means of vindicating throughout not only the British dominions, but throughout the civilized world, wherever there were small nations curbed by tyranny, the principles of right, of justice and liberty. We pay no tribute. We contribute nothing towards her navy. We enjoy absolute autonomy, and it is through that autonomy, and of our own free will, that we to-day undertake to build this Canadian navy in order to help the mother country in first defending our own coasts and co-operating loyally with her in case of emergency. The Conservatives say that the Liberal party and the Prime Minister have altered their policy. They quote in the province of Quebec, one line from a speech delivered by the Prime Minister in 1902 in which he stated that this young country was not to be drawn into the vortex of militarism. To that expression of the Liberal policy I assent as I assented a moment ago to the words spoken by His Excellency the Governor General. We are not a military party. We are a Canadian party. If we were for militarism we would accept the doctrine propounded by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We would throw our money into the British exchequer without counting, without discussing; we would send our men, without calling parliament, and without putting the regulations of our militia and of our navy under the control of the Canadian government. But, Sir, the Canadian constitution, give us, as British subjects, a salutary check—a check which we can impose even on His Majesty the King. Yes, Sir, that is no new doctrine. Let me quote from Lord Camden:

> I will maintain it to my latest hour; taxation and representation are inseparable. This position is founded on the laws of nature; it is more, it is itself an eternal law of nature; for whatever is a man's own is absolutely his own; no man has a right to take it from him without his consent, either expressed by himself or his representative.

That is sound British doctrine, the doctrine for which Hampden fought, but I suppose he was only a pedant according to my hon. friend. Hampden and Pym stood and fought for such a principle and it is embalmed and ingrained in the British constitution of to-day. Yes, parliament can impose a salutary check even on His Majesty the King. I am not disloyal, Mr. Speaker, in uttering such words. Let me read again from Lord Camden:

> To fix the era when the Commons began is perilous and destructive; to fix it in Edward's or Henry's reign is owing to the idle dreams of some whimsical, ill-judging antiquaries; but this point is too important to be left to such wrong-headed people. When did the House of Commons begin? When, My Lords? It began with the constitution. There is not a blade of grass growing in the most obscure corner of this kingdom which is not, which was not ever, represented since the constitution began. There is not a blade of grass which when taxed was not taxed by consent of the proprietor.

Lord Camden must have been a very disloyal subject indeed, and I am surprised he did not leave his head on the block in those dark days of despotism. Happily, the doc-

trine he propounded is engraved in the British constitution.

We are told in the province of Quebec that this naval policy is a new idea, that it is being sprung on the electors of the Dominion. My hon. friend made that statement in the county of Jacques Cartier. Sir, I read the other day, on my return to Canada, with the greatest pleasure the very able speech—worthy of being called an essay—in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) gave a synopsis of the various imperial conferences held in London since 1887. I read that speech carefully and would like to have it read by every youth in this country. I commend it not only to the young men of the English speaking provinces but to the young men in the province of Quebec. They will there learn that the idea of a Canadian navy is not a new one, that it is not a new fancy of the Prime Minister. They will see that as far back as 1887 the question was mooted at the imperial conference. It was not discussed at Ottawa in 1893, because, as stated by my hon. friend, that conference had been summoned, not by the British government, but by the colonies. But it came up very prominently at the conference of 1902, and in the light of that conference, those who say that this policy of a Canadian navy is a new one and that the people ought to be consulted regarding it, are singularly ignorant of the facts. Why, the policy embodied in the Bill we are now discussing, the very ideas expressed in that Bill, are to be found in the declaration made in the name of Canada during the imperial conference of 1902. I hope I am not detaining you too long——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But as I intend this speech of mine to be circulated among the French Canadians of the province of Quebec, I wish to make this quotation which is to be found in the appendix page 73 of the return for 1902:

> The Canadian ministers regret that they have been unable to assent to the suggestions made by Lord Selborne respecting a navy, and by Mr. St. John Brodrick respecting the army. The ministers desire to point out that their objections arise, not so much from the expense involved, as from a belief that the acceptance of the proposals would entail an important departure from the principle of colonial government. Canada values highly the measure of local independence which has been granted her from time to time by the imperial authorities, and which has been so productive of beneficial results, both as respects the material progress of the country and the strengthening of the ties that bind it to the motherland. But while, for these reasons, the Canadian ministers are obliged to withhold their assent to the propositions of the admiralty and the War Office, they fully appreciate the duty of the Dominion, as it advances in population and wealth, to make more liberal outlay for these necessary preparations of self-defence which every country has to assume and bear.
>
> At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side. The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval system of defence as well. On the sea coast of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that at an early date a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to the making of their services available for defence in time of need.
>
> In conclusion, the ministers repeat that while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the Dominion to make expenditures for the purposes of defence in proportion to the increasing population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures should be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which she now bears; and have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of the experienced imperial officers, so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

Reading that state paper, left in the hands of the secretary of the imperial conference of 1902, one can find the very principle, the very theory of the Bill we are now discussing.

I say that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he declared to his electors, a few days before the session that the country had been taken by surprise, either had not read the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister in 1902 or laid himself open to that other reproach of having assented during the session following the imperial conference of 1902 to the policy then advocated by the Prime Minister.

Mr. MONK. I have read very carefully not only that, but the different views expressed by the Prime Minister during the conference of 1907.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In this document, the right hon. the Prime Minister anticipated, so to speak, the legislation being presented to the House to-day. In 1907, he refused to be led by the Hon. Dr. Smart and by Mr. Jameson who were then propounding a militarist policy. The right hon. gentleman differed from them, but he adhered firmly to his declaration of 1902, and when the affairs of this country became more prosperous, when he found that the financial crisis and its effect had passed away, he came out boldly with the policy advocated in 1902. I say further that the resolution unanimously adopted on the 29th March, 1909, is based on that state

paper. My hon. friend should blush before declaring war on the government, as he is doing in the province of Quebec, when he himself was here and agreed to that resolution. My hon. friend says and his friends in the province of Quebec contend that we should submit this question to a plebiscite. Sir, I have only one answer to make to my hon. friend, and it is the answer of the knight-errant of whom he spoke a moment ago. When there is arising in this country a question of duty, not only towards the Crown, but towards the native land, there is no need of a plebiscite. A knight-errant is impelled by a deep sentiment of loyalty and chivalry to accomplish his duty, and has not to consult the country, because he knows fully well that the country is at heart with him, just as the city of Ottawa was at heart with the government on Saturday last.

Mr. SPROULE. Was not the argument the hon. gentleman advanced some time ago, when he read some remarks of Lord Camden, to the effect that nothing should be taken from the individual without his consent and that representation went with taxation, contrary to the argument he is presenting now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is generally fair, and I must pay him this compliment, that he is sincere and honest. There is no discrepancy between the two statements. A moment ago, in answer to the reproach which is being hurled at us in the province of Quebec, that the navy was at the beck and mercy and fancy of the imperial authorities, I said that it was not—that we were British subjects, possessed of rights and privileges; that we had a parliament, and that parliament would say whether our navy would serve the imperial ends or not. Then I quoted Lord Camden as my authority, and I believe that the principles laid down by him are at the very foundation of the British constitution.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman this? Provided we go on and carry out this policy, and are prepared to take part in all the controversies of Great Britain from year to year, shall we not be doing it in violation of the very principle the hon. gentleman lays down, because we have no representation in the British House of Commons, to say whether the wars are proper or improper according to our judgment, though we contribute to them?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will answer that question in a moment. But we are told by some of our hon. friends that our navy is not worthy of that name. It is the laughing-stock of the Conservative press in the country. Do you believe, Sir, that Dreadnoughts or battleships alone are required by the British Admiralty? I do not claim to be an expert; far from it. But since this question has been before the country, I have taken the trouble to read a little of what has been said in this country and abroad by experts. What is the opinion of Sir Wm. White, who, as we all know was the chief naval instructor of the Admiralty of Great Britain until very lately. He made a speech not very long ago before the Royal Society of Arts in London, and what did he say? He said:

> 'Showing the flag even in small vessels' has been and is no empty or merely ceremonial custom. It has done much to maintain British prestige, to promote and protect British commerce, and to make more real the recognition of British sea-power all over the world; while the small vessels employed on these services have furnished excellent schools of training and opportunities for gaining experience and lessons in direct responsibility by younger officers. There has been a tendency in recent years to minimise these results, and to treat as 'worse than useless' the smaller classes of vessels which from time immemorial have been so engaged. It is satisfactory to note that wiser counsels are again prevailing, and the necessity for employing vessels of many classes in an imperial navy is recognized.

This is the opinion, not of a humble parliamentarian like my hon. friend from East Grey or myself, but of an expert. He would not characterize the Canadian navy, with its eleven ships, as a tin-pot navy. He would say that it is a necessary adjunct to the British navy and a great helper in time of war.

Mr. SPROULE. He says they are useful for training ships.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And also for the protection of British commerce I will quote further:

> Every care ought to be taken to avoid inferiority in types and numbers of ships, and to provide all classes required to make up modern battle fleets,—ships fit for the fighting line, cruisers, torpedo craft, submarines and special vessels used as colliers, store ships, repair ships, and for other subsidiary but important duties. Battle-fleets are essential to the maintenance of supremacy at sea, but it is necessary also to provide for the protection of British commerce and communications.
>
> In addition to regularly built cruisers, lightly armed mercantile vessels possessing high speed and large coal supplies will certainly be used in future for commerce destruction. During the last two years a fresh start has been made in the construction of commerce-protecting cruisers of moderate size, and all who have the interests of the empire at heart must rejoice at this return to a saner policy, which has been justified by long experience.

The scheme for Canadian and Australian navies contemplates the building of a number of swift cruisers of this class for use in the approaches to great ports where trade routes converge and the chances of injury to merchant ships attain their maximum if an enemy possesses vessels suitable for employment in those regions.

This is the opinion of an expert and I am glad my hon. friend gave me an opportunity of further quoting what has been stated by so great a military authority on the British navy.

Now, shall I speak of the German scare? I think I need not refer to it. The British electorate have just answered the insinuations which were made on the platform in England to the effect that the German navy was every morning leaving the Baltic sea and ready to land on British soil and get possession of London itself.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not claimed that the British electorate got a whack at the Lords?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows better. He knows that in this election there were three issues, one as regards the Lords. It was a very strong issue which was somewhat obscured by my hon. friend's friends on the other side, by tariff reform and the German scare. Did not the great leader of the Conservative party in England, in the very last days of the election, have resort to some of the words used by a certain Socialist by the name of Blatchford? Yes, Sir, even Mr. Balfour himself stated in so many words that there was fear of a German invasion and that the British electorate should repulse that old enemy, the Radical party in England, because, forsooth, British institutions were not in safe hands. It is about the same story in England as it is in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. By what process does my hon. friend find out what caused the remaining majority of the Liberal party, which of these three things was it that brought it about and which of the three things was it that gave the Unionists so large a gain over them? I know he has been there and understands all that—he is the one who did the business.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In 1906, when the hon. gentleman with his well known eloquence went to England to help the cause of tariff reform, the Liberal party abnormally secured a majority of over 200. My hon. friend came back to Toronto and other issues were discussed in England and the parties took to their normal level in British politics. I am in earnest in what I am saying. My hon. friend knows as a matter of fact the majority the Liberal party secured in the election of 1906 was abnormal, owing to circumstances that we know too well. At this last election the Liberal party came back to power with a working majority, with a substantial majority, but it is the aim of the Tory press in this country to distort the facts. Every day we hear of a coalition ministry. But Mr. Asquith is quietly resting on the continent, he is enjoying his villegiature there. He will come back in a few days. His majesty, the King, will open parliament, the budget will be adopted even by the Lords and the Liberal party, aye the Labour party which after all is only the vanguard of the Liberal party, will continue to govern Great Britain. I am, I believe, just as much a Unionist, in the better sense of the word, as my hon. friend is. I am a true Unionist, and when I speak of a Liberal majority in Great Britain, whether that Liberal majority comes from the Radical party, from the Whigs, from the Labour party, or from that island whence the ancestors of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Doherty) came, it is nevertheless a Liberal majority, it is a reform majority.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. gentleman has appealed to me as being in some way able to speak for a certain portion of that majority. I desire to say most emphatically that so far as I know them, they form part of no Liberal and equally of no Conservative party in England.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman knows a great deal, but I can tell him that during the last parliament the Irish party voted on nearly every question with the Liberal party. They would be very ungrateful indeed if they did not vote with the successors of Gladstone, but they were not ungrateful. During the recent contest, after the speech delivered on the 12th of December last, by Mr. Asquith at Albert Hall in London, we received the echo of another speech delivered the day after by Mr. Redmond, in which he pledged the support of his party to the Liberal majority in the House of Commons because he knows that with the Liberal party in England they will secure home rule for Ireland.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask my hon. friend—

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, I did not speak for Ulster.

Mr. SPROULE. Who was responsible for the German scare which he says the Unionists used so effectively during the elections?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will say that the German scare is the work of a very thrifty journalist by the name of Lord Northcliffe.

Mr. SPROULE. It was started in the House of Commons by the present leader of the Reform party, Mr. Asquith himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will answer my hon. friend by the words of Mr. Asquith and of Mr. McKenna, the present Lord of the Admiralty. I quote, from 'Public Opinion', Mr. McKenna's words:

At this moment, Great Britain has got seven Dreadnoughts in commission, Germany has got two. When Germany has four in commission, Great Britain will have ten; when Germany has five in commission, Great Britain will have twelve; when Germany has nine in commission, Great Britain will have fourteen; and when Germany has eleven in commission, Great Britain will have sixteen; and when Germany has thirteen in commission, Great Britain will have twenty.

And further:

The navy scare has not the slightest foundation in fact.

That is the statement of the first Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. McKenna. And what does Mr. Asquith say? He stated, at Birkenhead, on the 21st December last:

With regard to our defensive forces, the navy and the army, I do not hesitate to say that they never were in a more efficient, a better equipped or a more highly organized condition than they are to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not what I was asking. What was this statement in the House of Commons when he was asking for the naval estimates?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not aware of that statement, but I take the statement made publicly on the platform by Mr. McKenna, the first Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Asquith, the prime minister, and Sir Edward Grey, the secretary for Foreign Affairs. Sir Edward Grey said:

The British navy is being maintained in a position to protect the country from any probable combination of fleets.

Again, the right hon. Reginald McKenna, first Lord of the Admiralty, said on January 5th last:

This navy scare is absurd and ridiculous. No attempt has been made to argue the question seriously. How can we reason with rumour or reply to shrieks?

Mr. McKenna may have used other language, but I quote his latest statements. I do not deny the statement alluded to by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but we all know that this German scare exists only in the imagination of party politicians. It was started by the party press of Great Britain, controlled by Lord Northcliffe, and was written up during the elections by the well-known socialist, Mr. Blachford, in the pay of a certain party in Great Britain. But, Sir, who will ever believe that Britons are scared by a 'German terror?' Sir, I am of French descent, but I know something of the history of England, and I say that no country in this world can abate the well-known and well-founded pride of British valour.

We are told that the building of this Canadian navy will give rise to graft, and that we in Canada are too ignorant to build a navy. The charge of graft is beneath contempt. Let the hon. gentleman who believes that Canadians are unable to build a navy go up from the bar of this chamber to the library, and he will see on the wall the following inscription:

In honour of the men by
Whose enterprise, courage and skill,
The 'Royal William,'
The first vessel to cross the Atlantic by steam power, was wholly constructed in Canada and navigated to England in 1883.

I claim—and I know that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), after all, is too good a Canadian not to say—that if Canadian energy and enterprise in the city of Halifax in 1833 was able to accomplish this, the Canada of 1910 is able to construct the modest—I admit, but very efficient—navy which is in germ in the Bill presented to this House. Sir, I have the pride of my country. I do not belong to the racial majority and may not have the same ideals as they have. But it seems to me there should be in this country common ideals on questions of this nature. If Canada has been able to build a Canadian Pacific railway, and if the enterprise of two men of the province of Ontario, Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, is duplicating that road in the Canadian Northern to-day; if the Canada of 1903 was able to remove, so to speak, further north, the boundaries of Canada by building another Transcontinental; if we are able to undertake the Hudson Bay railway, and to construct the Georgian Bay canal, it seems to me that it is not beyond our reach to build a Canadian navy. And we have in the maritime provinces, nay, we have in the old section of the province of Quebec, in the county which I have the honour with you, Mr. Speaker, to represent in this House, a thrifty and skilful people whose ancestors were all sailors, who were building ships, and the best ships of the empire, at the time of the ship-building industry in this country. May not we hope and expect that the descendants of these sailors and shipbuilders will be able to accomplish to-day what their forefathers were accomplishing sixty or seventy-five years ago?

But the experts of the British navy themselves are in favour of a Canadian-built navy. Sir William White, chief of naval construction of Great Britain, says this:

By many leading Canadians whose opinions are entitled to respect, it would be preferred to follow the course recently adopted by New Zealand, and to make a money 'grant-in-aid' of British navy estimates, leaving the decision as to the use made of the money to the Admiralty, who would be free to construct what numbers and types of ships they thought proper, to arrange for manning them, and to employ them in whatever service they chose as units of the Royal navy. This would be a simple plan, no doubt, would involve a minimum expenditure on construction, armament, manning and maintenance, and would secure early completion of these additions to the fleet. On the other hand the plan favoured by the Canadian government and (as I believe) supported by a preponderating opinion amongst the people of the Dominion is natural in the circumstances, has some distinct advantages, and tends to cultivate a national interest in the fleet, while it gives opportunities for the personal service of Canadian citizens in the naval defence of the empire. The government of the Australian Commonwealth is acting on lines similar to those favoured by the Canadian government, and has decided on the creation of its own navy before the Imperial Defence Conference of this year was aranged. In doing so Australia abandoned the plan of an annual cash payment (or subsidy) to British navy estimates, which had been in force since 1888.

I say that a Canadian built navy would be much more acceptable to the Canadian people than cash contributions to the British exchequer. The Canadian national sentiment would be much feebler if Canadian money was invisibly spent in England, instead of having a navy of our own, of having the ships under our own eyes, manned by our own people and built in our own yards. At first the navy would not be built as well as it would be in England, granted. The cost may be greater, granted again. But we must begin. I believe we will become a great nation, and we must arouse the pride of the Canadian people. If we were to argue, as some of my hon. friends argue on the other side of the House, we might bring back to this country the British garrisons. The British garrisons have departed, and we have assumed the care of Esquimalt and Halifax. We have now our own militia. Is it not better to form our own seamen instead of hiring, not Hessians, as in the days of old, but our sailors from the mother country, who, otherwise, would be of service to the motherland in the North sea and the British channel? Is it not better that we should have Canadian sailors on both the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans? Shipbuilding should not be confined to England, it should be extended to Canada. That was the view taken by Lord Milner when he came to this country a few months ago. That is the view of the grand old Canadian statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, in a letter he addressed to the Canadian press a few months ago, wherein he expressed his hope that the leader of the opposition would remain faithful to the policy unanimously adopted in this House on the 29th of March, 1909. Let me also quote the words of a Conservative paper, a patriotic paper, I mean the Ottawa 'Evening Journal':

Canadian navy built in Canada means the spending of the money in Canada, the establishment of shipyards and naval training schools in Canada, the building of ships in Canada, the employment of men in Canada, the purchase of material here, the encouragement of other Canadian industries. It means a stimulus to Canadian towns and cities, a new development of national self education and confidence, the avoidance of possible causes of friction with the mother country. The contribution policy means that Canadian taxes are spent in England, and they may become a source of friction and irritation, a source of dissatisfaction, here and there, as to the amount, and the way it should be expended. There will be no continuity to the system.

These are all strong reasons for adopting the policy propounded this afternoon by the right hon. gentleman. We are reminded by some that ours is only a tin pot navy, whilst in the province of Quebec it is regarded as a luxury. Sir, I thought my hon. friends had more pride. I have here a list of independent countries, and self-governing colonies, whose population does not exceed 10,000,000 people, and is in many cases less than that, who have navies of their own:

NAVIES OF COUNTRIES HAVING LESS THAN 10 MILLION INHABITANTS.

Argentina.—9 cruisers and armoured cruisers, gunboats and torpedo boats. Population, 7,000,000, 6,000 men. Naval policy, $35,000,000. 3 Dreadnoughts under contract.

Brazil.—15 armoured cruisers, 5 dockyards.

Chile.—7 armoured cruisers, 3 Dreadnoughts under contract. Population, 3,750,000.

Columbia.—3 cruisers on the Atlantic; torpedo boats; 2 cruisers on the Pacific. Population, 2,500,000.

Costa Rica.—1 torpedo boat, 1 gunboat. Population, 350,000.

Denmark.—9 armoured criusers and monitors. Population, 2,500,000.

Equator.—1 torpedo boat, 1 transport, 250 men. Population, 1,250,000.

Greece.—3 armoured cruisers and 20 torpedo boats; 4,000 men. Population, 2,000,000

Haïti.—6 warships, 3rd class cruisers, gunboats. Population, 1,500,000.

Mexico.—10 gunboats, 1 training ship, 6 protected cruisers, 198 officers, 965 men. Population, 13,000,000.

Holland.—17 cruisers, 8,000 men. Population, 5,750,000.

Norway.—5 cruisers, 1,000 men. Population, 2,500,000.

Paraguay.—5 transports and coast defence ships. Population, 700,000.

Peru.—5 armoured cruisers, 2 cruisers. Population, 5,000,000.

Portugal.—8 armoured cruisers, 5,687 men; Population, 5,500,000.

San Domingo. — 1 gunboat. Population, 610,000.

Sweden.—15 armoured cruisers. Policy, fortification works to last twelve years. Population, 5,500,000.

Sir, if we were to follow the advice of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier we would have the province of Quebec in the position in which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), a few years ago, said England was: in a splendid isolation; we would have the province of Quebec in this confederation, where all of the other English-speaking provinces on this question are one, although differing in details, we would have the province of Quebec in a position of splendid isolation.

Mr. Speaker, I am against the splendid isolation of the French Canadian race. I say to my hon. friend and to his ally, the ex-member for Labelle, Mr. Bourassa, one of the most talented men that the French Canadian race ever produced, that in propounding this policy of splendid isolation for the French Canadians in this confederation of ours, they are not true to the traditions of their race. No, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier does not respond to the national traditions of the race which he and I represent. He does not even respond to the political traditions of the French Conservative party of old. Let me give a few glimpses of the history of the province of Quebec, My hon. friend seems to infer that we, in Quebec, are naturally against any movement in favour of either a militia or a navy. In 1759, when the last act took place of that sombre drama on the Plains of Abraham, my forefathers passed under another domination. Under the French regime our forefathers had not known what liberty and free institutions were. We were governed by a bureaucracy and there was no such thing as parliamentary institutions. But, as Aeneas came from Troy to Rome and brought with him his customs and his laws, so, the British and the Scotch grenadiers, who vanquished the French on the Plains of Abraham, brought with them, so to speak, the British constitution and all that it implies. We were left a few thousand French, led by the Roman Catholic clergy, and abandoned by the seigneurs, who at that time returned to France. We were left a minority of 60,000 people on the two shores of the St. Lawrence, almost lost in the Anglo-Saxon continent of North America. We would have been submerged if the British parliament of 1774 had not, under the most generous impulse, given to the French Canadian Roman Catholic minority, its laws, its language, its customs and its religious freedom. Does not my hon. friend, whose allies are invoking the Monroe doctrine as a protection for us in case of attack, remember having read in the history of the thirteen colonies, that one of the grievances adduced by the revolutionists against the mother country was that very fact that the mother country had given the French Canadians and the Roman Catholics their religious freedom, their French laws and their national customs? In the light of history, would my hon. friend believe that if we were once launched on the American ocean, our laws, our schools, our usages and customs would be protected by the United States Congress? Let him remember the history of Louisiana. There was in Louisiana a French minority. It had the civil laws of France as we have the civil laws of France embalmed in the Canadian statutes. It professed the Roman Catholic faith. Let him go to Louisiana today; let the clergy; let the bishops of the province of Quebec go to Louisiana and what will they find? They will find many French names in the directories, but they will hear very little French spoken. They will see that while twenty or twenty-five years ago, French was taught in the schools, to-day there is only one language, and that is the English language. French laws were preserved. They are in their code, but they are printed in English and before the courts they are cited in the English language only. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that we had nothing to care about British supremacy, that if perchance British supremacy was a bygone thing, what we had gained, we would still keep. I say to my hon. friend that his language does not voice the sentiment of the far-seeing men of his race, and of his province. It is, on the contrary, of the most vital interest to the French Canadian citizen, whether he be a layman or a priest, whether a priest or a bishop, to stand up for the maintenance of British supremacy in order to preserve the rights, the privileges and the franchises which were obtained from the British parliament in 1774. My hon. friend says that we owe nothing to British statesmanship. As a Liberal, as a Canadian, I cannot forget that it is due to Charles James Fox, to the great Pitt himself, that the Canadians of 1774 secured what I have called on many occasions, the Magna Charta of the province of Quebec. What we obtained in 1774 was secured again under the constitution of 1791 and a few illustrations will show that the role of the French Canadian clergy has always been one of grateful and loyal adhesion to the British Crown just on account of the privileges enjoyed under it. What did Mgr. Briand, Bishop of Quebec, say? In May, 1775, at the time of the American invasion, he used this language:

The singular favour and kindness with which we have been governed by his most

Gracious Majesty King George the Third, since by the fortune of war we have been subject to his rule, the recent favours which he has just shown us in granting us the use of our own laws and the free exercise of our religion, and in allowing us to share in all the privileges and advantages of British subjects, should assuredly suffice to excite your gratitude and your zeal to sustain the interests of the Crown of Great Britain.

I may say to my hon. friend that Monseigneur Briand was a humble priest. He had seen this country passing from the French régime to the British régime, and he was full of the traditions of the past, but he had learned to appreciate what it meant for French Canadians to live under British institutions. He was not a sycophant or a jingo. He was a Canadian. He was not looking for honours or favour, for titles or knighthood, but he was simply voicing the sentiments of his people and expressing their gratitude to the British Crown. My hon. friend says we owe nothing to the British Crown, that we have wrested from Britain what privileges we possess. This is not exactly the language used by another distinguished prelate in the long line of French Canadian bishops. What did the Rev. Joseph Octave Plessis, afterwards bishop, and recognized as such by the British sovereign say? Sir, remember that in those days there were Catholic disabilities in England, but as far as Quebec was concerned those disabilities were wiped out by the British Crown, and the Roman Catholic church of Canada became practically an established church. What did this Catholic bishop of Quebec say? This is the language he used:

Our conquerors were looked upon with jealousy and suspicion, and inspired only apprehension. People could not persuade themselves that strangers to our soil, to our language, our laws and usages, and our worship, would ever be capable of restoring to Canada what it had lost by a change of masters. Generous nation, which has strongly demonstrated how unfounded were those prejudices; industrious nation, which contributed to the development of those sources of wealth which existed in the bosom of the country; exemplary nation, which in times of troubles teaches to the world in what consists that liberty to which all men aspire and among whom so few know its just limits; kind-hearted nation, which has received with so much humanity, the most faithful subjects most cruelly driven from that kingdom to which we formerly belonged; beneficent nation, which every day gives to Canada new proofs of liberality. No, no, you are not our enemies, nor of our properties which are protected by your laws, nor of our holy religion which you respect.

Sir, let me quote again what Monseigneur Plessis said on September 16, 1907. Speaking to the French Catholics of Quebec he said:

You have understood that your interests were not apart from those of Great Britain.

Thus he was speaking against the policy of isolation propounded by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and by Mr. Bourassa. He continued:

You are convinced, as we are, that it is impossible to be a good Christian without being a loyal and faithful subject; that you would be unworthy the name of Catholics and Canadians, if, forgetting the rules of your holy religion and the examples of your ancestors, you should show disloyalty or even indifference when it is a question of doing your duty as subjects devoted to the interests of your sovereign and the defence of your country. You have not waited until this province should be menaced by an imminent invasion, or even until war was declared to give proofs of your zeal and of your good-will for the public service.

This language applies as much against the reliance on the Monroe doctrine as against the splendid isolation preached by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. Sir, what benefit could French Canadians expect from annexation with the United States or from isolation in this confederation of ours? What would become of our language, our laws, our schools? As I said a moment ago, remember Louisiana! I repeat it again, my hon. friend does not represent the national aspirations of the province of Quebec in this matter. He does not even represent the French Conservative traditions. Sir George Cartier, whose name he mentioned, was the man who introduced in parliament the Militia Act of 1862. The Bill brought about the defeat of the government. What did Sir George say:

But I must at the same time confess that the question upon which we fell—the motion of Tuesday last (20th May, 1862) was a severe blow to us; in fact, it defeated us as responsible advisers to His Excellency. If, however, that blow had been aimed against us only, we should not have expressed regret, but I cannot help saying I apprehend—I sincerely apprehend—that vote will be hereafter invoked by those—and they are numerous who are hostile to the institutions of Lower Canada, and particularly to the French Canadians. But I hope that the noble conduct of our clergy, and the manifestation of the population of Lower Canada last fall, will mitigate any aspersion unprincipled men may be disposed to cast upon us.

In 1867, what did Sir Geo. Cartier do? In order to impress his fellow countrymen with the necessity of joining hands with the English-speaking Canadians, he demanded from his colleague, Sir John Macdonald, the portfolio of Militia. Why? Because he knew he could make that military policy popular with his own countrymen when they came to understand it. He

wanted the two races to be united in order to carry out the work of confederation.

It was necessary to prepare for the defence of the land, in the firm determination of the country to remain British. And so long as there was a British nation existing, the people of this dominion were resolved to remain a portion of it. He was certain that even if the expense were heavy for such a purpose, it would not be repudiated. He was almost ashamed to state before the great House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada that he required so little money to carry out so great an organization. (From the speech of March 31, 1868, before the House of Commons.)

On the first of May, 1868, when moving the House into Committee for the consideration of the resolutions respecting fortifications, Sir George Cartier said:

While it was conceded that Canada could always claim the aid, in emergency, of all the resources of the empire, it had been thought only just that the dominion should share the expenses necessary to make this assistance effectual. . . . If it be contended that such works are unproductive, it may be said in reply that Canada has now reached a stage of development, when following the example of other nations, it may oppose a barrier to invasion. By thus raising a barrier between Canada and its neighbours, Canada solemnly declares before the whole world that she desires to remain united to Great Britain. When the great fortifications previously mentionned, are built. English capitalists will be still more firmly convinced that their funds are secure in this country, and Canada will then become a field of profitable investments for British capital. Thus falls the objection to a measure which is nothing else but the very measure proposed by the imperial government itself. That objection that I foresaw, and which consists in saying that the country is going to spend large sums of money on unproductive works cannot stand.

What he said about fortifications and the Militia applies with greater force to the conditions with which we are confronted to-day. But Cartier spoke also about a Canadian navy. It must not be supposed that he was opposed to it. At the sitting of the 31st of March, he intimated that this policy would be taken up later on. He said:

I do not contend that the present Bill provides for the organization of the naval militia. That is left to the Governor General in Council.

Speaking of that isolation policy, which is being preached by my hon. friend in the province of Quebec, may I not remind him of the language used by his former leader, Sir George Etienne Cartier:

Isolation can never lead to our national glory; that is to be found in effort and in fight. In days gone by, we arose in arms to resist despotism and tyranny, and later on generously to defend the flag of the motherland. Now in peaceful emulation and rivalry through the paths of business we strive with our fellow-countrymen for the first place. Any race of men having overcome so many difficulties, fought so many battles, and suffered with such constancy in resistance to monopoly and tyranny, must be a fighting race, able honourably to hold their own with any other.

Let us beware of belittling the minds of our fellow-countrymen by the narrow views we may ourselves take of political and social questions. The idea will perhaps be derided, but deep thinkers have held it to be true that the citizen of an independent nation is morally and intellectually greater than the inhabitant of a colony. His intellectual vision ranges over a broader expanse, he having to study graver questions and to deal with more serious interests.

Let us therefore avoid surrounding our nationality with the mental disabilities which exclude success and greatness. The sphere of our activity should be constantly enlarged, that we may become great and noble by the works of our children and our champions.

Confederation will extend that sphere, while also giving to our inner life, to our family life, a happiness and a joy to us hitherto unknown. We will be free and absolute masters in the administration of our own patrimony.

But I have already spoken at too great length, and I must crave the indulgence of the House while I offer a few more remarks. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, when concluding his speech the other day, referred to the rhetorical delusions of the Prime Minister of Canada. My hon. friend himself indulged in a few literary reminiscences. He spoke of Paul of Tarsus. He also quoted Byron, who, describing the agony of the Dacian gladiator dying in the arena at Rome, said:

He heard it, but he heeded not—his eyes
Were with his heart, and that was far away;
He recked not of the life he lost nor prize,
But where his rude hut by the Danube lay,
There were his young barbarians all at play,
There was their Dacian mother—he, their sire,
Butchered to make a Roman holiday—
All this rush'd with his blood—shall he expire
And unavenged? Arise! ye Goths, and glut your ire!

In the province of Quebec—because this is for Quebec consumption—the Dacian gladiator, whose blood is oozing from him, butchered in the arena, is the French Canadian fighting for the British flag, and the young barbarians are supposedly our sons. We, the French Canadian members of the House are, of course, responsible for that state of things. Who are the Goths? I suspect that in my hon. friend's mind, the Goths are the Yankees beyond the boundary who would, no doubt, invoke the

Monroe doctrine in case of aggression—'arise, ye Goths, and glut your ire.' Mr. Speaker, is that patriotic language—language befitting a seigneur belonging to the great feudal aristocracy of lower Canada?

I cannot close my remarks without also indulging in some literary reminiscences. As I said a few moments ago, I had the good fortune of studying under my hon. friend, who was my professor of constitutional law at Laval university. From his lips I learned to love, admire and appreciate British institutions; and looking at my copy-book the other day, I found on one of the pages—the ink was dry—I am speaking alas! of nearly twenty years ago—the definition of the British constitution imparted by my hon. friend to his students. He used the words of Edmund Burke, that great luminary of the British parliament, who was one of those statesmen who defended Canadian liberty at Westminster in days gone by. My hon. friend, the member for Jacques Cartier waxed very eloquent when addressing his students in those days. In order that we might fully appreciate the value of British institutions, he concluded his lecture with the following definition:

If the standard of moderation be sought for, I will seek for it. Where? Not in their fancies nor in my own—I will seek for it where I know it is to be found, in the constitution I actually enjoy. Here, it says to an encroaching prerogative—Your sceptre has its length. You cannot add a hair to your head, or a gem to your crown, but what an eternal law has given to it.

Here, it says to an overweening peerage: Your pride finds bank—there is a bound to the raging of the sea. Our constitution is like our island, which uses and restrains its subject sea, in vain the waves roar. In that constitution I know, and exultingly I feel both that I am free and that I am not free dangerously to myself or to others. I know that no power on earth, acting as I ought to do can touch my life, my liberty, or my property. I have that inward and dignified consciousness of my own security and independence which constitutes and which is the only thing which does constitute, the proud and comfortable sentiment of freedom in the human breast. I know too that I cannot by royal favour.

Knighthoods,

Or by popular delusion,

Monk's speeches.

Or by oligarchical cabal, elevate myself above a certain very limited point so as to endanger my own fall, or the ruin of my country. I know there is an order that keep things fast in their places; it is made to us, and we are made of it.

This is the clearest definition ever given of the British constitution and all that it conveys. I think my friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), my heart is full of gratitude to him. He, with the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, in my younger days taught me to love and to revere British institutions. How amazed I am to find him speaking on a subject and advocating a policy which if it were carried through—but thank Heavens it will not be—would go against the very principles enunciated by him twenty years ago. The French Canadians in the province of Quebec are the proud possessors of all the advantages described in the words of Burke. They intend to maintain and to treasure those advantages and privileges by doing their duty like men and like patriots towards their country and towards their King. Doing their duty towards their King and towards their country, I claim, Sir, that they are also doing their duty towards God Almighty.

On motion of Mr. Middlebro, the debate was adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The debate, I presume, goes on to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. To-morrow the Minister of Railways, who is very anxious to finish his estimates, as the Deputy Minister is leaving the service, will proceed with them. The debate will not be resumed until Tuesday.

Mr. FIELDING. To-morrow we might also take up the item for French relief.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.50 o'clock a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 4, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. GERVAIS moved that the second report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. GERVAIS. This is the report of the Debates Committee recommending the appointment of Mr. Desaulniers as translator in place of Mr. Laferrière who died a few days ago. The Debates Committee make the recommendation to the House and hope that it will be concurred in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that, according to the present law of the Civil Service—with which I do not profess to be familiar—this appointment cannot be made on the recommendation of a committee. I understand, however, that the gentleman who is recommended for appointment is acceptable and is to be appointed, but by the regular authority that has power to deal with such matters under the law.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as there is a divergence of opinion, as I understand it, as to the competent appointing body, would it not be well to have the matter looked into? As far as I am concerned, if the Committee on Debates is only an ornament, not being much of an ornament, I must decline to continue to act on it; and I am satisfied that that is the feeling of the other members of the committee. If one committee of this House can engage a young professor to perambulate the country for another purpose, I cannot see why a standing committee of this House should not have the authority to recommend the appointment of an officer to carry on the work of which that committee has charge.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I can only say to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that I should be sorry to lose his services on this committee. I could better dispense with his services in some other matters. He is right sometimes, especially in military affairs—

Mr. HUGHES. This is not a military committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—and I understand that, in this case, the gentleman he recommends is quite acceptable.

Mr. HUGHES. That is not the point. This is a question of principle—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is it; have we or have we not this power?

Mr. HUGHES. That is what we want to find out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the authorities deny that we have the power.

Mr. HUGHES. Would the Prime Minister mind giving the authority to the House?

Mr. FIELDING. It is provided under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. The Act provides how appointments shall be made to the Civil Service. And, while, as I understand it, it was not intended to take from the House any of its rights in the management of its affairs, still it was agreed that appointments should be made according to the Act, and by the same authority that makes appointments in other portions of the Civil Service—that is, the Civil Service Board. If that be correct, I do not think that this is the way to do it. This involves a charge on the revenue, and is not in order for that reason. But there is the other objection that appointments are to be made by the Civil Service Board and not on recommendation of this committee.

Mr. GERVAIS. Under the Civil Service Act, action with regard to the appointment of an officer of the House of Commons must be taken by the House of Commons. And, in the case of the appointment of an officer of the Senate, action must be taken by that House. I understand that, by the passing of the Civil Service Act, the House has not been deprived of its power of expression which it gets from the law of nature and not from any enactment. And it has power to express itself to the Civil Service Commission in relation to an appointment. The Debates Committee are simply making a recommendation to the Civil Service Commissioners that Mr. Desaulniers be appointed; that is all we are now doing. If the appointing commission do not want to deal with our recommendation, the time will come to decide whether their action is legal or illegal, right or wrong. But I do not think for a moment that the House of Commons should refuse to recommend a first-class man, who has passed his examination three years ago—before the Board of Civil Service Commissioners was established—and come out of the examination with the highest marks, who has been on the waiting list for three years and has been employed as spare translator at an occasion during that time, and who also is declared by the government as perfectly capable of doing his work. We propose, that, and I think the House of Commons should express its opinion that Mr. Desaulniers will be a fit and suitable person to be translator of debates. It will rest with the Civil Service Commission to accept the expression of opinion of the House of Commons. That is all we are asking of the House. We may make the recommendation—

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. member (Mr. Gervais) a question. He recommends to the House thus and so; the House agrees to the recommendation—is not that practically carrying it into effect?

Mr. GERVAIS. It is not the same thing at all. Under the new Civil Service Act, the commissioners may declare that our recommendation is not in conformity with all the requirements of the formalities provided for under the Act, and may refuse to accept our recommendation. That will end

the matter, unless some other action is taken by this House. But I do not see why this Debates Committee, entrusted by this House at the opening of the session with the supervision of the official report of the debates, should be treated in this way. If so, there will be only one thing to be done, and that is for every member of the Debates Committee to hand in his resignation. We are making the recommendation; that is all. We are simply making a recommendation, which we thought the Civil Service Commission might accept or ignore.

Mr. SPROULE. To settle the question, I rise to a point of order. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, if this motion is in order in the face of the law.

Mr. ETHIER. Although I am a member of the Debates Committee, I was not present when that recommendation was adopted, and I think the committee has not taken the proper step to obtain the appointment of a translator. I understand that the translators of the debates are governed by the Civil Service Act and that they are under the control and authority of the Speaker as head of the Department of the House of Commons. According to the Civil Service Act, I understand that the head of the department, on the certificate of the deputy head, who in this case is the clerk of the House, may ask the Civil Service Commission to appoint such an officer, and, thereupon the Civil Service Commission has power to appoint him, and this in accordance with section 21 of the Civil Service Act amendment, with or without examination. I have no doubt that Mr. Desaulniers who has passed the required examination before the Civil Service Act was in force, if appointed, would fulfil the duties of the position satisfactorily. But I do not think the proper course under the Civil Service Act is for the Debates Committee to recommend the appointment of such an officer. I think this is a case in which the Civil Service Act must apply.

Mr. FIELDING. Might I suggest that instead of asking for the ruling of Mr. Speaker, we might accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes), that, if there be a doubt as to the legal interpretation of the Act, we endeavour to have that doubt removed by obtaining the opinion of the Department of Justice. Happily, there is no difference of opinion as to the man recommended. The understanding, however, is that the House has agreed to permit its officers to be treated in the same way as officers of the Civil Service; and in the case of a technical officer to be appointed under the Civil Service Act, the commission would have to be satisfied that he was qualified, and that the nature of his services came within the scope of the class to which it was proposed to appoint him. Applying that rule to this case, it is suggested that the Civil Service Commission must deal with this application.

Mr. HUGHES. Under the law, how could the matter be brought before the Civil Service Commission? We must look at that commission through smoked glasses.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not wish to interpret the law, but rather to act upon my hon. friend's own suggestion. This same question may come up again, and it is as well that we should have a clear understanding of the application of the new Civil Service Act to the officers of the House of Commons. I would therefore suggest that my hon. friend do not press his motion today; and as we all have the same object in view, every good end will be served by adopting the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. GERVAIS. Acting on the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FIELDING. Let the motion stand for another day.

Mr. GERVAIS. Let it stand for another day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Wherever in one of the departments an officer is to be appointed by order in council, similarly, an officer of this House; but as an order in council can only appoint a person who has been recommended by the Civil Service Commission, so this House can only appoint one similarly recommended. I do not know anything about the action of the committee. In one sense it may be all right, but still I think it is extremely desirable that the provisions of the law should be observed, and I concur entirely in the view expressed by the Minister of Finance that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown or of some legal authority should be obtained for the guidance of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that that opinion will be communicated to the House when it is obtained.

Mr. FIELDING. The clerk of the House will comply with the wish of the House in that respect.

Motion withdrawn.

GAS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 132) to amend the Gas Inspection Act. He said: The most important amendment is in section 3. Under the present law there is a percentage of allowance made for errors in the inspection of meters. That percentage is reduced,

thereby assuring greater accuracy in the meters in use. It is largely on the recommendation of the officers of the department and the city of Toronto that this amendment is proposed. Under another amendment power is taken to test gas for its calorific qualities. At present it is tested only for its illuminating qualities. The other amendments are not very important. In several clauses the word 'district' is inserted in place of the words 'city, town and place,' as the work of the department is regulated by districts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved that the House go into Committee on Tuesday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that the regulations of the 21st day of June, 1909, intituled: 'Regulations of the National Parks of Canada,' which were passed on the date above mentioned by His Excellency the Governor in Council, under authority of section 4 of the Rocky Mountains Park Act, being chapter 60, R.S.C., 1906, copies of which regulations, as well as the necessary order in council, have been laid before this House, are, in so far as they relate to the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada, approved by this House, in accordance with provisions of subsection 3 of section 5 of the said chapter 60.

Motion agreed to.

ASH WEDNESDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday next, the 8th instant, it stand adjourned to Thursday, the 10th.

Motion agreed to.

ALLAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. CROSBY. Before the orders of the day are taken up, I want to ask if the Allan line of steamers, which have a subsidy from the government for carrying the mails via Havre, have given up calling at Halifax. I should like to know whether they are compelled to call at Halifax or not

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry I cannot give the information at the moment, but will get it on Monday.

Mr. CROSBY. I might say that the last Allan steamer, the 'Corinthian,' arrived at St. John the day before yesterday, and did not call at Halifax.

BOY SCOUTS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The following clipping has been sent me, taken from the Toronto 'Globe':

Arrangements are being made, says the London 'Daily Mail,' by which a number of boy scouts will be enabled to visit Canada during the ensuing summer, and so have the opportunity of practising scouting under conditions which would be impossible in this country.

Red Indians will be employed to lay trails and also to teach the boys the art of tracking on a scale which could not be attempted in England. Canoeing, fishing, and following the slot of the wild deer will also form part of the scheme, which is a sequel to the interchange of the visits between English and German boy scouts last year.

The boys, who will be under the care of scout-masters, and for whose welfare the most precise arrangements will be made, will be selected by competition. The trip will be quite free of cost to the participators.

Has the Minister of Militia any information concerning this?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not. This is the first I have heard of it.

FISH FRY.

Mr. EDWARDS. Owing to the regrettable illness of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), I addressed about ten days ago a letter to the deputy minister asking for application forms for fish fry. I have not yet had a reply, and should like to know to whom I ought to address a communication in order to get a reply within a reasonable time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman has not received any answer. I shall make inquiries at once.

UNITED STATES MINIMUM TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) any information yet as to whether a decision has been come to by the United States authorities to admit Canadian exports under their minimum tariff, or whether he has had any communication at all with these authorities on that subject?

Mr. FIELDING. We are only aware of what is currently reported in the public press as to the proceedings of the United States authorities in these matters. I have no official information.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HAVING CROWN RESIDENCES.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask when I may expect a return to an order of the House of December 6, promised for the early part of last week, respecting the number of officials of the Senate and House of Commons, who have residences supplied them by the Crown?

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. JAMESON. When will the report of the International Fisheries Commission be laid on the table? I see by a despatch from Washington that President Taft has transmited the report of Professor Starr Jordan to congress.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend refers to the commission about the international waters and lakes. This report ought to be laid before this parliament and congress. It has been laid on the table here.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. Before my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways proceeds with his estimates, I would ask the approval of the House to a proposal to grant the sum of $50,000 from the treasury of Canada towards the fund organized in France for the relief of sufferers from the recent floods. We are glad to know, from the latest information, that the waters are receding and conditions improving. Nevertheless, the information available to us, both official and unofficial, shows that there has been very great distress and misery, and that there is much need of relief. Generous citizens of all nations are contributing, and in some instances governments have contributed. I am sure it will be the wish of this parliament and the people of Canada, irrespective of class, creed or nationality, that the Canadian people should show sympathy with the government and people of France in this trying moment. I propose that we should ask the French government to accept the sum of $50,000 as a practical expression of our sympathy and desire to assist the suffering.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister give us an idea of the losses and the degree of distress being suffered?

Mr. FIELDING. It is difficult to obtain anything like an official estimate. We have to rely to some extent on the public press. We have communicated with our Paris agents to ascertain whether foreign contributions would be desirable and acceptable, and we are assured that such contributions will be gladly accepted by the French government. What we intend is that this amount should be forwarded to the French government through our Paris office and the British ambassador at Paris, who has kindly consented to communicate with the French authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a course which has been taken more than once where the people of foreign countries have suffered from great disaster, and it seems to me eminently fitting that a similar course should be followed in this case, more especially as the country to which this offering is made is the ancestral home of a very considerable part of our population. It is also appropriate for the further reason that the relations between the British empire and the French republic are at present of the most cordial and satisfactory character, as we believe they will continue to be in the future.

Mr. CROCKET. Would the minister state whether some other governments have contributed?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, our Paris office informs us that the government of Turkey has contributed $10,000 and New Zealand $2,500. I think the United States government is contributing in a less formal way, and judging from the public press, through the Red Cross Society very large sums are being contributed by individual citizens of the United States and foreign countries. I notice that the German Emperor has sent his personal contribution of $5,000, but at the moment of our latest information the only governments to contribute are Turkey and New Zealand.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Like the Minister of Finance, I believe in charity being the greatest virtue, but while I do not want to speak in any way against what he has brought before the House, I want to remind him that charity begins at home. I have brought to the attention of the government on various occasions cases in my own riding where, owing to floods, farmers have not been able to reap the benefit from their operations which they should reap. No attention whatever has been paid to that by the government, and I want to again impress on the government that we ought to take care of our own people whenever we have an opportunity. In saying this I do not want any one to misunderstand me or to think for a moment that I desire to do anything less than the Finance Minister in aiding these poor unfortunates in France. I believe, Sir, that charity, while a good thing, ought to be reciprocal at all times. We all remember of the disaster here in Hull and Ottawa in 1899, when so many of our French Canadians were left absolutely destitute on the streets as a result of that fire. At that time various nations of the world came to our aid. I shall give a summary of the cash subscriptions that were sent from various sources to aid the Hull sufferers. They were as follows:

Received from	Canada..	$500,781 00
"	Great Britain..	363,248 00
"	British Colonies..	53,605 00
"	United States..	33,505 00
"	France..	1,036 00
"	Chili..	4 86

I hope that the government will remember at this time the action of France at the

time of that disaster and reciprocate to the very fullest extent the kindly aid we received from the motherland of the ancestors of the people who were the sufferers from the disaster I spoke of.

Mr. FIELDING. My friend has laid down two principles, neither of which I entirely concur in. In the first place, in the sense in which he uses the words, I cannot agree with him that charity begins at home. It is particularly the business of the Dominion of Canada to attend to the giving of foreign charity if a case may be worthy of charity, but the government of Canada is not a body for distributing charity at home. We have organizations, provincial and municipal, for the granting of charity at home, and the fact that the Dominion government did not grant charity in any particular case where disaster has arisen at home would by no means be evidence that the Dominion parliament was lacking in liberality or had in any respect failed in its duty. We are the proper dispensers of charity for a foreign country if Canada desires to give such charity, but this parliament is not the proper dispensing body for charity at home.

Mr. HUGHES. Are we to understand that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) is to apply to a foreign government for charity in his locality.

Mr. FIELDING. No; but I have such faith in the provincial and municipal organizations of Manitoba that I would say that with these provincial and municipal organizations, in 19 cases out of 20 there would be no need of any foreign charity assisting the people of that section. But if there be any exceptional and unusual case of need, then it is a question whether the Dominion parliament shall grant it. We have sometimes had embarrassing questions as to whether we should grant relief in the cases of fires in Canada, and I think on the last occasion when we were considering a grant of that kind, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointed out, and reasonably, that it was very difficult to lay down any principle upon which we should aid funds of that kind from the Dominion treasury. However, if there should be anything of that kind exceptional and unusual, I have no doubt the parliament of Canada would respond.

My hon. friend's second thought was that charity should be reciprocal. 'And now abideth faith, hope and charity, but the greatest of these is charity.' It does not add that it must be reciprocal; charity must be voluntary in every case.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not subscribe to the principle that charity begins at home in such a case as this. There is but one idea that should animate the human breast in making gifts of this kind, it is that of humanity. A great calamity has happened, humanity is suffering, humanity is in need and I think that neither relationship, nationality or anything else should actuate us beyond the tie of human brotherhood that binds us to the human race. I think it should be given on that line and on that line alone.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not propose to say anything against the resolution introduced by the Minister of Finance. If there is suffering and want in Paris because of the unusual floods that have taken place, there, it is quite proper for the Dominion government to give out of its plenty something for the relief of those sufferers. But I wish to call the attention of the government to a case in my own county—not that I want to ask for any charity from the funds of the Dominion of Canada for the people in a portion of the county of Frontenac, but I want to ask for consideration of the rights of the people of the township of Bedford who suffer every year owing to floods caused by a certain government dam, known as the Wolf Lake dam. These people have had to meet the damages thus caused, and I think that this is a proper occasion to call the attention of the government, and particularly of the Minister of Railways, to this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask whether the Prime Minister has considered this question? This must be, unless there is a string to it, a severe jolt to the autonomy of which the government speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I fail to see the joke.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not my intention to take any exception whatever to the grant of $50,000 to aid the sufferers in France; but it has occurred to me that possible we ought to learn some lessons from what has occurred in the old lands which may be useful to us in this country. If the flood has been caused, as some suggest, by the meandering of the comet which has been roaming around the world for the last 70 or 80 years, of course we can take no action, we cannot defend ourselves. But it is alleged that the clearing away of the forests in the north of France, where the river takes its source, has largely been the cause of the flooding of the country. Rains were plentiful, and there was nothing to hold back the water. The natural forests had been cut away, the result being that the water came down with greater rapidity, and caused the overflow which has brought about so much trouble. Now, in this country are we doing our part

to prevent an occurrence of that kind? Is it not a fact that we are not taking measures to prevent such a thing? I have no doubt that it is felt throughout the province of Ontario that the waters in the spring of the year come down much more rapidly from the unorganized districts to the lakes, and cause flooding, which would not take place if the forests were maintained. I think there is a lesson here for one of the commitees of the House which has to deal with the conservation of our natural resources. I have heard it said, and I presume correctly, that the reasons for the floods in France has been the cutting away of the forest around the sources of the river. If that is the case, I think there is a lesson for us, to take warning, because we might not find France and other countries so willing to come to our aid as we, in our good heart, propose to come to the aid of the people of France.

Prince Edward Island railway—branch line Harmony to Elmira, $150,000.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). This branch line was undertaken two years ago. It is ten miles in length, and is estimated to cost $315,000. The House will remember that I gave the estimate off-hand at something like $400,000.

Mr. CROSBY. Does this complete?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. We have spent on it so far only $25,000, and we are asking $150,000 to spend this year.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the gauge?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a narrow gauge.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Whitehead Brothers, the lowest tenderers.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be about $40,000 a mile for a narrow gauge railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I always like to be safe. The estimate given by the engineer is $315,126, considerably less than I mentioned last year. Tenders were asked for in the usual way, and these were received, at these amounts: $142,911; $175,219; $146,036; $148,811; $135,835. The latter was received from the Whitehead Brothers, who got the contract. It was awarded on schedule prices. I am giving what they called the quantities moneyed out by the engineer. His estimate was $315,126.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the estimates of the quantities so far as they have gone?

Mr. GRAHAM. The work is only starting, we have not yet much data of the quantity, and how it will work out.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might read some of the larger items, showing the rates upon which they moneyed out the different quantities.

Mr. GRAHAM. Common excavation, including material, 17 cents; solid rock, $1.10; loose rock, 17 cents; foundation excavation in water, 70 cents; foundation in air and water, solid rock, $1.50.

Mr. FOSTER. That would seem as though it would cost $135,000 the way they moneyed it out. Where does the minister get the difference between that and his estimate of $315,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am giving the estimate of the engineer on the $315,000. He makes an estimate as to what it will cost, and that is the engineer's estimate. The contractor comes along, and he makes an estimate of $135,835, that is, for the quantities only in the contract. The other includes rails, clearing, close cutting and grubbing. $315,000 includes all these things.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister get it down to what is included in the contract or estimated for by the engineer and see how it moneys out? I want to see how near the engineer came to the contractor's price.

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimate for the items in the contract as made by our own engineer is $139,506.40 and the tender is $135,835. The items estimated for the balance amount to $176,016.

Mr. CROCKET. Progress estimates, I suppose, are paid upon the certificate of the resident engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the engineer in charge there?

Mr. GRAHAM. Laurence is his name.

Mr. CROCKET. Is he a Prince Edward Islander?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, he is a Prince Edward Island man under Mr. McKenzie at Moncton.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the minister's attention to this fact that if, when these tenders had come in he had asked for the estimates in the office, he would not have to make them up here. Does the minister, when he is letting a contract, inquire what the engineer estimates the work to be worth?

Mr. GRAHAM. Every detail is set out in the order in council, and I have it all in my hand.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the contract fix a time for the completion of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract fixes a time, but, as in most cases, the time under the contract is likely to be extended. We usually fix, approximately, the end of the year for which the vote is taken. This amount will not finish the work; the whole estimated cost is $315,000.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has been paid to the contractors up to this time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Engineering and everything else has cost $28,618, of which practically all but $1,000 has gone to the contractor.

Increased accommodation at Charlottetown, $79,320.

Mr. GRAHAM. This finishes the work. The entire item is a re-vote. The amount to be spent is not so much as originally intimated.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. Additional sidings, new rails, stone-filling, concrete curb, new 20-stall engine house, and items of that character.

Mr. CROCKET. Who has the contract for the engine house?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract was awarded to Clark & Morrison, the lowest tenderers for $44,400. The contract for the freight-sheds was awarded to Mr. Clark of Summerside, at $8,140; the turntable to the Canada Foundry Company.

Mr. BARKER. Had there been a turntable there before?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It was removed to some other place and a new one put in.

Georgetown—engine-house at—$5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is absolutely new. There has not been an engine-house there up to this time.

National Transcontinental railway — surveys and construction, $27,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a vote for the Transcontinental Commission. The amount asked last year was $20,000,000. I laid a statement on the table the other day carrying every item of expenditure practically up to the end of the calendar year, 1909, and showing a total expenditure of something over $15,000,000. The statement showed also the amount of work that has been done on the eastern section this year, and the amount done up to date.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent on surveys in 1909-10?

Mr. GRAHAM. I laid on the table a duplicate of the statement I have now before me.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. We have not seen it. Of course, the minister must know that we require a statement of the expenditure, and how it compares with the estimate, how much work is done, and how much remains to be done. We do not ask for details, but we do need totals of the several items.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend (Mr. John Haggart) would consult the copy of the report which I laid on the table, he would have the matter pretty well in hand.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. We have had no opportunity to look at it, even if we had seen it. It would be better to let the item stand, or, at least, some item on which we may be allowed a full discussion later on.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is unreasonable. But this interim report is merely for the accommodation of members of the House. The report required of the commissioners by law is the annual report, and that I laid on the table almost the first day of the session.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. But of the work for nine months we have had no information whatever.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the way the matter is left by the requirement of the law—that the work done for the year ending March 31, shall be shown in the annual report. But, for the convenience of the House, I gave this interim report of which I have spoken, and I gave amounts also in the statement made in the House the other day.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. In that statement, the minister gave figures only for the fiscal year.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, in many cases the statement was brought down to December 31, 1909, and in others to November 30.

Mr. FOSTER. In the estimate now under discussion, there are two items—surveys and construction. How were they divided in last year's expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM. In engineering and supplies, $6,935.59. The rest went to construction.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the $20,000,000 has been spent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Altogether $15,939,985.67.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Did I understand the minister to say that the statement of expenditure for the nine months ending the 31st December, 1909, has been published?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. The commissioners must make a report annually at the end of the fiscal year. I asked for an interim report, which would show what has been done for the nine months, but that is not published unless the House so orders.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. This is the first I have seen of this statement. I have not had an opportunity of looking at it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been rushing to get all the information possible, and the reason I am bringing these estimates so early is that in the peculiar position in which I am placed, I want to get them through while my deputy is with me, for the new deputy would not know anything about them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as that is concerned, this interim report is practically non-existent, because nobody can examine it for the purpose of making any criticism or any recommendation. No one would desire to embarrass the minister under the peculiar circumstances in which he is placed; but as a matter of fact, the construction of the Transcontinental railway is not especially under the charge of the deputy minister, but is under the commission appointed for that purpose; so I would not think that the absence of the deputy minister would make a great deal of difference in that regard. At all events, I think the item had better stand for the present.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no objection. I placed a copy of this statement on the table of the House.

Item allowed to stand.

Hudson Bay railway—to provide for the survey and location of a line of railway from the Saskatchewan river to the Hudson bay, $180,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This item is only to complete the location of the line. Although there is a difference of opinion as to the better harbour, the location of the line for 260 miles from the Pas to Split lake is a common location, no matter which harbour is selected. This item is for the location of the line up to this point. When that is done, we may possibly have the other question settled.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the proposals of the government with respect to construction? Is the railroad to be constructed by the department, or is it to be let by contract, or is a charter to be given to some private corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I expect to bring down an item for construction in the supplementary estimates, when I hope to be able to give the information which my hon. friend asks for. A bridge is to be constructed across the Saskatchewan at the beginning of the line, which would have to be done whether the work were given to a company or carried on by the government. It would not affect this item, which is merely for the survey and location of the line.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the survey?

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the minister anything to tell us with reference to letting the contract to Mackenzie and Mann? It is stated in the press that the government is about to let the construction of this railroad to that firm, and that Mr. Mann was down here the day before yesterday. Perhaps the minister would tell us whether that is well founded or not, and how far the negotiations have gone.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Mann was down on some other business. He did not discuss this with me at all. We have no agreement with any one for the construction of this line. It is absolutely an open question, so far as I know.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is it the intention to construct a portion of that line this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the intention of the government to start construction, and I hope to give more details when I ask for an appropriation for construction. A bridge might be constructed or a portion of the line, but whatever may be done will only be to save time and not delay the work. If the work be given to a company, whatever be done can be taken into consideration in any arrangement made.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the hon. minister the other day to say that Mr. Armstrong had demonstrated that Nelson harbour was a very superior one. I do not find that to be the case. The remarks of Mr. Armstrong are not based on his own surveys, but on various reports issued by the Department of the Interior and on information supplied by Hudson Bay Company officers. If that is all there is in Mr. Armstrong's report, for which we are paying all this money, I am afraid we are not getting much in return.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Armstrong has made a report since the departmental report of March 31, 1909. He made a later report in a small volume which was laid on the table some weeks ago, and accompanying that report is a chart showing the soundings taken by Mr. Armstrong himself.

Mr. ROCHE. Is it not a fact that the Canadian Northern has a line constructed as far as The Pas, and has not the government an idea of that company undertaking the construction of the road? If not why has the government selected The Pas as the starting point?

Mr. GRAHAM. That seems to be the natural point at which to start. It is the nearest to the existing system and to Hudson bay, and the idea of the government was to make connections from the nearest point to Hudson bay.

Mr. HUGHES. Any other system would have to go near it too.

Mr. GRAHAM. The total spent on the survey is about $157,000. That will be to the end of the year.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Does that include the vote you are getting this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. What is the total cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount this year and the amount already expended would be a little over $500,000.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is not that an enormous sum for the purpose of locating a road like that?

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy says it is very moderate. It is really an investigation during the last few years, instead of location. The country is pretty far from home.

Mr. CROCKET. That amount is all practically for preliminary surveys?

Mr. GRAHAM. The $180,000 we are asking for location, and the $187,000 for preliminary surveys.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has control of this, and who is responsible?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Armstrong is the engineer directed by the deputy minister, and the business management is under the deputy head of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Who makes the appointments?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Armstrong himself, and Mr. Butler together, selected the men for the different parties.

Mr. FOSTER. Who buys the supplies?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. FOSTER. How are they bought?

Mr. GRAHAM. The great bulk are bought from the Hudson Bay Company because that company has better facilities for delivery than any body else.

Mr. FOSTER. What supervision is there as to accounts and prices?

Mr. GRAHAM. Every account is checked by the chief engineer or some one under his charge.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any departmental audit?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, there is a very careful departmental audit of everything. Mr. Bell is the head of our audit department, made so under our reorganization.

Mr. FOSTER. Are none of the supplies purchased by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that wherever practicable tenders were called for and prices obtained from different parties and the lowest taken.

Quebec bridge construction, $1,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that hon. gentlemen know a good deal about the situation of this bridge.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it possible to state when the bridge will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I said the other day that I thought it would be at least four years from the time the contract was let. The contract cannot be let until next autumn, and I am of the opinion that unless greater progress is made, and that is not likely while parliament is sitting, this $1,000,000 will be all we will be able to spend in the meantime.

Mr. J. HAGGART. At what time does the contract call for the completion of the foundation piers?

Mr. GRAHAM. One next fall and the other the year following. There are two piers which will be required whether it is a cantilever or a suspension bridge. Another will be required if it is a cantilever. This is included in the Davis contract, but the contract is so drawn that it can be struck out if it is not required.

Mr. FOSTER. What if the old foundations are not being utilized?

Mr. GRAHAM. One pier in its entirety. The foundation of a very large pier is being used on the south side but it will be enlarged. The old pier was 150 by 50 feet and the new one is to be 180 by 80 feet. They have taken it down to low water mark and are using the foundations and enlarging them.

Mr. CROCKET. When does the minister expect to have Transcontinental railway trains running in Quebec? That is of great interest to the maritime provinces.

Mr. GRAHAM. The railway from the east will be constructed before the bridge. I think it will be at least four years from the coming autumn before it is completed.

Mr. CROCKET. What about the Transcontinental trains to Quebec?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that if it is found advisable a ferry can be established to carry quite a number of cars at that point. There is a car ferry now between Quebec and Levis, with provision on the boat to meet the rise and fall of the tide.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Can the minister give details as to the estimated amount which will have to be expended on the bridge and its approaches?

Mr. GRAHAM. The other day my hon. friend (Mr. J. Haggart) estimated that the bridge would cost between $8,000,000 and $10,000,000. That is money yet to be expended. My own opinion, without being absolutely tied to this figure, because everything is not completed to make a full estimate on, is that my hon. friend was perhaps $1,000,000 under the right amount, that we will have to spend $11,000,000.

Mr. BARKER. Not including what you have paid to the Quebec Bridge Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the situation with regard to the piers. I understand that the superstructure of the bridge gave way from some defect in design and was precipitated into the water and remains there. I was not aware until the minister made his statement a few days ago, that there was anything wrong with the piers.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, there is absolutely nothing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then why have they to be increased or strengthened?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend struck it in his opening remarks. The piers of the old bridge were too light. The new structure will be nearly twice as heavy as the old one, and the piers have to be enlarged to meet the new design.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It amounts to this, that the piers were quite sufficient for a bridge which would fall down, but they are not sufficient for a bridge which is to be permanent. The design of the piers was wrong, because the design of the superstructure was wrong.

Mr. CROSBY. We are very much interested in the east in the construction of this bridge. The minister says it will take about four years to complete it. Is it the intention of the railway to facilitate transportation in any way by means of a ferry across the St. Lawrence? Do the government propose to help us out in that particular, and is it not possible to press the work along and bring it to a conclusion within four years?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that I am very careful in what I say. While we want the bridge done as rapidly as possible, a structure of this magnitude must be done very carefully. I think there is brought to bear on it as fine a quality of engineering skill as there is in the world. These men will only go so far as they can feel their way at every inch, because it is something new, nothing like it has ever been undertaken.

Mr. J. G. HAGGART.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Is it a suspension or a cantilever bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. This design is a cantilever. I had hoped to go to Quebec and look over that ferry, as they use it now. But my experience of the Intercolonial convinces me that we cannot hope to carry traffic by a ferry as well as a bridge. But it will do until the bridge is constructed.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has not answered the question I put, as to when he expects Transcontinental trains to be running from the west to Quebec.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not in a position to answer that. My hon. friend asked me when I expected trains to be running from the east into Quebec in connection with the bridge.

Mr. CROCKET. No, I said trains running from the west to Quebec, or from Quebec to the west, because this bridge is a very important link in the system upon which the eastern provinces are depending. If, in the meantime, traffic is going to be carried by the Grand Trunk to Portland, Maine, and it gets settled in that channel, it will be very difficult to get it back to the maritime ports.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to say when the Transcontinental would be running into Quebec. We are making fair progress with the construction. But I would not care to express an opinion, because I cannot do so upon any authority.

Mr. CROCKET. Will it be before the completion of this bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine it will.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is that road hauling wheat now from Winnipeg to Port Arthur?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not. Mr. Gordon Grant informs me that, except for speed of the trains, which, of course, is of great importance in the present transportation problem, they are using the road now, and any ordinary traffic could be carried over that line now. His recent report to me is that it will be practically complete and ready to carry wheat almost in another year. But trains can be run, and the contractors have offered to run a train a week over that line at 25 miles an hour, with safety.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The minister stated about the middle of November that wheat was being hauled over that road. I would like to know to what extent. I put a question on the order paper, and I was told that ten carloads had been hauled. I presume there have been none hauled since.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave the answer as received from the engineer. But I think they are not yet doing a regular traffic business on the road. Of course it will only be run

as the contractors run it, and they have offered to put on trains, but I understand there is some difficulty in coming to an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is responsible for the insufficient piers and the light superstructure of the Quebec bridge, to which my hon. friend has been making some reference this afternoon? We were told when this scheme was first launched that the government were engaging the very best engineers. They had before them all the construction work of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the weight of rails, the kind of engines that were to be run upon the road, the kind of cars that were to be used, capable of carrying the heaviest freight. But with all that before them, the engineers of the government planned an insufficient bridge. Surely there must have been some great blunder on the part of some person. While I am not going to censure the minister, because he was not in the department at that time, somebody certainly is responsible for that blunder. I think it is fair now that the minister should say who was responsible, so that the country may know where to place the blame.

Mr. GRAHAM. It might take the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to decide that question. There was a very long report made, largely technical, in regard to the fall of that bridge. It was planned by a gentleman who was supposed to be the best bridge expert on this continent, if not in the world. There is no question that some one bungled, because the bridge went down. A royal commission investigated it thoroughly, and brought in an exhaustive report, but it is so technical that I would prefer that my hon. friend would read it for himself. It is difficult to say where all the responsibility lies. In engaging an expert so eminent, the government supposed it was protecting itself and the country as well as it could. However, the bridge has fallen down. It is a great calamity, but it strikes me as a layman that this bridge was beyond the calculations or the principles that any engineers had yet attempted to apply to bridge construction.

Mr. BLAIN. Has any of the superstructure that fell down been taken out of the water?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a contract let for removing it as far as may be necessary. I think none of it has been removed yet, but they are working at it now. I went out on the fallen bridge or on the debris lying in the water, as far as they would allow me, and the material appeared to me almost perfect as far as the material itself was concerned. The steel was not broken; it was twisted. A gentleman who was with me and who claimed to know something about it, in passing his judgment, said that the quality of material in the bridge was as good as it could be.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was responsible for the lives that were lost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Phoenix Bridge Company settled the damages for the loss of life.

Mr. BLAIN. Did it cost the government any money?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have never paid anything in that respect.

Mr. BLAIN. No claim against the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. There has none been made. Occasionally I had some letters, but the Phoenix Bridge Company settled all claims that were made.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But if they settled the claim the government took over all their responsibilities?

Mr. GRAHAM. We took over the Quebec Bridge Company but not the responsibilities of the Phoenix Bridge Company. The Phoenix Bridge Company were the contractors really.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that for the lives that were lost no responsibility rested upon the government and no money was paid by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. How much money had the Phoenix Bridge Company been paid by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Quebec Bridge Company paid them.

Mr. HUGHES. But we paid the Quebec Bridge Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Quebec Bridge Company paid them something over $3,000,000 which we afterwards took over as a liability of the Quebec Bridge Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know where the responsibility is ultimately to be found. This, as the minister very truly says, was a gigantic undertaking, therefore, it should have been preceded by precautions as great as were necessary in respect of any such engineering project. But, the situation was this, as far as I understand it, that the government, although practically financing the whole work, left all the contracts to be made by the Quebec Bridge Company, a corporation with a very small capital and utterly unable to proceed with the enterprise without the aid of the country. Eventually the government is obliged to take over the enterprise and in doing so it is sufficiently generous with the people's money to hand back to these gentlemen all

the money they had put into the enterprise together with directors' fees and a ten per cent bonus on the stock.

Mr. LENNOX. With interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) informs me that I have omitted one item and that I should have included the item of interest which was also allowed to these gentlemen. In the course of these proceedings they had made a contract with some person for the construction of the bridge, and some person must be responsible for the defective design. The fact that there was a defect in the design, represents, I suppose, $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 to this country, and I think it might be a very legitimate inquiry by the people's representatives in parliament as to whether or not there is some remedy to the people in respect of the undoubted defects which did exist in the design. If the Quebec Bridge Company had proceeded with ordinary business precaution and prudence, they would have had a contract under which some remedy might have been asserted if the design or the execution of the work proved defective, and they should have had that contract with some company which would be responsible in damages to the Quebec Bridge Company and through them to the people of this country for any loss which might be occasioned by reason of a defect either in the design or the carrying out the design. I would like to know exactly what the position is in that regard. I would like to know whether the government have suffered this project to proceed under such conditions that $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 of the public money of this country is represented only by a mass of twisted steel in the bottom of the St. Lawrence river, under such conditions that we have absolutely no remedy at all against any person, or body corporate, or company, for one single dollar of the moneys which had been lost. I think the minister ought to give a very clear and lucid statement of what the situation is in that regard.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend has outlined the history of the case pretty accurately. There was in the contract a clause providing for penalties in case of failure, but one regrettable part of it is that it is not so easy to enforce these penalties under the conditions as they exist. The Phoenix Bridge Company is not the original Phoenix Bridge Company that is worth such a large amount of money. The Phoenix Bridge Company is capitalized at $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that paid up?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure. It is a limited liability company.

Mr. BLAIN. Was it created for the purpose of constructing this bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. My own opinion is that it was created for the work of the construction of bridges. It seems to be the practice of these large companies on the other side to organize subsidiary companies for certain work. I admit that when I came to Ottawa, I thought at first blush that we were dealing with the big strong Phoenix Iron Company, which is a rich company, but when I got a little further along I found we were dealing with the Phoenix Bridge Company, which is only a subsidiary company with a capitalization of $50,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any security put up by the Quebec Bridge Company to the government for the fulfilment of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. There was a $100,000 bond given on behalf of the Quebec Bridge Company by a regular corporation. An attempt was made to realize on that bond, but up to date if I am correctly informed it has not been successful. Negotiations are proceeding between the Department of Justice and the company, but the company claim that they were not informed before the expiration of the time when such notice should be given under the terms of the bond.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was responsible for the information being given?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be the Quebec Bridge Company, I would think.

Mr. CROCKET. The $100,000 is lost.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not given up all hope of getting it yet. It is in the hands of the Justice Department. We have from the Phoenix Bridge Company a drawback of, I think, $100,000, and there is a lot of scrap metal. I have had for some weeks negotiations through the Justice Department with the Phoenix Bridge Company. But I may say to the committee frankly that, with a capital of $50,000, I have no great hopes that I can collect any great amount of money from the Phoenix Bridge Company, even if we have a case, and, of course, there is always danger in a lawsuit of being thrown out on some technicality.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this an American company?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It is a company that has done splendid work. If I had work of my own to do, and could get security of any fair value from them, I would expect to get as good a quality of work from them as from any other concern on the continent —or any other continent.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the Phoenix Iron Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Phoenix Bridge Company, I undersand, has done good

work also. I have recommendations from engineers showing that they have done splendid work.

Mr. BARKER. I think the minister ought to have gone a little further in his description of the way this contract was entered into. He knows that it was entered into with the Quebec Bridge Company, composed of some lawyers and merchants in Quebec who had this charter. They were utterly bankrupt as a company; but, just before the end of a long session preceding a general election, they came forward with a contract made with this small Phœnix Bridge Company for the construction of a bridge satisfactory to these lawyers and merchants of Quebec. Absolutely no care was taken by the government to see that the plans were what they ought to be. The engineer of the Quebec Bridge Company was a very respectable engineer, who had been employed upon the railways of the country, but who, probably, had never been engaged in the construction of a bridge of over two hundred feet—a very respectable gentleman; I know him; but a man utterly inexperienced in this sort of work. In the railway offices they had a very good man on the staff who declined to say that he was responsible for what was done. Within three days of the closing of a long session, the government rushed through an agreement with the Quebec Bridge Company, guaranteeing over $6,000,000 of expenditure that that company had undertaken.

Mr. GRAHAM. In what year was that?

Mr. BARKER. In 1903, I think. The government brought in a Bill to validate that agreement, and, within the last three days of the session they rushed it through the House of Commons and the Senate, and it became law. The next thing we heard of it particularly was that the bridge was in the river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does seem to me that this is the most extraordinary tale of negligence in the management of public affairs that the history of this country can show.

Mr. FOSTER. Or any country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am perfectly willing to amend it,—this is the most remarkable instance of negligence in the conduct of public affairs that any country has ever known. The mere recital of the circumstances, without any comment at all, is enough to stagger one. The minister has pointed out that this was an undertaking which was almost beyond the limits of engineering skill at that time. The government must have known as well then as they know it now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think the engineers knew it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At all events, it was perfectly apparent to the government, the engineers and every one else, that it was a tremendous undertaking. In the first place, they hand over the control and management of that undertaking, they hand over charge of the construction, to a company which practically puts no capital into the enterprise. They exercise no care with respect to the contract; they do not even see that the contract is made with responsible persons or that any adequate security for carrying out the contract is given by the persons who undertake the work. The work goes on. It is work that requires the very highest order of engineering skill. In the end the whole thing falls into the river. The only thing left for the government to do is to pay off the Quebec Bridge Company, take over their liabilities—not to receive their assets, because they have no assets of any account—and to proceed with the construction of this work under greater disadvantages than would have affected the undertaking if the Quebec Bridge Company had never intervened at all. The simple statement of the fact that $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 of the money of the people of this country has been spent without any adequate supervision or precaution and is represented solely by the superstructure of this bridge lying at the bottom of the river, with probably no remedy against the Quebec Bridge Company or the Phoenix Bridge Company or any one else, is sufficient without any comment at all. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is wise in not attempting to make any defence of it. Even he, with all his ability and ingenuity, could not make any defence —no man could make any defence of such a transaction. And it does seem to me that the government, in this particular instance above all others, has shown the most remarkable and unheard of disregard of the public interest and more complete negligence than could possibly have been imagined.

Mr. LENNOX. And I would like to bring to the attention of the committee, on this point, the actual figures in connection with this matter. My leader (Mr. R. L. Borden) has referred to the extraordinary negligence of the government as regards proper precautions to see that a proper structure should be erected and proper engineering skill employed—to see, in fact, that such measures were taken as would have prevented this deplorable loss of money and, worse by far, this deplorable loss of life. In this connection, it might be a little interesting to note for a moment how generous the government is after the event. A month or two ago, I

got the information from the government, and I will give it as it is returned. The total that we have paid to the end of the last financial year in connection with the taking over of this work is $6,424,728, according to the Auditor General's Report. I asked certain questions and the answers were very significant. A large proportion of the money shown to have been spent was utterly unjustifiable expenditure, as I submit. I will read the answer after each question. And I wish, by the way, that the government could arrange to have each answer as it appears in 'Hansard' put immediately after the question to which it relates.

Mr. GRAHAM. The answer is always given after each question.

Mr. LENNOX. I mean that it would be well if they could appear in that way. I do not want, in saying this, to get into any quarrel with the 'Hansard' reporters, because they do their work exceedingly well. I asked:

1. In the total sum of $6,424,718 paid by the government to, or for, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company during the financial year ending 31st March, 1909, were the following items and sums included and paid, namely:—

Interest to the Bank of Montreal on various amounts advanced to the company..	$889,687 81
Interest to shareholders in company..	65,209 07
Bonuses to shareholders in company..	26,370 00
Making a total for these items of..	$981,266 88

The answer to that given by Mr. Fielding was very concise: 'Yes'. Then I asked:

2. What was the rate of interest paid to the bank?

The answer was:

2. 5 per cent was the rate of interest payable to the Bank of Montreal by the Quebec Bridge Railway Company upon advances made to the company.

The next question was:

3. Was the interest to be paid by the company to the bank in arrears at the time the government assumed payment of the account?

The answer is: 'Yes', emphasizing the fact that has been referred to frequently, that this was a paper company only, and that when we took over the account we had to pay the arrears of interest which these gentlemen had allowed to accumulate during the time they were nominally building this great national work, and drawing their salaries. I next asked:

4. Did the bank claim to be entitled to be paid the sum $75,673.18 or any sum, as interest on accrued interest, and did the government pay the sum of $75,673.18, or any sum, to the bank as interest upon accrued interest, or compound interest?

Mr. LENNOX.

The answer to that is:

4. Interest on such advances fell due half yearly, and when unpaid carried interest at the same rate as the principal. The government, in taking over the undertaking paid the Bank of Montreal the sum of $75,672.58 on this account.

Then I asked:

5. In the interest and bonuses paid shareholders as aforesaid was there included and paid as interest and bonus the sum of $3,304.84 to Hon. S. N. Parent, chairman of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, and the sum of $17,901 to Mr. M. P. Davis, one of the contractors for construction of said railway?

6. How was the interest paid shareholders made up, from what date and at what rate was it computed, and was it compounded? If so, how often, or at what intervals?

The answers to five and six are as follows:

5 and 6. Simple interest at 5 per cent was paid shareholders from the respective dates of payment by them on account of their stock until December 1, 1908, when the undertaking was taken over in accordance with the statutory agreement of October 19, 1903.

Hon. S. N. Parent received interest, $2,600, and a bonus of 10 per cent on $7,000 capital stock owned by him, and Mr. M. P. Davis received interest, $8,411, and a bonus of 10 per cent on $94,900 capital stock owned by him, in accordance with such agreement.

Then I asked:

7. Have all the rights of the company been acquired and paid for?

The answer was: 'Yes'. As to the answer to questions 5 and 6, let me observe that while it might be argued that it was very equitable and fair that these gentlemen should be paid bonus and interest, it should be remembered that at the time they were drawing interest from us we were paying their interest in arrear while their capital was unpaid. It was a most remarkable transaction. The most glaring feature of it was the deplorable destruction of the bridge because of the absolute lack of care on the part of the administration in seeing that proper engineering skill was in charge, while, as a matter of money, we were not only losing all the money that was properly put into the bridge, but were paying these gentlemen the bonuses and interest for looking on and doing nothing.

Mr. BARKER. I want to say one word more. We paid the interest and bonuses that have been allowed by the government upon the payments into the company by the shareholders. Now, the government, when they allowed that, had the evidence in their hands that the money that was supposed to have been paid into that company by these shareholders was nearly altogether not cash, but direc-

tors' fees for attending meetings. You paid interest on the directors' fees and a bonus, and that was known to the government.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to use nickel steel in the superstructure of the new bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that it is, so far as it is possible to use it, in the compression members and in the principal cords.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has stated that when he came to Ottawa to take his new position as Minister of Railways, he understood that the government had a contract with this strong financial company, the Phoenix, and that if we had any difficulty with that company we would get some redress. My hon. friend has had a very large experience in politics. He was a very prominent member of the Legislature of Ontario and in the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not very long.

Mr. BLAIN. That was a matter left in the hands of the electors of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM. They did not act very well that time.

Mr. BLAIN. However, that is another matter. I want to congratulate the government on their ability to put through a scheme of this kind while leading my hon. friend, a very prominent supporter in the province of Ontario, to believe, until he became a member of the government that they had a contract with this strong company. When he came here and made an investigation he found that the contract was only with a very weak company. With that confession from my hon. friend, surely no one will wonder that the ordinary elector should be deceived. My hon. friend was a student of Dominion as well as provincial politics; he has taken part in all these discussions; and yet it was only after he came here and made investigation that he found that the contract to build this structure, costing many millions of dollars, was given not to a strong company, but to a very weak company. All I can say is that I compliment the government on their ability to deceive the conntry.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend was in the House all the time with these documents under his eyes, and he will not take refuge now under the plea that he did not know it was a weak company.

Mr. BLAIN. It was like the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was merely an outsider, an ordinary elector, whereas my hon. friend was here all the time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that even the minister did not discover it until after the bridge fell down.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difficulty is the bridge fell down the night before the hon. gentleman referred to became minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there any connection between the two events?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nobody would be sufficiently cruel to say so.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the minister say that the road between Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction was not regularly running?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no regular traffic over it. The engineers say that the contractor offered to put on a certain service. It would have to be run as a contractor's service until taken over.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call attention to what is certainly a grave abuse—the putting of a misrepresentation into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General in the speech from the Throne. Here is what His Excellency was made to say:

> The construction of the Transcontinental railway has made substantial advance during the year. The western division has been extended 66 miles beyond Edmonton, completing a total distance of 861 miles west of Winnipeg. Contracts have been let for 399 miles in the Mountain division; good progress was made on this work. The eastern division is now open for traffic from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction and thence, by the Grand Trunk Pacific branch, to the lake itself. The whole of the work between Winnipeg and Moncton is now under contract.

If that conveys any meaning at all, it is an announcement that the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction is open for traffic, whereas in reality it is not finished or opened for traffic. That was certainly a grave abuse, and the right hon. the Prime Minister went far beyond what he should have done when he made that statement and made the Governor General responsible for it. We have just found out, some three or four months later, that it was simply a piece of deceit.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the government a contract for the removal of the scrap from the river, and what is the nature of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. A contract has been let, after asking for tenders, for $45,000, and the debris taken out belongs to the contractor.

Mr. BARKER. He gets $45,000 and the stuff taken out?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the debris in the way of navigation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of it had to be removed on account of navigation and some on account of the construction of new piers.

Mr. FOSTER. There are now four piers, two on land and two in the river. Do these occupy the same positions as the old ones?

Mr. GRAHAM. The south pier occupies the same position, but is enlarged. The main pier on the north side is shifted.

Mr. FOSTER. The pier on the south side war partly useful; that on the north side was absolutely useless. What was the cost of the one on the north side?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not got that.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the two in the river itself occupy the same positions?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am talking about the two in the river.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the two on land, are they in the same position as the old ones?

Mr. GRAHAM. The two anchor piers have to be taken down.

Mr. FOSTER. The old piers then were useless and had to be removed?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have to be taken down. They will not fit into the new plan.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Part of the bridge did not fall. Will that part be used?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will have to be taken down. The material may be used for another purpose.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the board of engineers to be employed until the completion of the bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they are engaged until the bridge is completed, and they are responsible for the engineering department until then.

Mr. CROCKET. What is their remuneration?

Mr. GRAHAM. $1,000 per month while employed, and a less amount as consulting engineers. During the construction perhaps two may remain as consulting engineers. The engineer who is permanent will be paid $1,000 a month.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the minister to say there had been a board of three engineers appointed, and the government called in two others to confer with them, and that the whole five had agreed in what should be done.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think I exactly said that.

Mr. BARKER. What will the minister say now, because it is important to know whether there are any differences of opinion?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, as a practical man, will know that you cannot get two engineers or two architects in the building of a house to absolutely agree on all the details. When the board was appointed, it was provided that should they disagree, they would have the power to call in two other men to confer with them. They have all agreed on the substructure. As to the superstructure, on the great principles they are agreed, but on some details they disagree, and they have the power to call in two other experts to confer with them. If it came to an absolute disagreement, I suppose the majority would rule.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the minister to say the other day that there was practical agreement of the three.

Mr. GRAHAM. On the substructure there was.

Mr. BARKER. Only on the substructure? Is there disagreement on the bridge itself?

Mr. GRAHAM. The board are working away. They had differences, these two men were called in, they have given their ideas and the reasons for them. It is likely before they get through that they will absolutely agree on all these things.

Mr. BARKER. They have not agreed yet?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not on every thing in connection with the superstructure.

Mr. MONK. It is rumoured in Montreal that there is an absolute disagreement among the three engineers in regard to the superstructure and for that reason these two additional engineers, Mr. Holgate and another, were called in. Is that the case?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the three had agreed, there would be no need to call in the other two, but they did not agree. I may say frankly it has been no easy task to get along with these three prominent engineers. Of course their reputations depend on their making a success of this bridge. If they make a failure of it, they are ruined professionally. They understand that, they hold very strong views along certain lines, they expressed them strongly and when they first met they were quite a way apart. Each belonged to a particular school, and we have been trying to get the result of the skill of each of them.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the hon. minister will say that is what the government ought to have done in the first instance.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what I am doing.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Why does the minister not have the whole bridge constructed of nickel steel? It would be less

work and require no painting. The model modern bridge is the nickel steel one.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed, not altogether. There are certain portions of the bridge in which it is of no advantage to have nickel steel, but where it will be any advantage nickel steel will be used in its construction.

Mr. MONK. The minister says there is still not absolute harmony on all details. What we understood in Montreal was that a part of the commission wanted a suspension bridge and another part a cantilever bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. The difference does not exists there. We are preparing plans for both. The difference is rather on details of construction which I would not dare to attempt to explain, but I think there will be no difficulty as to disagreements as we proceed.

Mr. MONK. Have tenders been invited for the superstructure?

Mr. GRAHAM. Intending tenders have been invited to examine the plans as far as they have gone and to study the plans and specifications for both cantilever and suspension designs. After so many months, in which they will have a chance to study these plans as they go along, we will give them a certain length of time in which to put in their actual tenders.

Mr. CROCKET. To whom was the contract for removing the fallen superstructure given?

Mr. GRAHAM. Charles Koenig, of Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that there will be no action or responsibility on the part of this government towards the widows and orphans who suffered in this disaster?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could not say what will happen in the future about any thing. The Phœnix Bridge Company, I understand, assume all responsibility and have settled the claims against them for loss through this great calamity.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any threatened suits against the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not heard of any.

Mr. BLAIN. In looking over the debate I see that the Finance Minister said that this bridge would be ready complete in December, 1906.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not informed then that it was going to fall.

Mr. BLAIN. Neither was the opposition, because we had my hon. friend's statement that the very best engineers would be engaged, the greatest caution would be exercised, my hon. friend would deal with this matter as if dealing with his own affairs. Instead of that we find now that the minister himself says: Of course the superstructure was altogether too light and insufficient for the work and as for the abutments, they have to be added to and strengthened. When we keep in mind the fact that there is no change on the National Transcontinental railway in respect to weight of engines or traffic, we come to the conclusion that my hon. friend and his government blundered and the people of the country are of the same opinion.

Mr. FIELDING. If you can conceive of such a transaction as that being my own, I could not have dealt with it in a different way. We had the most eminent bridge engineer on the American continent dealing with the matter, I do not know where a better one could be obtained.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you a better one now?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot say.

Mr. BARKER. You had a gentleman from New York, Mr. Cooper, to give advice.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Cooper was chosen as the engineer to have direction and charge of the whole work. But there was no question at that time as to his capacity or his eminence.

Mr. MONK. It was proved at the enquiry held in the first instance by a committee of the House of Commons that when the plans were finally prepared they were sent in for the government's approval, and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber obtained authority from the government to have the plans examined by an American expert. He sought out that American expert, the construction company heard of it, and they protested that they would not allow the work that had been performed in the way of plans and specifications by Mr. Cooper, who was their engineer, to be supervised by anybody else. That was abundantly proved in the investigation, and the correspondence is in evidence in both committees of this house. Then the Prime Minister said that if Mr. Cooper had approved of the plans it would not be necessary to go any further. So there was really no government examination of the plans, and they were approved under those circumstances. Those are the uncontroverted facts.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not admit they are uncontroverted facts. I regret that I am obliged to speak from memory, to some extent, on a question of this importance; but my recollection is that Mr. Cooper

was chosen by the bridge company as their engineer, and when it was proposed that there should be another engineer chosen to represent the Department of Railways and Canals, Mr. Cooper objected; and then Mr. Schreiber gave us the advice that, inasmuch as the interests of the bridge company and the interests of the government were the same, the opposing interests being those of the construction company, there was nothing to be gained by undertaking to put another engineer there as against Mr. Cooper, who was representing the bridge company. But when Mr. Cooper objected to being associated with some other engineer, Mr. Schreiber said: Mr. Cooper is a most eminent engineer, and his interests as representing the bridge company are not at variance with the interests of the government. And I think Mr. Schreiber advised that the matter should be left in Mr. Cooper's hands. I believe the papers will show that to be the fact.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend is absolutely wrong. It is true that Mr. Cooper was the advising engineer of the bridge company. But who suggested Mr. Cooper to the bridge company? It was the construction company itself, the Phoenix Construction Company. At any rate, the government had nothing else to do, when the plans were sent in for final approbation, than to rely upon those plans after approval by its own engineer. This Mr. Schreiber would not undertake to do. He was called upon to approve of the plans, and he represented to the government that he had not the expert knowledge, the latest expert knowledge as a bridge builder which was necessary to enable him to pass upon so important a matter. When we voted the last sum of money to the bridge company we insisted and the government gave us an assurance, that there would be competent examination by an independent authority. Mr. Schreiber then suggested to the government that he be allowed to employ an expert, and the name of the expert whom he recommended is given in the evidence. Mr. Schreiber had correspondence with that gentleman, who, I think, was from Philadelphia, at any rate he was a man of equal reputation to that of Mr. Cooper. When the company became aware that their plans were going to be examined by an independent authority, they came here and made representations and succeeded in defeating the intentions of the government of having this expert from the United States examine the plans. The Prime Minister himself told Mr. Schreiber, what the Finance Minister has just said, that Mr. Cooper was a perfectly competent man, and if he had found no fault with the plans, then he might affix his signature to those plans. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and myself were sitting on that committee, and we obtained from Mr. Holgate, one of the Royal Commissioners who had conducted the first inquiry, the assurance that the examination by an expert would have allowed them to see what escaped Mr. Cooper, that is to say, a defect in the construction. Mr. Holgate found at once that any independent expert would have detected that defect.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend's remarks imply that the government and the company were at variance with the recommendations of their chief engineer, Mr. Schreiber. Am I right in saying that he meant to convey that impression?

Mr. MONK. Certainly.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I state unhesitatingly that in that respect my hon. friend is wrong. I say that no step was taken regarding the engineering matters in connection with that enterprise without the cordial approval and support of Mr. Schreiber; and no other engineer was called in to be associated with Mr. Cooper, it was because Mr. Schreiber himself advised that such was not necessary.

Mr. BARKER. Have you got his written advice?

Mr. FIELDING. I am speaking entirely from memory, but I venture to say that Mr. Schreiber will confirm that statement. I was for a short time in the Railway Department, during a portion of the period these negotiations were going on, and I would not have dreamed of taking any step in relation to a work of so great importance, without Mr. Schreiber's advice. I know that Mr. Schreiber was of the opinion that we were getting the best available advice, and that nothing would be gained by insisting on another engineer. I am sure that Mr. Schreiber will say that that is a correct account of what occurred.

Mr. MONK. It is a question of memory. But I will endeavour to get the absolute proof of what I am saying.

Mr. BLAIN. We have been endeavouring to ascertain from the Minister of Railways who was responsible for this blunder.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend might ask who is responsible for any great disaster which occurred. It is easy to find fault afterwards. He might ask who was responsible for the falling of the Tay bridge, who is responsible for the loss of life on the Canadian Pacific railway a few days ago. These things occur in the ordinary way in the management of a great public corporation. Whenever they happen in great corporations little comment is made; but when an accident happens upon

a government work we have 200 odd critics in the House of Commons finding fault which is sometimes unreasonable.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not trying to hold the government responsible altogether for the accident. But we on this side have been contending this afternoon that the government were aware that this was a very important work. My hon. friend himself is fully aware that the government was responsible altogether for the payment of money, and for guaranteeing the bonds, because the Finance Minister himself had charge of it in 1903, and came down with a statement in 1904 for the guaranteeing of the bonds. I am not holding the government responsible for the accident. This side of the House has never made any severe criticism of the government on that point. But we are now asking the government, who is responsible for the design of a bridge that was absolutely insufficient for the work for which it was intended? That is the position. It was insufficient, the design was altogether wrong, and that is the reason why this country is put to such enormous expense, and I suppose that is the reason why the bridge fell into the river. As a proof of that we find the government now coming forward and making the statement that the superstructure was altogether insufficient. They have now prepared for a very much stronger and heavier superstructure. I would point out to the Minister of Finance that had there been a change in the Grand Trunk Pacific by which larger and heavier engines and trains were to go over this bridge, that would have been one reason why there should be a heavier superstructure. But, there was no change in that respect and therefore, my hon. friend and his government must be and are held responsible for this accident in so far as that is concerned. The minister can say that the responsibility rests with the engineer if he wishes. That may be his statement, but the people of the country and we of the opposition must seek our redress as against the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I entirely disagree with my hon. friend as to what the people of the country think on this subject. I do not believe that the people of the country expect the members of this government to be engineers. What they do expect is that in a great engineering matter they shall select good professional advice and if it turns out that the engineer made a mistake and if an accident happens on government work, which is just as likely as on any other great work, I suppose that is proof that the eminent engineer was wrong in his judgment. But if the government selected the best engineer that could be found I think the people of the country are reasonable enough to give the government credit for having taken every precaution in the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He had never seen the work.

Mr. FIELDING. If so, that does not necessarily prove anything.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He was never on it.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that that is correct.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas.

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—Mr. Monk.

PATENT OF MOND NICKEL COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 92) respecting a patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—Mr. McGiverin.

On section 1,

Mr. BLAIN. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill has been reported without amendment by the committee. I do not know the Bill myself.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the promoter in the Chamber?

Mr. PARDEE. The promoter is, unfortunately, absent. But the fact that the Bill is reported without amendment indicates that the committee was satisfied.

Bill reported.

Mr. GRAHAM. The next items on the Order Paper are Bills to be considered in Committee of the Whole. But they have been amended by the several standing committees that dealt with them. They are not railway Bills, or I would be ready to go on with them. But, as I do not know the nature of the amendments, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 128) to incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Low.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Collection of revenue—Intercolonial railway, $9,000,000.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to say that some hon. gentlemen who were not present this afternoon wish to discuss some items which are covered by the general summary then before the committee, and would like to have an understanding with the minister that this will be open to them. It will not be a matter of detail requiring the presence of the Deputy Minister, but they would like to have left open for further discussion the items of the Intercolonial railway and the Quebec bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will not object. With regard to this item, hon. gentlemen will notice that we are asking for $250,000 less this year than we asked for last year.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to have an explanation from the minister as to how he has made this reduction—whether it is by cutting down the number of regular hands or otherwise. As a matter of fact, a great many men have been laid off, particularly in the city of Halifax and its vicinity. I also understand that a number of high class men have been engaged at large salaries. I would like to have some idea of how this saving is made.

Mr. GRAHAM. There has been a general reduction all round. The amount we ask for is based on the experience of the past year; in fact, we think we shall hardly reach an expenditure of $9,000,000 this year, which has been an especially good one for operation during the winter. Next year, of course, something extraordinary might happen, and we might have a deficit. I will give my hon. friend some items showing how the expenses were cut down last year: steam locomotive repairs, $114,242; passenger car repairs, $1,903; freight car repairs, $114,643; floating equipment repairs, $3,999; shop machinery and tools, $10,566; heating and lighting, $6,493; traffic expenses, $9,637; dispatching trains, $11,882; and various other items of this kind. We did dispense with the services of a large number of men. Quite a number have been taken back, as vacancies occur, and I am asking that the old employees be taken back to fill them.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. BARKER. I quite appreciate, from some personal experience, how impossible it is for the head of a railway system of some 1,400 miles to put down approximately, as he can do in capital expenditure, what his working expenses will be for the coming twelve months. It is a variable item, and must depend not merely on the number of men employed, and the rate of wages paid, but also on the amount of business done. I desire here to express my great gratification at the departure which has been made by the government from the practice of the past. We have had, year after year, the painful experience of seeing a great public work managed politically. On our side, regardless of whether we should be in power, we desire that this great Canadian institution should be worked for the benefit of Canada, particularly for the benefit of the eastern provinces, regardless of politics. We quite appreciate, I think, the difficulty of hon. gentlemen opposite in restraining their political friends in the interest of economy, and have tried to make some allowance for that. But there can be no question that so long as a railway like the Intercolonial is worked on political lines, there can be nothing but extravagance and waste. It was for that reason, although I would have liked to have seen the railway removed even farther from the political influence of the government, that I heartily welcomed the appointment of the board of railway men who are now in charge of its operation. I have the more pleasure in saying that much, because in the few months during which these gentlemen have been in charge, we have seen an approach to better things. Year after year, since I have had the honour of being in parliament, I have endeavoured to impress upon the government the absolute necessity of keeping the accounts of this railway as every railway company keeps its accounts—not merely for the purpose of reducing expenses, but for every consideration that applies to any business corporation.

One of the great difficulties we have had in discussing the affairs of the Intercolonial railway has been that we have never been able to compare the results of its operation with those of the operation of other great railways. It has been absolutely impossible for us to take the results of the year's working and compare them with those of any other large concern, for the simple reason that deliberately, wantonly, in the face of every experience, the government have insisted upon keeping their accounts on a different basis from that on which other railway companies keep their accounts. If the Intercolonial railway accounts had been kept as are those of the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway, all the discussions in this

House, which have taken up our time from day to day and from week to week, could have been dispensed with, and the year's operations discussed in two or three hours. Take such a company as the Grand Trunk railway whose accounts are reviewed 3,000 miles away from here by the men whose money is invested in the enterprise, in a few hours they get at the bottom of the year's work, while it takes us weeks in the case of the Intercolonial railway. Why is this? It is because the accounts of the Grand Trunk railway and these other railway companies are kept on a practical system and basis, so that when you find that the working of either of these companies takes a certain percentage of the profits, you have a fair idea whether it is being operated in an economical and business-like manner. Can we say this of the Intercolonial railway? On that road there has not been any system for charging expenditure as between capital account or working expenses. The system adopted by the government would be laughed to scorn in any business corporation. It is one which conceals the actual results of the work. How can you expect the management to be careful to keep down the expenditure if all the manager has to do is to charge 25 or 30 or 40 per cent more to capital account and thus show better results? Yet that system has been absolutely fostered, and in fact recommended, by the Department of Railways. The minister wants to show a surplus, and it is the easiest thing in the world to do so, if you take 10 or 20 per cent out of the working expenses and transfer that to capital. We can see in the last nine months the beginning of a different system. We find an effort on the part of the management to know precisely what they are doing. For the first time we find these gentlemen setting aside a round sum out of revenue and charging it against the earnings of the road for the purpose of renewing in the future the rolling stock which is wearing out. I would like the minister to show us any such item in the past. These gentlemen have had very little time to show what they can do, but I feel certain that as they go on, further improvement will be shown and, whether the Intercolonial railway shows loss or profit, we shall know the truth. It is absurd for hon. gentlemen from the eastern provinces to tell us from Ontario or elsewhere that we are prejudiced against the Intercolonial railway. We have no desire whatever to belittle or misrepresent the Intercolonial railway. We do not desire that the Intercolonial railway shall make money unjustly or unfairly to them. We want the road worked honestly; what we want is to know the truth, whether there be a profit or a loss, and we shall be content. What more can the people from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick ask? We are not going to complain if the railway does not make a profit, but we do say that in the interests of honesty and of the country at large, we should know the truth. How can you expect the staff to care whether they are doing their best for the railway or not, if it makes no difference whether the railway is really gaining or losing, if they can gain the approval of their employers simply by misrepresenting the actual working expenses of the road? Why, every time you claim credit in this House by showing a pretended surplus, you hold out temptation to your officers to misrepresent; because it is very easy for the manager or the engineer or other departmental head, who knows that his reputation in the minister's eyes depends on showing a surplus—it is very easy for him to show one, and he will take care by every means in his power to do so, especially as he knows that he cannot be subject to criticism, because his accounts are kept differently from those of any other railway management in America. Who in the world can tell whether a railway man has been a success or a failure if his accounts are kept differently from the accounts of every other railway man in America? There can be no greater temptation to wrong-doing on the part of a great staff of employees than to put them in the position they have been in for years. I have great confidence in railway men. I have had nearly forty years experience of them, and I say there are no men who are more loyal to honest, good working, to the true interests of their employers, than the railway managers and officers. The railway man's whole reputation depends upon it. He knows that whatever clap-trap may be uttered on the public political platform, there is a great mass of experienced men over this whole continent who laugh at cooked returns such as we have presented to us. He knows that if he hopes to rise in his career, the worst place he can go to is a concern which keeps its accounts differently from other railways. I am glad this advance has been made. I can see in these few months' accounts an advance in the right direction. I do not want to criticise, and it is useless, in my opinion, to criticise this round sum set down as the estimtaed amount you may probably have to pay for your working expenses, which, as I have said before, depend upon your traffic. I hope that the minister will be able to go further in the right course he has taken. I hope he will put the administration of this road more and more in the hands of the professional men, as I may call them, who have been bred to the business, and take it more and more out of the hands of the politicians.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know my hon. friend will agree with me that it is easier to speak from his standpoint than from the stand-

point of the man who has to do these things. He must have heard some criticism, not unkindly criticism, rather intimating that the appointment of a board was to escape responsibility. I may say that is not my view. I wanted to escape first an enormous amount of detail about which I knew nothing, but which came to my office every day only to be returned to the management and perhaps returned to my office again. I sought, in the first place, a way to get rid of innumerable details and to let them all be settled by men who knew something about that kind of work. However, I am obliged to my hon. friend for his kind words with reference to what I think is an improvement. So far as I am concerned personally, it would be much more comfortable and far easier in one way to continue the old system and have no board. But having undertaken——

Mr. BLAIN. What way is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will not put that on 'Hansard' because we never can get it out of there. I am frank in saying and hon. gentlemen will agree with me, that it is a difficult position, a difficult problem to work out. But the board, I think on the whole, has given good results. I am not so anxious to have the Intercolonial railway pay a lot of money, we want to give a good service and the road has been established under conditions that have not allowed it to make much money, but we want to maintain the standard of the road. We want to maintain the service as far as possible, but I do say that at the present time the Intercolonial railway ought to be able to at least pay its own way. It has not any dividend to pay, it has no interest to pay and I think it should be able to support itself. One year we may have a surplus, the next year we may go a little behind.

As to the keeping of the accounts, some three years ago the present deputy minister engaged an expert to go through our books and reorganize the accounts of the Intercolonial railway and get them on the same basis as the books of a company. That cannot be all done in a moment, men who have been working one way all their lives cannot change quickly, but at present our returns are kept on the standard classification of the railways of America. Our reports are made under the head of maintenance of way, maintenance of structure and maintenance of equipment, traffic expenses, transportation expenses, just as returns are made to the Railway Department from all railways operating in Canada. As to charges to capital and revenue we have adopted the standard of the Inter-State Commerce Commission and whether it be a surplus or a deficit accounts are being kept absolutely as they are kept by a railway company. This year we have charged everything to capital just as a a company would. We have been putting aside $25,000 a month for renewal of equipment since 1907, but not for renewal of rails. This year we are placing $100,000 to one side for rail renewal account and I think that whatever the reports to the House may be they will be shown exactly how the matter stands and will be exactly as the accounts of a company would stand doing the same business.

Mr. BLAIN. I am much interested in the remarks of the minister. Whatever may be said, it is certainly a departure. For many years we have been listening to the predecessors of the Minister of Railways stating to this House that there was absolutely no political patronage in the management of the Intercolonial railway. After the minister had made this statement year after year, he would be endorsed by the hon. gentlemen from eastern Canada emphasizing the fact that whatever other defects there might be in respect to the management of the railway there was no political patronage. We would gather from the remarks of my hon. friend, coupled with the fact that they have changed the policy and have now transferred the management to a board, that there had been some political interference. Now the government is being complimented because of the change that has taken place. I want to direct my hon. friend's attention to this remark made in the House a few days ago by a gentleman who lives down in the province where the Intercolonial railway runs, and who is a prominent supporter of my hon. friend's government:

> I would like to know if it is in the interest of the people that the commissioner takes a big stick and threatens a newspaper if it criticises the management that it will get no more patronage, and not only threatens but carries out his threat. That is the way the people's railway is managed for the people. God save us from the people's railway.

That is not a criticism by a gentleman from the province of Ontario, that is not a criticism of the old policy, but it is a criticism of the new board of management by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black), showing that there certainly is some interference, that the commissioners do take up the big stick; and if a newspaper down there attempts any criticism of the management of the road, the commissioner says: No more money from the government until you stop that kind of criticism. Now I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Of course he is a railway man, and his experience is very valuable; but I would hesitate to compliment this new board of management until we see what they are going to do.

Mr. BARKER. I only said I was gratified with what they had done in the way of improvement, but I expected a great deal more.

Mr. BLAIN. Improvement in lessening the number of employees. It was charged from this side of the House that they had altogether too many employees on that railway, and we were answered by their saying that, in comparison with other railways in Canada, there were no more employees on the Intercolonial than were required for the passengers and freight. Now we find a number of men have been dismissed. For what reason? Times are prosperous. Surely that is an answer to the criticism on this side. The fact is that a commission appointed by themselves declares there has been altogether too many put on there for political purposes. And now they are dismissed by the railway board, dismissed by the hundreds. A certain great man said that people are bundles of inconsistencies, and I think that remark would apply very well to my hon. friend's department. We have not much to say about my hon. friend, we are waiting until his record is made. My hon. friend from Hamilton thinks he is doing pretty well, but I am not so well acquainted with his achievements. But to-day we have a complete rebuttal from the government side of the policy that they declared was the policy of managing the Intercolonial without any political interference at all. Now I am sorry to have to sit in the House and to find that a criticism, keen and cutting, comes from a gentleman on their own side of the House, who says the management is not a bit better. The commission takes up the stick the same as the government did, and as soon as any criticism comes from a newspaper in eastern Canada about the management—no more support from the government until you stop that sort of criticism.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend complains of political interference. He won't feel so badly when he knows that it is a Liberal newspaper that is under discussion.

Mr. BLAIN. I was reminding my hon. friend of a criticism of one of his own supporters, and perhaps he would tell us whether that is true or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend contended that the same political interference was being exercised by the commission as there was before by the minister when they took up the big club.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Hants said that.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the hon, member for Hants did not mention political interference. I am pointing out that this cannot be political interference, because it is a Liberal newspaper that is under discussion. As a matter of fact I believe the board did have some disagreement with a newspaper in the east, because the board represented to me, and I saw some of the statements myself, that this paper was making a campaign against the Board of Management of the Intercolonial which I have no hesitation in saying was absolutely unfair and based on untruths: and in my private capacity I would not give any business to my best friend if he told what was not true. Of course we have criticism of the Intercolonial management more or less, but no charge of political interference can be made against the board. There would have been political interference if I had said to the board: 'You must not do that; you must keep on giving this Grit paper business.' But I try to keep my fingers out of the trouble. I hope my hon. friend will see the point.

Mr. BLAIN. It certainly could not have been any criticism of a Conservative newspaper, because my hon. friend knows well the Conservative newspapers do not get any pap from the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong again, because he does not keep track of things. One of the complaints occasionally made by strong Liberals is that we do give advertisements to Conservative newspapers. That is true. The Halifax 'Herald' for instance, which the leader of the opposition will recognize, gets advertising; so does the Montreal 'Gazette', so does the Quebec 'Chronicle,' and I could name others, where we get good value. My hon. friend also referred to dismissals. Now, as a matter of fact, the traffic on all roads fell off immensely; every company road, I understand, dismissed their men by the dozens, by the hundred, by the thousand. Wisely or unwisely, I kept our men on. But when the board came in they said there were too many, and they did what a company road would have done a year before. I hope that the Intercolonial will get so much business back that we will have to reemploy some of the men who have been dismissed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that the minister has given the board perfect liberty to advertise in whatever papers they choose, in the eastern provinces or the western, for railway supplies?

Mr. GRAHAM. For everything in connection with the Intercolonial. The board is doing this now, I could not give you tonight a list of the Liberal or Conservative papers in which they are advertising.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that, so far as the minister is concerned, he gives absolute freedom to the board to advertise in whatever papers they choose?

Mr. GRAHAM. So far as the Intercolonian railway is concerned.

Mr. A. HAGGART. There is a certain amount of politics, of course, in connection with the road. But I suppose the minister will not deny that, now when we are two years further away from the general election, the department might exercise some more economy with regard to this $250.000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This $250,000 is really not in question. The expenditure has been reduced. This year there will be less than the $9,000,000. We took a vote of $9,250,000 last year so as to be sure to cover all contingencies. I am not asking that much now for the experience of last year proves that we will not need it.

Mr. CROSBY. How many freight passenger cars and locomotives are idle at the present time by reason of the fact that they require repairs? I do not know whether the minister will be able to-night to give me an answer to another question which I desire to ask, but if not I would like him to give it at some other time. I would like to know what the difference is between the number of men getting from $1.25 to $2 a day on the Intercolonial railway in 1907-8, and the number of men receiving that wage on the road at the present time. I would also like to know the difference in the number of men getting $2,000 and upwards as between the present year the year 1907-8, together with their salaries.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be impossible to get the details that my hon. friend asks for as it would take weeks and weeks to procure the information. In our higher offices we pay our men much less than the railway companies do. There has been a good deal of talk to the effect that we pay certain men high salaries and take it out of those receiving smaller pay. The ordinary man on the Intercolonial railway is paid as high, on the average, as men on any railway, or higher, whereas the officials filling the higher offices are paid less than men filling similar positions on other railways in Canada. The criticism of railway men—and we have heard it in connection with the retirement of Mr. Butler from the Railway Department—is that we do not pay sufficiently high salaries to our officers on the railway, and that we do not have enough of these officers. That is the professional criticism on the Intercolonial railway. Just before I came into the department my predecessor took occasion to get the opinion of an expert and his opinion was as I have expressed it. The criticism is heard that we possibly have too many in the lower grades and too few in the higher, and that while we pay good salaries to the ordinary employees we do not pay our higher officials a sufficient amount of money to keep them and to get the best out of them. As to the number of cars, there are about four hundred freight cars ready for repairs and we are turning a greater number out of the repair shops every day than ever before in the history of the road. There are about 5 or 10 per cent of the locomotives ready for repairs, but I find that our percentage of locomotives requiring repairs is less than the average in the Dominion of Canada to a considerable extent. I do not think there are any passenger cars, except those that are always going through the shops.

Mr. CROSBY. Last year we had in this House a report from a commission which had been delegated by the government or this House to ascertain whether the clerks in the employ of the Intercolonial railway were getting fairly paid or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was not a commission but a conciliation board agreed to by the men themselves and the management. The House had nothing to do with it.

Mr. CROSBY. For the purpose of my argument it does not make any difference. That board went out to ascertain whether the employees on the Intercolonial railway were paid by the standard of other employees on other railways in Canada. They came back with their report, and it was to the effect that they were paid 15 or 20 per cent less.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was not the report.

Mr. CROSBY. Well, what was it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The report was that we should reduce the staff of clerks and that by this reduction we could pay the balance of the staff a certain percentage of money as recommended by the commission. They recommended that we have a classification something like the Civil Service classification. There were great discrepancies. Some of the clerks were paid too little and others too much, or more than their jobs were worth. We have undertaken to classify these clerks, not by reducing the salary that any person then had, but if a man is getting $1,000 now in an office that under the new classification ought to be worth $750, the old man will retain his classification, but when he goes out his successor will get $750.

Mr. CROSBY. That is very good as far as it goes, but I remember when speaking of the matter in the House last session, that a different answer was given to me from that given to-night by the minister. A few days after, when the minister came down with his speech on government railways, he tried to satisfy the House that the Intercolonial railway was run at a

cheaper rate per mile than any other railway in Canada. Then this board went out for the purpose of ascertaining whether the men were overpaid or underpaid, and they reported that there was an over abundance of employees, a matter which was none of their business, because they were not sent out for that purpose. I tried to uphold the minister on that occasion because they were not doing him justice. If they had more men on the road than they should have it was not fair to him. But the minister came in and proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the railway was not over-manned. I had no reason to doubt the figures which he presented to show that that was the actual condition. That being the case, and the management having dismissed as many men as we are informed have been dismissed, we must have a railway which is not sufficiently manned at the present time. I did not have the pleasure of listening to the speech of the hon. Minister of Railways this session, and I have not had an opportunity of reading it, although I hope to do so. Now, I would like to ask the minister what difference there is in the number of men of the working class employed on the Intercolonial railway in 1910-11 as compared with 1907-8, or in 1909-10 as compared with 1908-9. I am sure the minister will be able to give me that information. Then I would be glad if he would give us the information with regard to the number of officials. I understood him to say that the technical men, as he called them, were paid less on this road than on other roads, while the labouring classes were paid as well on the Intercolonial railway as on other roads. No doubt, there are some men on the Intercolonial railway who should not be on the road at all, but if so, that is the fault of the management. Speaking particularly of the men in my own locality, including those engaged in connection with the terminal facilities, I do not think they are getting better pay than men who are engaged in other work in that city. In what he said, I suppose, the minister had in mind the fact that his deputy minister has been called to a very high position, at a salary, I believe, three times as much as he was getting here. I want to tell the hon. minister there are not many Butlers in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. Only the first families can have a butler.

Mr. CROSBY. I sympathize with the minister in losing his deputy, but we are all pleased that that gentleman has been called to so important a position. If the minister wants to hold his good men, all he has to do is to raise their salaries. Treat the good men well, and do not let them suffer for the bad ones. I suppose the minister will send me the information as to the number of workingmen on the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will try to send that to-morrow.

Mr. CROSBY. I understand the minister to say that there are about four hundred freight cars of every description now idle. He says also that the number under repair is from five to ten per cent. That is not very definite.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, in our change from the old shop to the new there was some delay of work. But, with the facilities of the new shops, we are effecting a greater quantity of repairs than ever before and are catching up rapidly. I do not take credit for that; it is due to the new shops which were designed and practically constructed by my predecessor.

Prince Edward Island railway, $400,000.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has some explanation to give of this.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave that at length the other day. Prince Edward Island is one of the most beautiful spots in Canada. But, so far as railways are concerned, it is isolated. We have a narrow gauge railway there, about 260 miles in length. You cannot give a fair service there and come out even, much less make money. The people of Prince Edward Island have always complained to me—and their complaint is not without reason—that they do not get the train service they ought to get. They certainly do not begin to get the service that is given on the Intercolonial railway. It is for parliament to look at the matter sympathetically. We must make up our mind that, each year, a certain amount must be contributed out of consolidated fund to maintain the service of the Prince Edward Island railway, for the traffic is not there to keep the road on an even basis financially. But Prince Edward Island is part of the Dominion; the people were brought into confederation expecting great things, and, for my part, I sympathize with the view that we ought to go on and give on that railway a better service than we do now, even though we know that it will increase the amount which must be taken from the consolidated fund.

Mr. BLAIN. How much is taken from the consolidated fund for this purpose now?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year, $90,000; this year it will be about $70,000. We must make up our minds that, if we are going to have the service we ought to have, the service that the rest of us enjoy and would make a fuss if we did not have, it will cost us, say, $100,000. I regard sym-

pathetically the idea that we should give Prince Edward Island a fair service.

Railways and canals—chargeable to capital —canals—Lachine canal — concrete vertical wall, $165,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a concrete vertical wall on the south side of the Lachine canal. The slope walls made during the last two years were carried up only to the water line. The portion above water is to be vertical to increase the width of the bank eight feet to twelve feet. Another section of vertical wall is to be built from the top of the rock from the Canadian Pacific railway bridge to the guard lock, where the dry wall is tumbling down. This wall is similar to the northern wall on the same section. This is a new vote. The items of this expenditure include $22,000 for concrete under water, for the vertical wall $80,000 and for cement about $30,000. Purchases will be made by tender in every instance.

Lachine canal—towards completion of wharf and basins, $135,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The tenderers in this case were George Goodwin, the Canadian General Development Company, Downey & O'Brien and Michael Connelly. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like the minister (Mr. Graham) to notice that when the canal question comes up, he finds that the men of the east are always prepared to see that the money necessary is provided. All they ask is that that money shall be properly spent. The men from the east are anxious to have every facility provided for the transportation of the commerce of this Dominion. So, I am glad to say, you do not find them trying to interfere with these estimates in any way.

Mr. BLAIN. Were tenders asked for in all the cases the minister has mentioned?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. By advertisement in the newspapers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Formerly, we sent circulars to the cement manufacturers, but now we advertise in the papers for cement also.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to criticise too closely on this point, but we ought to understand the policy of the department. Are we to understand that advertisements are given to the newspapers having the largest circulation regardless of party. Or what is the policy of the department on that point?

Mr. GRAHAM. So long as men are human there will be humanity in all these things, I suppose. The policy of my department, in regard to large works like the Quebec bridge, is to advertise in all the trade papers and engineering papers, which will reach particularly the men who would be able to undertake the work. General work we advertise in papers of good repute, and I am free to confess that they are mostly Liberal papers.

Mr. BLAIN. For instance, looking over the list of papers in Toronto, I find in connection with one item that $228.60 was paid to the Toronto 'Globe' and $228.60 to the Toronto 'Star'; but I look in vain for any advertisement given to any other of the leading papers in Toronto.

Mr. GRAHAM. Upon the basis of my hon. friend's suggestion, it is said by those who know that the Toronto 'Globe' has the largest circulation, inside and outside, of all the Toronto papers. It is said that the 'Star' has the largest circulation of the evening papers. So that outside of politics these would be the two papers that would reach the most people.

Mr. BLAIN. Accepting my hon. friend's policy of selecting the papers having the largest circulation—

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAIN. There can be no other inference from his statement that the Toronto 'Globe' has the largest circulation of the Toronto papers and the 'Star' has the largest evening circulation. Keeping that in view, I want to direct his attention to the fact that when advertising is done in the city of London, in western Ontario, my hon. friend does not select the paper there having the largest circulation, because in the London 'Free Press', which is recognized as the leading newspaper in that section, you cannot find any government advertisements. Therefore, the policy which my hon. friend has laid down applies to the city of Toronto, but not to the western part of the province. I am not complaining particularly. I merely want know exactly what the policy of my hon. friend is. My hon. friend says, therefore we may expect that in the future advertisements will appear only in papers that support my hon. friend and his government, and therefore the patronage list, which we have heard so much about lately, is not going to disappear altogether from the government, even from my hon. friend's department.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may be blunt, but I am not hypocritical. As long as I find a friend who gives me good service, I am inclined to lean a little towards that friend, and I am inclined to think that my hon. friend would do the same.

Mr. CROSBY. I am very glad to hear that that is the minister's policy, because it means that he will do all his advertising in the Halifax 'Herald' and 'Evening Mail,' which I think have the largest circulation east of Montreal, if not in the whole Dominion. They are also perfectly independent. No man can have their support unless he is worthy of the support of the people. Therefore, these papers, having been brought to his notice, being perfectly independent, and having a sworn circulation, I hope that the minister, whenever he wants to let the people know what he wants, will advertise in them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much will this item cost altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM. $241,319.50.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the cost of the other item?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is expected that the vote will cover the entire cost; but we have not yet let the work.

Soulanges canal—purchase of tool grinder, &c., $850.

Mr. BARKER. How are articles of this kind bought?

Mr. GRAHAM. All by tender. I have a list of 300 of the leading machinery men, irrespective of politics, and I write to all of them for tenders. It is cheaper than advertising.

Mr. BARKER. What we have had to complain of is that the government bought through middlemen.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not buy any tools from middlemen, unless they are recognized agents of their respective companies. In every case we try to buy direct from the manufacturer. In fact, in some cases I have told the manufacturer that he must tender direct.

Mr. BARKER. I believe that the minister means what he says, but in the Merwin case we found that the manufacturer was willing to sell and deliver at his price to the middlemen, but the government bought in preference from the middleman and paid him 87 per cent extra..

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing of that kind in my department.

Soulanges canal—stopping leaks, trimming slopes, &c., $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we asked for $160,000 and spent $60,000. The Soulanges canal is built through soft soil, which is very treacherous, and we are trying to improve the banks so that it will be impossible for us to experience the trouble we had in the Cornwall canal. The work we have done has proved very efficacious, the bank being dry where it used to be wet and spongy. We are completing that work, which must be done in the interest of shipping.

Mr. CROSBY. Will that cover all the work to be done?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will cover this particular work and overcome what appears to show signs of difficulty. We have to take the responsibility of keeping up the work to prevent any recurrence of this kind.

Sault Ste. Marie canal construction, $70,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work is under contract. It is for deepening and widening the channel at the upper entrance. We let this by tender to C. S. Boone, of Toronto, who made the lowest bid. Contract dated 12th March, 1907, value of work done to October last, $200,380. We hope that this $70,000 will complete the work.

Trent canal construction, $1,750,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we had a million dollars. This year we expect to let two more sections, which will bring us from Lake Simcoe to Lake Ontario. We expect to have all that under contract this year. My trip through the various canals in the old world convinced me that the Trent canal will be of real advantage to the Dominion. Quite a lot of water-powers will be developed along the way, and the dams constructed by us will assist in the development of more power. We have made arrangements with people who own the land along the banks wherever we could, and we expect that there will be developed altogether in that part of the province some 60,000 horse-power. Some two years ago, in order that the rates might be right, I amended the Act of the Board of Railway Commissioners and placed the rate to be charged by the people who develop these powers under the control of the board.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. How much still remains to be done after these contracts are completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Simcoe to Georgian bay, there is one route by Nottawasaga bay and the other by the Severn river. I expect to meet a deputation concerning these routes in a few days. One part of the people desire the canal to go by Nottawasaga, and the other by Orillia, taking the Severn river.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. It will be of no use for the craft that sail on the upper lakes?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it will be for canal barges drawing eight to nine feet of water. I look to a good deal of development of traffic that will come through in these barges. The opening of this canal will make that part of Ontario one of the paradises of Canada for summer tourists.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many locks? And is there any estimate of the cost of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer has not yet finished his report as to these two routes, the Severn river and the Nottawasaga. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) looked over part of the report in my office. I do not know whether it pleased him or not. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. Wright) was looking at it to. The report will be completed and give a full estimate of all my hon. friend asks.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART. The Newmarket canal no doubt will get its full share.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) is waiting for that.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the hon. gentleman appropriating for the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we did not spend much on it. I sent for Mr. Grant, the engineer of the department, who is a first-class man, and we discussed the Newmarket canal very thoroughly. He assured me that I can state to the House on his reputation that there will be plenty of water in that canal. Before the summer is over, you will find that the stretch then completed will have water in it.

Mr. WALLACE. It has none now.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they are skating on it. I am giving you what my engineer says. This year we intend to spend about $150,000 on that portion of the Holland river canal. Of course that is the portion in the vicinity of Newmarket. There is another section east of that called No. 2, Holland river, which requires dredging, but we have not done anything on that yet.

Mr. WALLACE. Last year you spent about $192,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. $57,000, I think.

Mr. WALLACE. You were to have spent the same as the year before.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not do it.

Mr. WALLACE. The year before most of the money was spent during August, September and October, 1908. That is the reason I thought this work was mostly political. Does the minister really intend finishing that canal, and has he any idea that it will be of any use whatever

Mr. GRAHAM. I do intend finishing it.

Mr. WALLACE. And you will get water?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not the faintest question about it.

Mr. WALLACE. Where do you expect to get it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am giving Mr. Grant's opinion. In Germany last year I visited one canal owned by a county council. The canal was 26 miles long, and it was supplied entirely from the drainage of the country. In Germany last year I visited one canal 29 miles long supplied absolutely by the drainage of the country. It joined a river, but the county council was precluded from taking any water from the river because a rival company had the monopoly of the water from the river. They made provision that in case the water supply ran low they can pump the water back into the canal and use it again. They have a system of double locks by which a boat goes through on one side and the same water is used for another boat on the other side of the canal. They have never used the pumping device as they get enough water from the drainage. It is one of the most beautiful places in Germany, and is a fashionable summer resort. Mr. Grant says that by a system, I think, of two dams and reservoirs they can provide ample water, and after discussing it with him I have not a lingering doubt in my mind that there will be plenty of water for the Newmarket canal.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the estimated cost of the canal with the water? Last year you said $982,000 without the water.

Mr. GRAHAM. Unlike my hon. friend, I always include water when I give an estimate for a canal. The estimate will be as I said last year, at least $1,000,000 in my opinion.

Mr. WALLACE. When do you expect to have the canal finished?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend is in a hurry, I can spend some more money.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think you should spend any.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have taken that we should not construct more branches until we finish the main work. When existing contracts have been completed, I intend to stop toying with this project and go on and complete it. This year I intend to spend $150,000 on it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government come to a conclusion as to the best means for irrigating the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. I could understand the necessity for a canal where water had to be pumped in and out if after having it in the shape there would be any traffic. I know that vicinity and I know that there is very little water to be got to go into that canal. I would make a special appeal to the minister to stop spending money on a useless work like that. I am appealing to the minister as a business man on a business proposition even in the

face of the report of the chief engineer. If the minister would go there himself and look into the proposition and come back and tell us that he thinks it is feasible to keep that canal supplied with water, and that when completed there would be any business or traffic, I would be willing to put up some money. You should stop building this canal, it is a work which should not go on because there are so many necessary works all over the country that are not being gone on with. I am satisfied that the minister feels he should not go on with it, but something is compelling him to make the expenditure. I am sure that if he had his own way he would not do it.

Mr. EMMERSON. If the hon. member had been in Ottawa some years ago and had had the privilege, which was my privilege of listening to a very large and representative delegation from that section of the country, headed by Mr. Lennox, a member of the legislative assembly of Ontario, I am sure his faith in the Newmarket canal would have been strengthened, and he would have been convinced beyond all question that it was a work in the interest of Canada, as well as in the interest of that section of the country, that there was abundance of water, that traffic was there waiting only to be carried, and that unless this parliament acceded to the very reasonable request of these gentlemen, parliament would be doing an outrage on the people of that section and on the people of Ontario generally. I was impressed by the earnestness of the appeal made and the representation with respect to the project.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did not the minister make any investigation?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was a very thorough investigation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What amount of traffic was stated to be likely to go through the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot recall now, but it was a number of years ago, and I am speaking of the impression made on my mind as to that. It was said that this traffic would mean a traffic to the city of Toronto as well as the country near the canal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What class of goods was it expected would be carried?

Mr. GRAHAM. Very largely lumber and materials that were to be brought down from the central point there in Haliburton through Lake Simcoe, through the Kirkfield lock, and on towards Aurora, and thence carried to Toronto. It was said that the manufacturing interests of Toronto would be largely advantaged, and that the resources surrounding these interior lakes would be given life, and the people of that section of the country would reap the benefits which are denied them today by reason of the lack of transportation.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. Did you ever see the feeder where the water is to go through for the Newmarket portion?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never personally seen it.

Mr. WALLACE. Does he remember the first estimate that the deputation asked the government for?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not carry it in my memory.

Mr. WALLACE. That deputation did not ask the government to build a canal from Lake Simcoe to Newmarket, but for a small appropriation to deepen the Holland river from Lake Simcoe to Holland Landing. In former days boats used to go from Lake Simcoe to Holland Landing. The chief reason why the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice justified that canal was that a deputation came down from North York, and there happened to be three or four Conservatives among them. Well, if that circumstance is a sufficient reason for this government to spend $1,000,000 on that canal, I am not able to see it myself. The deputation asked for a small expenditure, and the premier said that because Mr. Lennox was on the deputation, who he supposed was a member of the local House, that justified him in spending a million dollars. But I would remind the committee that the deputation did not ask for any such thing, they only asked for about $100,000, just enough to deepen the canal. It was Sir William Mulock who brought that deputation down here; he invited a few of his friends to come down to Ottawa. You can get any number of people to come down here on a little trip like that.

Mr. BLAIN. That was his own county.

Mr. WALLACE. Sir William Mulock was the representative of North York at that time, and he got this deputation to come down here. It was a little pleasure jaunt for the purpose of seeing the capital. But that is the reason the government gave for spending a million dollars there. That is the minister's estimate here to-night, but I am sure that by the time they get through with it it will cost $2,000,000. Before that time there had not been a dollar spent on that canal, except in survey work, according to figures brought down by the Minister of Railways last year. I do not think it is fair to try to make the country believe that Mr. Lennox, because he happened to be the local Conservative member, would come down here and ask the government to spend $1,000,000 on a useless work like that. The ex-Minister of Railways says he

does not remember what the first cost of that was. But all they asked for was a small sum of money, which has now grown to $1,000,000, and will probably be $2,000,000 before they get through.

Mr. EMMERSON. I happened to be Minister of Railways at the time this delegation came. I cannot speak as to the politics of those gentlemen, but I remember that the delegation was headed by Mr. Lennox. I assumed that they came as business men, and not as politicians, and I did not treat with them as politicians, but as a representative delegation from that section of the country, coming here for the purpose of impressing upon the government the necessity of this work. I remember that they emphasized the fact, they claimed it to be a fact, that it would be a very easy matter to clear out the Holland river to Holland Landing, which they said was the old route to the Georgian bay, and they only required a comparatively small sum of money to build that portion of the work. But they laid stress upon the necessity of extending that work up from Holland Landing to the interior, to Newmarket.

Mr. GRAHAM. Clear through to Aurora.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that far. Now, I am sure this delegation were in earnest. Subsequently I had the matter inquired into by an engineer, one who was not connected with the department at that time, and he made a report with regard to the estimated cost, and the traffic as well. I cannot carry in my memory, of course, what the report was. It is true that the then Postmaster General, who represented that constituency, took a deep interest in the work, and he and the local representative in the Ontario legislature seemed to be united in an effort to secure the construction of this work for that section of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. member for Westmorland could tell us whether any estimate was made by the department in his time of the probable traffic that would be carried over this canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give any details, and I only speak from memory as to the importance of the traffic, and from their representations. They convinced me, at least, that a traffic would come from the section to which I have referred, from the lakes away up to the Haliburton country, and from the Black river, and from the Georgian bay. They represented that material would be brought from the shores of the Georgian bay through the Trent Valley canal to Lake Couchiching, and from Lake Couchiching to Lake Simcoe, thence into Aurora, and thence on to Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. GEO. GORDON. Then the hon. member himself is practically responsible for the canal being started?

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly am, and I take all the responsibility that belongs to me. There is one thing I am always ready to do, I am always disposed to lend a listening ear to the people, to gentlemen coming here on the part of the people, seeking the people's interest, and I have yet to be convinced that it was not in the interest of the people to begin that work.

Mr. HENDERSON. Year by year we are told by the government that this Newmarket canal was built in response to the request of a deputation that accompanied Sir William Mulock and Mr. Lennox, who at that time, or subsequentliy, became the local member for that county.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was at that time.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps the hon. member could tell us what year that was in, so that we may know whether he was the local member at that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. He was introduced to me as the local member for that constituency in the Ontario legislature.

Mr. HENDERSON. I infer from what the ex-Minister of Railways has said to-night. that the object of that deputation was not to get a grant of money to construct this canal. What these people wanted at that time was something different, a sum, as he has told us, for deepening the Holland river, which would be a small part of this canal, and would cost but very little money.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not wish my hon. friend to be under any misapprehension as to what I stated. I said that they had spoken of the deepening of the Holland river as far as Holland Landing as a work that would not be very expensive. They emphasized the fact that it would not cost very much to do that, but that the important work and that which they sought, urged and solicited was the extension of that canal to Newmarket and Aurora.

Mr. HENDERSON. What I have heard in the discussions in this House in reference to the whole matter was that the deputation did not have in their minds the extension of the work which the government is at the present time undertaking. I do not think it ever entered into the minds of the people who came down at that time that the work was to spread out into a section of country where no water could be found for canal purposes, where practically no traffic sufficient to warrant the expenditure could be obtained. I am still under the impression it was only the small part that the people at that time asked for, namely the deepening of the Holland river.

I do not think that the ex-minister will succeed in convincing this committee that the larger project was ever thought of by that deputation. I have never been able to accustom myself to the idea that that was the real intention, nor can I imagine that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was so extremely liberal, even to help the few Conservatives who accompanied that deputation, that he would at once jump into an expenditure that was going to amount anywhere from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. I do not think it ever entered into his mind that he was going to do that. I do not think he ever contemplated anything of the kind. I do not think that he ever asked this House for an initial appropriation that was going to spread out to such a large sum. I think we might as well drop the idea that when the matter was initiated in the first place by the deputation which came down from the northern part of the county of York, headed by Sir William Mulock and Mr. Lennox, the local member, they ever had in contemplation any such outrageous expenditure. The ex-minister, I think, must see by this time that he made a mistake in venturing on such a broad scheme with the limited information he had. I confess that this is the talk all over that part of the country. It is the wonder of the people who go to see the Newmarket canal. They laugh at the idea. It is simply a matter of ridicule and no one who looks at the work ever thinks of justifying the government in this annual expenditure that is going on. I would appeal to the minister, as other hon. members have done, just to drop this matter of the Newmarket canal. Enough money has been spent on it. I do not think the country will lose anything if we just sink what has been spent and pay no more attention to the undertaking. Now, I have one question to submit to the minister. He informed us a short time ago that the engineer had assured him of the possibility of securing water for the canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said the probability—the surety—not the possibility.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibility.

Mr. GRAHAM. No not the possibility.

Mr. HENDERSON. The absolute certainty?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that strong enough?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. That is his opinion.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no doubt that you can make anything absolutely certain if you spend enough money—almost anything; I will not say anything.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are some limitations.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not doubt that if the minister puts pumps at work some where about Lake Simcoe he can provide enough water to fill this canal. That would be an absolute certainty, but what I want to know is whether the engineer gave him any estimate as to the possible annual cost of keeping this canal filled, and, if so, what that estimate is. How much are we to vote year after year for the purpose of supplying water for this canal? Will it be $50,000; will it be $100,000? Would it not be cheaper for this government to hire ox teams and convey the traffic over this route along which it is expected to build this canal than to expend money for the purpose of supplying water for the canal? I would like to know if the minister has any estimate of what it will cost yearly to supply water?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot permit my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to take his seat without making one statement. I have made the statement that this delegation came here, that it did not come here as a political delegation, as far as I recognized it at least, and that it pressed upon the department and myself as representing the department the absolute necessity, in the interest of that section of the country, of not only deepening the water-way of the Holland river as far as Holland Landing, but of extending the canal to Newmarket and Aurora. I have made that statement in the presence of my hon. friend. If, personally he cannot believe it, under the rules of the House he is constrained to say that he must accept it. These are the facts. It is not a matter of any moment to me now. I am speaking of it as an occurrence that transpired. I have a very distinct recollection of the circumstances of the delegation. I was impressed, in the first place, by the size of the delegation. We are not accustomed to have, in our eastern country, very large delegations. They usually send two or three men as spokesmen on behalf of a section of country. There is a different custom pursued in Ontario. I remember being assailed by a good many delegations not assailed, but I had the honour of meeting a very large number—I remember, in connection with the Trent Valley water-ways. I had great faith in the advantage that is to accrue to Ontario in connection with the Trent Valley water-ways, and that faith was strengthened by a close study of the conditions in that section of the country and by going over the route. Now, in connection with that, I looked upon the extension of the water of Lake Simcoe, up through the Holland river and on to these other points, as a work that was incidental to the comple-

tion of the Trent Valley water-ways. If there is not that traffic for the canal, if there is not that wealth of resource that was represented, so much the worse for that section of the country, but it seems to me that if the Trent Valley water-way is of any advantage to the interior of Ontario, if it is any advantage to the city of Toronto, and to the cities, towns and industrial centres along the shores of Lake Ontario to secure the development of the resources in that region, surely as a preliminary condition it is necessary not only to complete the Trent Valley canal, but it is as well a necessity to extend this canal up through the Holland river and beyond.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure that there is very much difference between the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) and myself touching this question. What I said, or intended to say, was that the primary object of that deputation was to secure the deepening of the Holland river.

Mr. EMMERSON. That would be a necessary incident of the extension of the canal.

Mr. HENDERSON. I never understood that the deputation at that time contemplated the large expansion of work that has since been proposed. And I cannot think that the ex-Minister of Railways would have entertained the proposition at that time if he had thought that it was going to expand so as to call for an expenditure of a million or a million and a half. The ex-minister adheres to the point that he understood that their primary object was the deepening of the Holland river, but that they did make reference to the expansion of the work.

Mr. EMMERSON. That they pressed it.

Mr. HENDERSON. But I have always understood that what they were in search of was, mainly, money for the deepening of the Holland river, not that they expected the minister to extend the work all over the country and involving such vast expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. They only limited it to Newmarket and Aurora.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is a matter of memory; it is unwritten history; but the people in that section have the impression that the work, whether undertaken in response to that deputation or for any other reason, is a work that is absolutely useless, that it is unworthy the expenditure that the minister is asking to make upon it. I simply give my understanding of it. I am not going to dispute the ex-minister's memory in the matter. I take my information from general inferences and what I think to be reasonable conclusions. Now, I would like to know from the minister how much it is going to cost yearly to supply this canal with water.

Mr. GRAHAM. The county of York is a very advanced county, so I suppose that when the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) speaks of ox-teams, he speaks metaphorically. Water for this canal will be supplied as water is supplied for other canals, by storing water naturally flowing on the watershed. The engineer tells me that the location is excellent and that the construction of one or two dams will have the effect of maintaing a fair water supply. As to the traffic, if we had stopped to discuss the traffic along any part of the Trent canal, and be guided in our determination by the traffic in sight, we should never have constructed any part of that canal. The probability is that, had a similar test been applied, the Rideau canal would never have been built. Had the traffic in sight only been discussed, many railways would never have been constructed. Certainly, had the authorities of Ontario stopped to discuss the traffic in sight in the north country, there would have been no Toronto and Northern Ontario railway. The question of traffic is alwavs problematical, but these lines of transportation do seem to develop traffic for themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a rather comprehensive rule that the minister lays down—that in deciding upon the construction of a canal you do not need to consider either the cost or the traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But what the minister did say amounts to about that. Would he be good enough to say how much of this vote represents work on the Newmarket canal to be done during the coming year?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that we expect to spend $150,000.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON. This is a proposition that every person who goes near it knows is utterly unworthy of completion. I am sorry that the ex-Minister of Railwavs (Mr. Emmerson) has stated that he is practically responsible for it. He has told us that Mr. Lennox and others came down here and made certain representations. It seems to me that it was his duty at that time to find out more about this matter than he did. I do not like to say anything unkind at any time, but I cannot but feel that, if he was to be so easily imposed on as this, we need not be surprised that he lost his job. Anybody knows that, in order to get water into a canal, unless you depend upon the rain, you must have some

feeders. I would ask the ex-minister and the minister also what lake there is to feed this canal; and, if there is no lake, where can the water come from except by pumping it back from Lake Simcoe?

Mr. HENDERSON. And I would remind the minister (Mr. Graham) before he speaks that my question was: How much will it cost annually to provide the water for this canal? I am not asking simply how it is to be done. The minister used a great many words, beat about the bush, and told us about their plan to have reservoirs, and about the practicability of that plan; but he evaded the point as to how much it is going to cost. Are we going to get value for the money we are to spend?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have tried to make it clear to my hon. friend, but I am afraid he is bound that he will not understand. He suggested that I said that we would have to pump the water, and he wanted to know how much it would cost to get the pumps. I told him that the water for the Newmarket canal would be supplied in the same way as water for all canals where rivers are united, by a system of storage dams and reservoirs; and my engineer tells me that there is not the slightest doubt that there will be plenty of water if it is properly stored. That is on the word of one of the best engineers we have in the service in regard to hydraulics, and a most reliable man, and I think his assurance is worth more than my private opinion or that of any one else on that point.

Mr. EMMERSON. An engineer, Mr. Walsh, made a report before this work started, as to the ample water facilities for the canal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems as if the minister has gone to Germany to gather information to enable him to come back and spend more money on the Newmarket canal. I would like to ask him whether, in sending his engineer to investigate the water supply of the canal, he instructed him also to investigate the amount of traffic that would likely be on that canal after it was completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have made the statement in a general way as to the traffic. I did not send an engineer to report on the canal. The engineer to whom I refer was the resident engineer of the Trent canal system, who has had charge of all the dams and reservoirs which have been constructed, and he says that with storage provided there will be ample water for the Newmarket canal. He has made no mistake on any other part of the Trent canal system with regard to storage, and I have not the slightest doubt that he is perfectly correct as to this.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The present statement of the minister is most indefinite and unsatisfactory, and must bring us to the conclusion that we should vote directly against this amount of money being passed at the present time. If the minister will go into that country and investigate for himself, I am sure that he will come to the conclusion which I came to long ago. I was born within 30 miles of Newmarket, and know that country thoroughly, and there is no way possible to get water for that canal except to build large dams and reservoirs to hold the water, or else to pump the water up. And when the canal is built, how much traffic will it get from that district? The ex-Minister of Railways told us it was a timbered country. If he went there, he would find that it is the very opposite. I plead with the minister, that before he spends another million dollars on this useless work, which will have no traffic worth speaking of and little or no water, he should make use of the money in another direction. It was only last fall that I had the opportunity of looking at the canal that was being built, and I cannot too strongly condemn the expenditure of such a large amount of money for such a useless purpose.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think it must be evident to every man of this committee that this project was undertaken without going carefully into the matter and obtaining such information as would warrant an undertaking of this kind. There does not appear to be any person here ready to defend it. We can hardly dignify with the name of defence the statements put forward by the minister this evening. I would suggest to the minister that instead of asking the House to vote this money for this purpose, he take a portion of it and expend it on a canal that will give tangible results, namely, the Wolfe Island canal. Let him deepen that canal, which will shorten the distance between Kingston and Cape Vincent by between 15 and 20 miles; and I can assure him that he will have any amount of water for that canal, as long as Lake Ontario remains as it is.

Mr. WRIGHT. I wish again to enter my vigorous protest against this expenditure on the Newmarket canal. The minister has associated this work in some manner with the Trent Valley canal system. It does not seem to me to be the part of wisdom to open up doubtful tributaries for the Trent canal when you have no outlet for that canal at either end. In building a railway, you build the main line before the branches; and it seems to me that the same principle should apply to a canal. The first thing to do with the Trent Valley canal, if it is ever to be made effective, is to complete it through to the Georgian bay. In that way it might be made of some benefit to the

people of Canada, in affording an outlet for the grain delivered at Midland and other ports on Georgian bay. With regard to the deputation that came to the ex-minister, as the name of Mr. Lennox, the local member, has been mentioned in connection with it, I want to say that I interviewed him with regard to this matter not many months ago, and he emphatically informed me that when that deputation was arranged for, and he was invited to join it, it was only intended to ask the government to deepen the Holland river. The building of the Newmarket canal was an after consideration and no part of the original scheme; and if some members of the deputation undertook to enlarge it when they came here, they got up the deputation under false pretenses, and got men to come down in support of a scheme that was not placed fully before them before they left home. A great deal has been said with regard to the water supply of this canal; but no water will be needed, because no vessels will ply up or down that canal. It will do as well dry as wet. So I do not see that we need trouble ourselves with the question of water for the Newmarket canal. They may cut it up and make pig pens out of it for the farmers when completed, but otherwise I do not think it will be of any value to the people. However I do not want to bother about that phase of the question. The minister ought first to open up the Trent Valley canal, and then, if he has money to waste, take up the Newmarket canal.

Mr. WALLACE. I beg to move that item 113 be reduced by $150,000.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. minister if, during his many visits to Toronto since he has become a minister, and in view of his statement that it is his policy to visit our public works from time to time, which are under the control of his department, he has gone over this work himself and satisfied himself that it is a proper and wise expenditure of public money. He knows that there has been a great deal of vigorous criticism against this enormous expenditure, and I should have expected that he would have visited this work and found out for himself whether it was a proper expenditure or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have seen the work, but I did not visit it for the purpose of investigation, because any information I could give would be based absolutely on the advice of experts whom we pay for that purpose.

Mr. WRIGHT. How much of that total vote will be spent on the western outlet of the valley of Georgian bay?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have already explained that nothing will be spent on that western section outside of the cost of survey. We expect to let two sections at the eastern end. We want to have connection between Lake Simcoe and Lake Ontario, and later we shall go on with the other section.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has already been expended on this Trent Valley canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. $6,514,787.84. Of this amount $309,371.31 was spent prior to confederation.

Mr. BLAIN. What may we expect the total expenditure to be when completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not in a position to give that because one very important section west of Lake Simcoe we have not estimated on yet. Approximately speaking about $3,500,000 to $4,000,000 without the western extension.

Trent canal—to pay damages to property by flooding, $30,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have spent about $100,000 now on claims for damages to land caused by the flooding of the reservoirs where we store the water. Claims are coming in as the work goes on, and I am asking for $30,000 more. The settlement is made by valuators.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the claims likely to continue every year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, until we get the work done.

Welland canal—land purchases and damages, $2,500.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no one in the House from that section of country through which the Welland canal runs, and I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press these items through to-night. Why not wait until the beginning of the week when the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) will be here? I am sure the minister would appreciate their assistance.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the last day my deputy will be with me. He has information about all these items; notice was given that I would go on with my supply to-day, and I would like to finish it if possible. I will leave an item over or anything that can be discussed on motion for supply.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought that the deputy's expert knowledge applied more particularly to railway matters. As to the offer to hold over an item, my experience is that when items are passed in this way they are never heard of again. However, I have done my duty in making the request for delay.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why is $66,000 being expended on the Port Colborne elevator

when he is contemplating a new Welland canal and the abandoning of the elevator. Only a small part of its capacity is being used?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for work that has been done on the elevator, extras over and above the contract. The contract has been let to Messrs. Hogan and McDonald, the lowest tenderers. The amount of work done there up to the present time under these tenders is $1,193,475. This is expected to complete the work during the coming season.

Mr. STAPLES. As this is a government-owned and operated transfer elevator, I wish the minister would give, for the advantage of the House and the grain producers of the west who have been pressing for government ownership of all terminal elevators, a statement of how this elevator is operated, how many officials are employed and any other particulars.

Mr. GRAHAM. The staff of the Port Colborne elevator is:

Name.	Capacity.	Rate.
J. A. Jamieson, supt. engineer (per month)		$416 66
W. F. Fawcett, superintendent		150 00
D. S. Harvie, foreman		125 00
Chas. Aston, weighmaster		100 00
Wills Maclachlan, electrician		100 00
John Glen, mechanic		75 00
Jos. Hanhan, mechanic		75 00
Jesse Lambert, mechanic		65 00
Robert Blackhall, mechanic		65 00
D. I. Robins, mechanic		55 00
James Roach, mechanic		55 00
Charles Augustine, oiler		60 00
Thomas Heffron, watchman		50 00
Frank Wilson, shovel foreman (per day)		3 00

The result of the operation from a money standpoint has not been a success directly. It is a question in my mind whether it will not take a good many years to get the trade in a government-owned elevator of this kind, because all the other interests will do their best to keep grain away from a government elevator if they can go somewhere else. I am informed that having that elevator there this year with all the facilities for transferring cargoes has kept down the rates from the west to the east.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the rate per bushel?

Mr. GRAHAM. One half cent. Last year we experienced with three-eighths of a cent, but this year we charge one-half.

Mr. STAPLES. Has it been able to pay interest on the money invested?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no, we have not been able to pay running expenses, handling one and a half million bushels did not pay the expenses.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would suggest that the way to get out of the difficulty mentioned by the minister would be for the government to take over all the elevators as the farmers ask.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost of the elevator to-day?

Mr. GRAHAM. Approximately, three quarters of a million dollars, perhaps a little less. Including this $700,000 we are asking for.

Welland canal—to straighten channel at head of lock 2, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer reports that there is a sharp curve going into this lock, and we must straighten it for large vessels. It is lock No. 2, from the Port Dalhousie end. Vessels are getting larger all the time.

Extending Chambly Canton wharf, $4,120.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are repairing old wooden bridges and culverts. We have not got our tenders in yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman explain how the advertisements reach the public for those tenders?

Mr. GRAHAM. By newspaper advertisements. They are placed largely in sections of country where we hope contractors will see them.

Mr. BLAIN. Have you any patronage list?

Mr. GRAHAM. I never saw the list; I do not know what papers get the advertisements.

Quebec canals—macadamizing two miles of public road, Hungry bay dyke, $14,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it customary for the government to build macadamized roads for the people?

Mr. GRAHAM. Where the government is responsible for destroying them. We raise a dyke, and it keeps the water off. Where the department damages a road, we leave it in as good a shape as we found it.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. $7,000 a mile would build an electric road.

Mr. GRAHAM. The road is on the top of the dyke. It is not like an ordinary macadamized road. There are six miles and a half altogether, the total cost of which it is estimated will be $32,500.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How many yards?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not a question of macadamizing the road, it is raising the road high enough to get it away from the water, and then making a substantial road on top.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. We would like to know the cost per yard.

Mr. GRAHAM. An hon. friend behind me says it was $1.95 for rock. The balance is done by day work. The stone work was done by contract to the lowest tenderer.

Protection wall, north side of Lake St. Francis, $4,500.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What is that for?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to raise the old wall above the new flood level on the north side of Lake St. Francis. We had a higher flood a couple of years ago than we had had in a good many years.

Cornwall canal—extension of concrete wall across washout above lock 18, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to strengthen the weak places in the wall. We have had one break there and we want to strengthen the wall as much as possible.

Improving upper entrance to lock 17, $55,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no place at the lock where boats can tie up. This is a very difficult place to get into, and as we had a request from the vessel men with respect to this matter we have decided, for safety, and because we are convinced of the necessity of this work, to improve this upper entrance. The estimate is $55,000. We expect to do the work this year. Tenders have not been asked for, but they will be advertised.

Improving upper entrance, lock 19, $5,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is there such a discrepancy between the two amounts?

Mr. GRAHAM. One is a very large improvement while the other does not call for so much work.

Removing high spots from prism of canal, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to clean up the bottom of the canal. After a canal has been constructed for a few years it is found that there are high spots where the boats strike.

To repair north bank between locks 18 and 19, $5,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this where the break occurred a few years ago?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is below it a little. Now let us go back to the item under the heading of Quebec canals:

Macadamizing two miles of public road, Hungry Bay dyke, $14,000.

My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) asked for some information in regard to that item. First there is crib work filled with stone up to top of loose course, 4,500 cubic yards and, second, stones piled on top of crib work 1,630 cubic yards.

Mr. HENDERSON. What do you pay per cubic yard?

Mr. GRAHAM. For cribwork filled with stone up to top of loose course $2.15.

Mr. HENDERSON. What kind of stone is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Boulders.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not crushed stone?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. For stones piled on top of cribwork 85 cents.

Galops canal concrete superstructure for piers, lock 27, $24,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We took an appropriation of $40,000 for this, but we cut it down to $30,000. I think that is the amount that it will take to do this work. We are asking for $24,000 now and $14,000 of it is a revote. The work will cost about $30,000 instead of $40,000.

Mr. SEXSMITH. That is for the superstructure?

Mr. GRAHAM. The piers are all right but there is a wooden structure on these piers and it is in very bad shape.

Mr. SEXSMITH. You are making the superstructure of concrete?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is the substructure wood?

Mr. GRAHAM. Wooden cribs filled with stone.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—iron mooring posts, $2,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are getting rid of the wooden posts and putting in iron and concrete for snubbing posts.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. This is on account of that accident, I suppose?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know, but we are doing it as wood is not safe and it rots away.

Mr. SEXSMITH. How many mooring posts will that cover?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the number here. The lock is about 900 feet long.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. While we are on this item will the minister give the committee some information as to what consideration has been given to the question of building another lock at the Sault before all water and power are taken by the locks on the other side? I saw an item in the papers and I think there was a statement made by the minister that we were going to have another lock on the Canadian side. The lock on the Canadian side is getting very busy.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a pretty large question. I made a statement the other

day. We have received quite a number of petitions from shipping men in reference to it. They think we ought to have another lock on the Canadian side. There are so many large things looming up all at once that I have hard work to form a decision. I have not brought it before my colleagues in a definite shape yet. We have a construction engineer at the Soo, and I have asked him, as soon as he can find time when he is not really busy, to get into shape an estimate of what the lock will cost. The chief engineer, though he has not the information at all complete before him, thinks that a new lock such as we ought to have—with a depth from 25 to 27 feet and built to carry large vessels—will cost close upon $10,000,000. We have not done anything in the matter. We have received a petition in favour of building such a lock

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. How will that compare with the cost of the present lock?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is considerably greater, but I cannot give exact figures. It will be both wider and deeper than the present lock. And besides everything costs more now than it did when the present lock was built.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I understand that the minister was there when an accident took place last summer?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was his attention called to the fact that they let the ships into the lock with a good deal of water, the 'wash' as they call it? I see this item speaks of 'iron mooring posts.' It would be impossible to carry on this practice, as I understand, without iron mooring posts. Is it the intention of the government to stop this practice?—for, I am told, if it is allowed to continue, some day two or three of these large vessels will go right down through the canal gates.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer tells me that it is practically impossible to carry through these very large boats if this is not done. They are getting a trifle beyond the present standard in their draught. Of course, the difficulty would be obviated if we had the new lock.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I sincerely hope the minister will consider it. Of course, $10,000,000 must appear a very large sum to us on this side. But in proportion to the hundreds of millions we are spending on other things, it is not a very large item. The large locks on the Canadian and American sides were each out of commission this year. Had both been out of commisison at the same time, the traffic between the east and the west would have been tied up. As I understand it, our lock is the favourite lock. But the Americans are considering the construction of a third lock.

Trent canal—improvements, $62,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the ordinary annual vote. Among the works proposed to be done out of this vote are: New concrete dam on White lake, new concrete dam on Devil's lake, and another on Jack's lake, dredging Lake Simcoe, Balsam lake division, dredging Cameron lake, dredging Sturgeon lake, Bobcaygeon and Lindsay river, dredging Peterborough and Lakefield section, dredging Otonabee river, new dredge, rip-rapping Balsam lake, Lake Simcoe division, duplicate lock gates and installation of electric lighting at hydraulic lift locks. These are the main items, and the work will be carried on by our own staff.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. My hon. colleague from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is not present. And it may be the minister has not been asked an explanation of the work intended to be done on this canal between Lake Simcoe and Georgian bay. If there is another item, either in these estimates or in the supplementary estimates on which that matter can be discussed, we do not need to go into it now. Otherwise, I would like to get the information.

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer is having his report completed on the Severn route and the Nottawasaga route. My hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) can come to the department and see what he is proposing. As soon as the report is completed, it will be laid before the House.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was it the same engineer who made the estimate on these who made the original estimate on the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. SEXSMITH. How many are there on the permanent staff in the Peterborough-Lakefield division?

Mr. GRAHAM. That will come up under the revenue items. I am not sure that the division are kept absolutely separate. And, of course, the employees are not the same in winter as in summer, though some remain all winter.

Mr. WRIGHT. As the minister has adverted to the western outlet, I would like to ask if the Severn route has been surveyed all the way down and if a report is on file?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have just stated that the engineer is completing a report. He will make two different reports of the two different routes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to challenge the standing of the engineer who made the report, but, as the minister was so misled with reference to the Newmarket canal, I think it would be advisable for

him to have these figures checked up by some other member of the staff, as, for instance, Mr. Riley, who appears to be able to come within a few dollars of the value of work to be done.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any estimate of these routes, before anything is done, will be reviewed by Mr. Grant, the engineer of the Trent, whom I will make responsible for all the figures.

Miscellaneous — arbitrations and awards, $4,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We take this vote every year, and if there are arbitrations, the expenses are thus provided for. This year, I am glad to say, we did not spend anything out of this appropriation.

Attendance, repairs and alterations to Governor General's cars, $2,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a vote we take each year. Last year the expenditure under this head was $646.40.

Maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada, $121,400.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason of the increase?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are several reasons. The staff is a little larger. The chairman has established an operating branch, with a practical operating man at its head, for the settlement of disputes between railways in regard to operation. The staff being larger, the travelling expenses are necessarily greater in addition to the salaries.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there not a vacancy on the commission, and is there a possibility of that being filled in the near future? Are there no applications?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are a good many recommendations for a new man. He must be a man from the west. Several men have been recommended, but we have not yet made the appointment. I have discussed it several times with the chairman of the commission. He tells me that the work is not suffering—that it is up to date. He has a great avarice for work himself, and up to the present there has been no urgent need. If I come across the right man, I want to appoint him.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not wish to find any fault with the chairman of the board. We all know that he is a hard working man, and does his work well; but the public suffer a good deal of inconvenience, I think, for the lack of more members on the board. I have known of men having to wait four days at considerable expense, either with a solicitor or without one, for a case to be dealt with. When the board was enlarged, it was intended that it could sit in two sections. That would certainly be a great advantage, and if matters were so arranged that only sufficient business to last for one day, or for two days at the outside, were brought before the board at one time, I am convinced that it would receive the approval of the public. I myself have sat for four days waiting for a case to be tried. I do not wish to differ with the chairman, but it seems to me that the country is losing money by not making up the full complement of the board.

Mr. BLAIN. This vacancy is, I suppose, that caused by the death of the Hon. Mr. Greenway. The minister states that as soon as he gets his eye on the right man, he will appoint him. Are we to understand that not one of the gentlemen from the west who have been applying, is the right man?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not appointed any.

Mr. BLAIN. It is rumored that there are some from the west now here waiting for the appointment. Perhaps my hon. friend has not got his eye on them yet.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not seen them.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister will tell us what qualifications are required for a position of this kind. Perhaps we could assist him in getting the right person.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I will get along with it. While there are many qualifications required, the chief one is good horse sense.

Mr. ROCHE. If that is the case, I should imagine that a farmer would be the right man. I understand that the grain growers of the west, to the number of hundreds, possibly thousands, have petitioned the government to appoint a certain gentleman to the position. I do not know whether it is the minister's modesty that prevents him appointing this gentleman, inasmuch as he bears the same name as himself, and is a distant relative. At all events, the grain growers have asked to be represented by one of their number on the board. I would make a plea for the farmers of the west, whose interests are so frequently involved in cases that come before the board, and I think that a man resident in western Canada and acquainted with western conditions should be appointed. If the chairman of the commission says that there is no necessity for the appointment at present, I do not wish to urge it; but if the minister means to appoint any one, I think the farming interests of the west should be represented.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Marquette should not forget that a resolution was moved in the House calling on the government to appoint a farmer, and our hon. friends opposite voted it down. Are we to understand that they have changed their

minds, and now intend to appoint a farmer?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is hardly fair. We did not vote it down. An amendment was moved that the vacancy should be filled by a man having a knowledge of railway conditions in the west. The original motion was to appoint a farmer. We changed that because we did not want to confine the appointment to one particular class, but to be enabled to get a good man from any class.

Mr. BLAIN. The resolution from this side asked for the appointment of a farmer. My hon. friend differed from that and had an amendment moved from his side of the House, and the first resolution was voted down. The first resolution was to the effect that as a farmer occupied the position, Mr. Greenway, the government ought to put a prominent farmer from the west in his place; and to assist the government, this side of the House moved the resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM. Are you sure that was the reason?

Mr. BLAIN. Well, the government had been making such professions on behalf of the farmers throughout the west that we thought we would point out that, so far as our side was concerned, we were favourable to the farmers. But my hon. friend differed from us and had the motion amended. When may we expect the appointment to be made?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to name the day. I have my own views as to the work of the commission. My opinion is that we ought to have a man from the west, and when the vacancy is filled, it will be by a western man.

Mr. BLAIN. Will he be a farmer?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not necessarily, but we will take a good man, no matter what his calling may be. I have had very prominent farmers there recommending a professional man, and giving reasons why it would not be wise to appoint a farmer.

Mr. ROCHE. Perhaps the minister is waiting for the photograph of the Calgary applicant.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Minister of Agriculture tell us whether he has urged on the Minister of Railways the necessity of appointing a farmer or whether he intends doing so?

Mr. FISHER. I voted for the resolution that passed the House.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Agriculture recorded his vote against the farmer.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. He voted for the amendment of the government.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. And the original resolution was that the government should appoint a farmer. That did not suit the Minister of Agriculture. He said we must not bind ourselves to appointing a farmer and he voted to enable the government to appoint another man. He will not say that, in that respect, he was very enthusiastic for the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. I am always enthusiastic for the farmers.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The Minister of Agriculture was out west last summer among the farmers and he must have handpicked a number of them and selected one he could recommend to his colleagues. I am surprised that the Minister of Railways should still adhere to the position taken by that side, that the new commissioner must not be a farmer.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not take that position.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And unfortunately a relative of the minister seems to be a favourite in the west for the position, and the minister is blocked from appointing him by last session's resolution.

Mr. HERRON. I think that professional men are well represented on the Board of Railway Commissioners, and that it is due to the farmers that they should have a representative on that board. I do not think that the minister could do better than appoint a farmer thoroughly acquainted with the conditions out west, and I would strongly urge him to do so.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I wish to press the view of my hon. friend who has just sat down. I think the board is well filled with professional men, and there is no class of people who do more for the country than the farmers. They are well entitled to representation on the board, and I am satisfied that the minister can find many able farmers in the west who could fill the vacancy very successfully.

Mr. BLAIN. I think we are entitled to some expression of opinion from the Minister of Agriculture. He will no doubt be going around the country next summer saying that this matter was not drawn to his attention. We wish to give him the opportunity of saying whether he still believes a farmer should be appointed. Has he made any recommendations to the minister on behalf of any farmer for that position?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. There are so few positions to which farmers can be appointed that I think we should leave them this one. Everything else in the service is blocked out for professional men, so that when a farmer makes application he is met with the statement you are not a graduate of any university and you have not professional training, &c. I really think that, in all fairness, as a matter of justice to the farming community, especially in the west, who have such vital interests at stake, the minister should be frank enough to tell the House that, all other conditions being equal, a farmer will be given the preference for this position.

Remuneration to government directors, Grand Trunk Pacific, $2,000.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would like to ask a question. Are the officials of the Railway Commission allowed transportation under the Railway Act like members of parliament? It is vitally important they should be, if not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they are provided for in some way. I know they do get transportation. I will look into that. I think they are included in the class that the statute provides the railway shall carry free.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. The reason I ask is that it is rumored that such is not the case, and it would be very unfortunate if it were not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall make a note of it. I see the distinction.

To pay expenses in connection with cases before the Railway Commission, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We spent last year $5,470.77. We have cases come up in which the department is interested, and we sometimes initiate cases on behalf of the government. Take, for instance, the express investigation.

Railways and canals—collection of revenue —canals—statistical officers, $37,506.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I hope the minister will look up some of the statistical records. He will find they are borrowed mostly from American publications.

Mr. GRAHAM. We get all our own original returns and abstract the American returns as well.

Mr. WRIGHT. How many officers are permanently employed?

Mr. GRAHAM. On the canals, all told, about 3,000. This is paid to certain officers for collecting statistics in addition to their regular salary.

Mr. FISHER.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk is not sure whether the item for the Quebec bridge was passed or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. The item for the Transcontinental railway remains over and any other items may be discussed on it. We kept it open with the distinct understanding that anything else could be discussed on it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood from the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that the items for the Intercolonial railway and Quebec bridge were to stand over. I do not wish to commit myself for the member for Hamilton in any way if these items are allowed to pass.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have gone through the Intercolonial for two or three hours, and if we left it stand now fifty hon. members may discuss it. I may have to bring back my staff and the whole matter be gone into again.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I would suggest that on the understanding the minister leaves an item over in order that discussion may take place on any point in his estimates if any member wishes to discuss any of these items. It would be only fair on account of the deputy minister being about to leave the department, that the member should give notice to the minister of what questions he wanted answered so that the rest of the staff could get the answer. It would simplify matters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) told me that the Intercolonial railway would stand over and also the Quebec bridge. The Transcontinental railway item was not touched at all. He said, however, that in dealing with these items it would not be expected that discussion would be raised that would require the presence of the deputy. They were not to go into details although there might be some broad matters on which discussion could take place.

Mr. GRAHAM. Suppose we leave the Transcontinental, and any discussion that any hon. gentleman wants to take up on any other item of my estimates can be fully discussed on the one item of the Transcontinental. We will have a full understanding that they can discuss anything they like.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. And any information about any other item on notice?

Mr. GRAHAM. On notice I shall be glad to give any information.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller). The Quebec bridge is passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Let the member for Hamilton and the minister settle that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Pass them and if the member for Hamilton wants them re-opened I will be perfectly willing to re-open them.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the debate on the Naval Bill will be resumed on Tuesday?

Mr. FIELDING. On Tuesday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 7, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved:

That the second report of the Marine and Fisheries Committee be now concurred in.

He said: This report recommends that 4,000 copies of the evidence taken last summer by Commander Wakeham, in connection with the lobster industry, be printed for distribution.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS. In reference to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Committee, I wish to ask the government a question; and in this connection I wish to call the attention of the hon. minister in charge of the Marine Department to the recent saving of life off Cape Hatteras which was reported in the daily papers.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not relevant to the question before the Chair.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Merchants' Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—Mr. McCarthy.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Immigration Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. LEWIS. The first section directs that immigrants when they land in this country shall be examined for weapons which the citizens of Canada are not allowed to carry, and that each immigrant shall be furnished with a printed document in his own language explaining to him, as shall also be done viva voce, that he shall not be allowed to carry such weapons. The first thing an immigrant after landing sees displayed in the windows of the second-hand stores of the port, are rows of revolvers, dirks, knives, and other weapons which ordinary Canadians are not permitted to use; and consequently he imagines that in this to him wild western country it is necessary for him to be armed with some of these weapons. The second section is an addition to the Bill I brought in before, and is in the line of the few remarks I made in the debate on the address at the beginning of this session, as to the class of immigrants that should be allowed to land in this country; and it reads as follows:

From and after the first day of January, 1911, natives of Europe south of 44 degrees north latitude and east of 20 degrees east longitude, and natives of Turkey in Asia, shall be prohibited from entering in and settling in Canada.

I contend that this country should in this respect take warning by the example of that great country to the south of us. Originally the slavery question was a very heavy and dark looking question to the citizens of the United States; but that question is overshadowed by another serious menace in the immigration of people from Southern Europe. Reports state that the average citizen of the United States is deteriorating physically, mentally and morally, of course on the average taking in all foreigners. Sir, we do not want immigrants to come here to hew our wood, draw our water, plough our fields and dig our coal alone. We want them to be one with the happy, free and independent citizens of Canada in forming a nation; and I contend that the only way to do this is to keep out all people except those of western Europe who have the same hereditary as ourselves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PARTY PATRONAGE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he has inquired with reference to the return which was ordered by the House some time ago for papers relating to the alleged securing of distribution of patronage.

Mr. GRAHAM. I expect to have it in a day or two. I have wired for all the information.

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE.

Mr. A. HAGGART. I wish to put a question to the Postmaster General with re-

gard to the post office in Winnipeg, the outer door of which has been closed. The latch string has hung on the outside for 20 years, and it has been a great convenience for the people to get their mail on going to and coming from church on Sunday. It is announced by a Winnipeg newspaper that it was closed yesterday for the first time, and remains closed. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if that is the case, and if it is the intention to keep it closed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I received a telegram the other day from some Winnipeg gentlemen protesting against the change that has taken place. I must say that it is a regulation which is in force in all the large cities in the west, and is done at the request of various religious organizations.

Mr. A. HAGGART. The Winnipeg post office has been closed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed it has.

Mr. A. HAGGART. Is it the intention of the government to keep it closed in spite of the protest of the people?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The matter is under consideration just now.

Mr. A. HAGGART. But in the meantime it is closed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is closed on Sunday.

Mr. A. HAGGART. How long will the department keep the matter under consideration? This is a serious matter because it is the centre of a large commercial population. People who go to Winnipeg on Sundays——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the question at this stage.

Mr. A. HAGGART. I am not discussing it, but I would like to get a more definite answer from the minister.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Mr. LEWIS. Representing, as I do, one of the largest upper lake ports in Canada, and being greatly interested in the traffic of the port of Montreal and the channels of the St. Lawrence river——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can only put a question at this stage.

Mr. LEWIS. I want to ask the government whether——

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be an urgent question, or one referring to the business of the House. At this stage, only questions of urgency are allowed, or those relating to the business of the House. Of other questions notice must be given, in order that the minister may be prepared to answer.

Mr. LEWIS. In the papers last Saturday there appeared an account of saving through wireless telegraphy of a great loss of life off Cape Hatteras, and I would ask the government if they will now take means to protect our great trade route, the channel of the St. Lawrence, and other great routes. It seems to me very important that we should put on shore wireless telegraphy stations, because it will be very much against the interest of Canada for loss to occur.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is our intention to protect the trade route of Canada by means of the telegraph, and a navy also.

THE DAUPHIN POST OFFICE.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The closing of this post office at Winnipeg reminds me of a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the rules of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask a question of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have warned the House under the rules what questions can be put at this stage.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Am I not in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman knows the rules of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask the Postmaster General with regard to the opening of the post office in Dauphin. The building has been completed, and when is the office going to be opened?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the office has been completed, it should be opened very shortly. Is my hon. friend informed that the building is completed?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand so.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If it is, it will be opened immediately.

DRY DOCK AT PORT ARTHUR.

Mr. BOYCE. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect the return of the papers concerning the application of a western delegation of shipbuilders for a dry dock, that is the application for a bonus or a subsidy for a dry dock at Port Arthur. The order of the House was issued about the 25th of November.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The return with regard to the Sault Ste. Marie dry dock has been

brought down. I will inquire as to the other, I hope to have it within a few days.

THE MARKHAM POST OFFICE.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when he expects to hand the Markham post office over to the department. I understand it has been finished about eight months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is my hon. friend aware that the fittings are all in yet?

Mr. WALLACE. I am aware that it has been finished eight months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into the matter. Of course, the building is not finished until the fittings are all in.

THE LACHUTE POST OFFICE.

Mr. PERLEY. I wish to ask the minister with reference to the post office at Lachute. It has been completed for several weeks, the fittings are all in, and the whole building was ready for use a month ago. When is it intended to use it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be much more convenient if questions of this character were put on the notice paper, in order that we may have time to obtain the information from the department. But I will have that looked into.

MAIL SERVICE IN SYDNEY.

Mr. MADDIN. I desire to ask the Postmaster General when we may expect a return to the motion for all the papers, correspondence and documents in connection with the free mail delivery service in Sydney, the order for which was granted by this House on the 6th of December, last.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take note of my hon. friend's question. I think we have to get the consent of the Secretary of State.

IMPROVED PAPER MACHINERY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 67) respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—Mr. Worthington.

On section 1,

Power to Commissioner of Patents to receive fee and extend duration of patent.

Mr. CARVELL. Unfortunately I was not present when the Bill was before the Committee on Private Bills. May I, therefore, ask the hon. member who has charge of this Bill (Mr. Worthington) to explain the reasons for asking for this legislation. Perhaps I may be permitted to say, we have a great many applications to parliament in recent years to renew patents which have become void for one reason or another. A Bill was passed a short time ago concerning a case in which the trouble, I am told, arose from the fact that, though the amount necessary for the renewal had been sent to the bank of Montreal, yet, through the mistake of a clerk, it was not forwarded to the patent office. In such a case, it is only reasonable, perhaps, that the patent should be renewed. What I particularly would like to know, in the present case, is whether the patentee commenced manufacturing within two years, and otherwise complied with the patent law. And, was the difficulty simply an omission to pay the fee within the time—which, I understand, expired on January 26, 1909—or is this a case in which a patent has become void, making this a Bill merely to give back rights which the patentee has forfeited through his own negligence to comply with the law?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This Bill was before the Committee on Private Bills at its last meeting and was accepted by the committee with the concurrence of the Minister of Agriculture. This was an exceptional case in which the holder of the patent was not responsible for the lapse of the patent.

Mr. EMMERSON. What were the circumstances?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. This is a very large company which has a solicitor employed especially for the purpose of keeping these patents in force. Through the negligence of this solicitor, one patent was allowed to lapse—it was misplaced. The solicitor recognized that the fault was his own, and offered to compensate the company. The company has built a large plant at Sherbrooke—it is one of Sherbrooke's largest industries—and is now prepared to manufacture this improved paper machinery, in fact has begun to do it.

Mr. CARVELL. Did they begin the manufacture within two years from the granting of their patent?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. In Canada?

Mr. WORTHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If this has passed under the cognizance of the Minister of Agriculture, I think that is the main thing.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. The Minister of Agriculture took the case into consideration and decided that it was an exceptional case in which the company was not to blame, and for that reason the Bill should be allowed to pass, with the understanding that a proviso at the end of the Bill should be withdrawn.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

L'INSTITUT DE NOTRE DAME DES MISSIONS.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 80) to incorporate L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions.—Mr. W. M. Martin.

On section 7, subsection 2, as amended:

The annual value of the real estate held in Canada by or in trust for the corporation shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that mean—'the annual value of the real estate?' Will the hon. member who has charge of the Bill please explain?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. In the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills it was pointed out that the power to hold real estate to the value of only $50,000 was very little in the case of a corporation such as this. Especially is this the case when you consider the relative values of real estate in western Canada and in eastern Canada. The object of the amendment in this case, as I understand it, is to allow the corporation to hold property which will produce an annual revenue of $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be a pretty large estate.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. When it is considered that this corporation, or voluntary society, at the present time holds real estate in something like eleven different places in the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, it will be seen that it does not need to hold much in each place to make a total holding of $50,000 annually. And, from my own personal knowledge of this society, I can say that it will not take very many holdings such as they have at the present time to make a total value of three or four hundred thousand annually.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. An annual value of $50,000 represents about $1,250,000 capital value.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. Money in the west is worth 7 per cent if not 8 per cent, and if you figure it on that basis it only makes about $700,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a land company, is it?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. In order to carry out the purposes for which they are incorporated it is necessary for them to hold land. I know they have acquired land in Regina, worth many thousand dollars and they have lately let a contract in that city for the building of a convent which will cost probably $50,000 or $60,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Under what charter have they been conducting their business in the other western provinces?

Mr. WORTHINGTON.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I am informed they have a charter in Manitoba which was granted about 1882 and under which they have been operating up to the present time. They have no charter in Alberta or Saskatchewan, and it is the intention to operate under the proposed new charter in all the western provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. Why should it not come under the provincial government?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. They would have to have three or four different charters.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as the control of education belongs to the different provinces, should not this charter be obtained from the provincial government? I ask the Prime Minister what the rule is?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not looked into the Bill and I am not prepared to express an opinion on it. It is private legislation.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the question of provincial rights brought up in the committee? Would it not be better in matters of this kind that are purely within the jurisdiction of the provinces, that the local legislatures should deal with them? As I understand, the Bill simply asks authority to do business in the new provinces, not in any other part of Canada, and if that be the case why should they not obtain a charter from the provincial legislature?

Mr. HUGHES. All these institutions are after government grants for education; they will naturally be under the control of the provinces in relation to education; they should be inspected by provincial inspectors, they are subject to provincial laws in relation to provisions for safety, &c., and if we grant charters to institutions of this kind, we are trespassing on the rights of the provinces in these matters. The whole control of matters relating to education should be left in the hands of the provinces as it is a provincial matter relating to the education of the youth of the country. I think the Bill has no place in this parliament.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. This is clearly an interprovincial Bill. This corporation, as it will be, is not asking anything more from this parliament than any railway corporation does when it asks for the privilege of building lines connecting two or three provinces. We cannot be expected to go into every province in the Dominion where we want to carry on business and ask a charter. We decided to come to this parliament and ask a Dominion charter. There is nothing in the Bill dealing with provincial rights, and if my hon. friend from Peel will go into the western provinces, he will find there is no question of provincial rights there to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not stirring up any question of provincial rights, my hon. friend is doing that by the manner in which he refers to it. This should come clearly within the province of the provincial government, and the Dominion parliament should not be asked to grant charters of this kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will see by section 11 that is all provided for.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, I saw that.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend will see that this company must come here to get this charter, they cannot get it elsewhere. No legislature can give a charter for the incorporation of a company to operate in another province, that is interprovincial. This corporation propose to operate in three different provinces, and therefore must come here.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand they have been doing business in Manitoba under a local charter.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, but now they want to extend and they have a right to come here and get this charter.

Mr. DANIEL. In section 7 power is asked to purchase or otherwise acquire certain kinds of property, and it speaks of real or personal and corporeal or incorporeal property. What is incorporeal property?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I suppose what is usually meant, bonds, securities and mortgages.

Mr. DANIEL. Would that not be considered personal property?

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I have no objection to changing the word to personal.

Mr. DANIEL. It looks as though it might refer to angels floating in the air, or something of that kind. I do not see what kind of property could be called incorporeal, when you have real and personal and almost every other kind mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. It would seem to me that the proper wording for subclause 2 would be to state the amount of real estate they may hold. You introduce an element of difference and possibly of some difficulty by not giving a statement of the annual value of the real estate they may hold. If you have any basis on which to calculate it, calculate it on that basis.

Mr. EMMERSON. Say not exceeding $1,000,000.

Mr. FOSTER. And I think you should say the value of real estate 'so held.' That is for the purposes of the corporation as shown in the preceding clauses. I do not suppose you intend this to become a land dealing company.

Mr. HUGHES. Under this clause they could become a banking or loan society or a land speculating institution, they could do anything they had a mind to. I would move that this Bill stand over in order that it may receive more careful consideration than it has. It is a very dangerous Bill from many points of view. In the first place I maintain it conflicts with provincial rights, inasmuch as it is incorporating by the Dominion government an institution for the education of the youth of the country. That is clearly in violation of provincial rights. They can go to the provincial government and obtain their charter. Personally I have objection to incorporating any institutions of this kind under Dominion charters; the province is the proper place for that, in order that they may be subject to proper provincial inspection. All schools are supposed to be subject to provincial inspection, whether they are private or public schools. If we grant this charter we place this school outside of the control or discipline of the province and they will be under no obligation to observe the laws of the province except under one clause, in relation to the control of property. I do not think the Bill should pass until it has received more careful consideration. We all know that when Bills affecting any religious corporation are brought before the House, like this Sunday Observance Bill that we had before parliament a few days ago, we are told that the church is behind them and we stand to one side. I do not think that a Bill of this kind should be allowed to be enacted by this House and I therefore oppose it.

Mr. MONK. I do not see how the reasoning of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) would apply to a case like this. The moment the fact is indicated to us that this society intends extending its operations beyond one province, we have the jurisdiction to incorporate it.

Mr. FOSTER. It has institutions in two provinces.

Mr. MONK. It has institutions operating in two provinces, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, and it may wish to extend its charitable and religious institutions beyond the limits of one province. Therefore, why should we not have power to incorporate it here? We could not incorporate, strictly speaking, a society of that kind intending to operate only in one province. I do not think we could give it legal entity. As a matter of fact we are incorporating this society and placing it under the clear jurisdiction of the province with respect to educational matters. Surely my hon. and gallant friend from Haliburton and Victoria will not deny that? What is the object of this society? Its object is to do educational,

charitable and other eleemosynary work. Would my hon. friend say that this places it above the laws of the province in respect to education? Surely it is absolutely subject to its laws in the same way as an individual or a purely provincial creation would be. Therefore, it seems to me that the objection of my hon. and gallant friend is not well taken. There is no privilege conferred by this Bill beyond it. It indicates the object of this new creation. It falls consequently under all the laws of the province respecting education, and if it went beyond in any respect it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. CARVELL. I am very much impressed by the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I think that if the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) would consider the course he is taking in this matter he would see that this is not education as it is referred to in section 93 of the British North America Act. That refers to public education; this is a purely private matter. The applicants for this Bill wish to educate their children, or rather provide institutions at which children may be educated, but it is purely private. It has nothing to do with public education and it has nothing to do with education in the sense in which it is referred to by the British North America Act. I would call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that many bodies have been incorporated by this parliament with practically the same objects in view as those for which this Bill is introduced, and if it be true that these applicants wish to do business in all of the provinces of Canada excepting Manitoba, they are practically compelled to come here. The society might possibly get one charter in Saskatchewan and another in Alberta, but there would be no possibility of working them under one general head. It would be two distinct corporations. In going over the provisions of this Bill it will be seen that they are similar to the provisions of a Bill passed by this parliament in 1884, one with which the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton will not quarrel, and that was a Bill for the incorporation of the Methodist Church of Canada. The Methodist Church of Canada consisted probably of corporations in each of the provinces as far as I know. All these different corporations were banded together in one and very much the same provisions were incorporated in the Bill as were asked for in this Bill. This Bill gives this corporation the right to hold property.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand that Bill was to amalgamate certain different religious bodies into one.

Mr. CARVELL. Exactly, and so does this.

Mr. BLAIN. No.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. CARVELL. Absolutely so. There is a body in Manitoba that has a corporate right, there is a body in Saskatchewan which has no corporate right, and there is property held by different persons in trust for these bodies. There is another body in Alberta holding property in trust. But the same principle is involved in each case; they are trying to get these three bodies incorporated under a general head and there is provision by which they may hold property, borrow money on their property, and the parties who hold property in trust are authorized to convey it to this corporation. It seems to me that is exactly the power that the Methodist Church got. I think that the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, if he considers these matters, will say that if it is fair in one case it is fair in the other. The only thing I would suggest would be an amendment to clause 2 of section 7. It is, to my mind, unreasonable to limit the holdings of this society to $50,000. I do not know what amount would be proper, but the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill can state what, in his opinion, would be a proper amount. With that change, it seems to me, the Bill is not only necessary for the work, but it is perfectly legitimate and it should pass.

Mr. HUGHES. The parallel which has been drawn by the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, (Mr. Carvell) does not hold. Unless I can get some further legal knowledge from the two brilliant legal minds which have just preceded me, I must still hold to my view that this Bill clearly trangresses the rights and duties of the provinces. The Bill declares that:

The objects of the corporation shall be the instruction and the Christian education of children and other works of charity, such as work rooms——

This is a bad piece of composition, I should imagine, but the objects can be very well understood——

—orphanages, refuges and other similar undertakings, and the advancement, in other ways, of education and religion, charity and benevolence.

These are all very proper, but the education of the youth of the land comes clearly under the power of the provincial authorities, and the point I want made clear to my mind is that if this Bill is passed in its present form will the provinces have any——

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to convey to the committee the idea that the private education of pupils, or the conduct of private schools, comes, under the British North America Act, within the jurisdiction of the local government?

Mr. HUGHES. There is no private educational institution in Ontario, or in any other province of the Dominion of Canada, but is under inspection by the——

Mr. CARVELL. I would like my hon. friend to answer the question.

Mr. HUGHES Just let my hon. friend wait until I am finished and he will get his answer. There is not one which is not, under the law, under inspection for fire purposes, for educational purposes and for other purposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Look at section 11.

Mr. HUGHES. For educational purposes they are under the control of the provinces

Mr. CARVELL. Section 11 says that all provincial laws apply.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton seems to conjure up something that is not here at all. I know he has strong views with respect to education, but he would deprive school children of a christian education because he will not permit it in the public school, and he wishes to shut out such education from private schools. We have these private schools in every province in Canada under all denominations. These applicants are here simply to ask for incorporation.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the private schools to which my hon. friend refers under Dominion charter?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some might very well be.

Mr. CARVELL. Mount Allison is.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have in New Brunswick, as my hon. friend from Carleton says, Mount Allison in Sackville, in the county of Westmorland. I see no reason why any of them should not come to this parliament and ask for incorporation. Such an institution as the University of Acadia in Wolfville, in Nova Scotia, does not operate beyond the confines of that province. They do not need any Dominion charter, but, this society purposes operating in at least three of the provinces and, therefore, they should have incorporation from this parliament. In section 11 we say that the exercise of its powers shall be subject to the laws of any province it may operate in, as to the acquisition and holding of land by religious corporations in so far as such laws apply, but even without that I think it would be subject to provincial laws in that respect. It does seem that the point taken by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) with respect to the extent of the value of the property is opportune and that there is ambiguity as to what 'annual value' means.

Mr. HUGHES. After such a disquisition from the learned authority on divinity matters——

Mr. EMMERSON. You are convicted.

Mr. HUGHES. A gentleman who is so well posted on all the needs of religious corporations, who has gone to Sunday School, and has had all the benefits of a christian education as exemplified in his life and bearing, I would be bold indeed to appear to hesitate to accept his conclusions. But, section 11 only applies to the holding of land by religious corporations, and I am not speaking of the holding of lands at all. What I want to know is: If these institutions are formed in a province and should there be public schools, will the children attending them be subject to inspection under the laws of the province? If that is made clear, I have no objection to the Bill. But I require something better than the authority of the learned law lecturer from Laval, or of the luminary from the valley of St. John, or of the divinity expert from Westmorland, to convince me of that.

Mr. CARVELL. These are private schools, and should they become public schools, it is for the people of the western provinces to look after them. Until my hon. friend can show that they are public schools, his argument amounts to nothing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Education is under the control of the provinces in relation to public schools which are maintained by taxation. But, in all British countries it is the privilege of British subjects to maintain their own schools if they do not want to send their children to the public schools. In some countries children are compelled to go to public schools, but in British countries parents have the privilege of sending their children to private schools, and that right has never been denied. There are many such private schools in the provinces where nothing but public schools prevail under the authority of the province. But with those voluntary private schools there is no interference, and I do not think this Bill departs from the principle acknowledged in all British countries.

Mr. HUGHES. I am content if there is nothing in this Bill which will interfere with these schools being liable to the province just the same as if they had a provincial charter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If these schools become public schools they will be under the control of the province, and so far as education is concerned, no authority other than the province has a right to control them.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not a lawyer, but I do feel that the arguments of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell), and the hon. mem-

ber (Mr. Emmerson) have not convinced me. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) said that Mount Allison University had a Dominion charter because it operates in more than one province.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I say that the Methodist institution at Sackville is managed under a Dominion charter because it is the property of the Methodist Church of Canada, which is incorporated by this parliament. The Mount Allison institution is controlled by Dominion charter in that way, and not because it operates in different provinces.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand it the Universities of McGill and Laval have provincial charters and yet they operate throughout the whole Dominion. I was not aware that Mount Allison University is incorporated by Dominion charter, but I suppose I will have to take the word of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) for that.

Mr. CARVELL. I have not said that Mount Allison University was incorporated by the federal parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. We all thought you did.

Mr. CARVELL. I say it is the property of the Methodist Church of Canada, and as the Methodist Church of Canada has a Dominion charter the university is operated under a Dominion charter.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the hon. gentleman say that Mount Allison is operating under a Dominion charter?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes, so far as it is the property of the Methodist Church of Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. It either has a Dominion charter or it has not. Does the hon. gentleman say it has a Dominion charter?

Mr. CARVELL. I have said it is controlled by the Methodist Church which has a Dominion charter.

Mr. DANIEL. I am referring to the university and not to the church. I have been trying to get a straight answer, but the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) appears to be too good a lawyer to be able to give me such an answer. Perhaps his experience up above in another part of this building has made him so apt that he is able to give what we might call an evasive answer. Does the hon. gentleman refuse to answer the question, yes or no?

Mr. CARVELL. I have answered it three times already.

Mr. DANIEL. As to the merits of this Bill, I have nothing to say, but I do believe that if there is nothing to be said in its favour other than what has been said by the hon. members for Carleton and Westmorland, then, the reasons for its incorporation by this parliament are very weak indeed. I would still like to inquire what is the nature of 'incorporeal property,' because I think that if there is no such thing we had better strike out these words.

Mr. CARVELL. I would suggest that if the hon. member sends to the library for any law dictionary, he will have no difficulty in the finding the meaning of 'incorporeal property.' It is elementary.

Mr. DANIEL. If it is elementary, the hon. gentleman might give us the information. I have read in Shakespeare of 'incorporeal spirits,' but I have not heard of incoporeal property.

Mr. HUGHES. Might I ask if it is within the authority of this parliament to incorporate incorporeal property? I did not know that our authority extended beyond the confines of the nether world.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think there is anything in the British North America Act about incorporeal property.

Mr. HUGHES. The language of subsection 1 is very broad and very peculiar. I beg to move that it be amended so as to read in the last line: 'for the uses and purposes of the corporation.' This would make the meaning clear. Will the promoter please explain the meaning of the word 'whatsoever' which appears so frequently in this clause?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is like many words lawyers use—it does neither harm nor good.

Mr. FOSTER. That is when they charge by the word?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. They are like chips in porridge.

Mr. HUGHES. Suppose property were willed to this institution in opposition to the laws of a province, would its charter override the laws of the province?

Mr. DANIEL. I have been looking up the word 'incorporeal,' and I wish to give the House the authority.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the authority?

Mr. DANIEL. Webster's Dictionary.

Mr. CARVELL. You should get a law dictionary.

Mr. DANIEL. This is from the library, and therefore, I presume it is authoritative. The meaning given of the word 'incorporeal' is, first, 'not corporeal'; second, 'not consisting of matter, not having a material body, immaterial.' I do not see any good in putting anything immaterial into this Bill. Then, as relating to law, it says: 'Existing only in contemplation of law, not capable of actual visible seizing or

possession, not being an object of sense, intangible.' If that is the meaning of the word, I think we might better leave it out entirely, and let the rest of the clause translate itself.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the promoter of the Bill please explain the meaning of this term? We should treat all these corporations on the same basis, as they are neither kickable nor damnable.

Mr. DANIEL. I move that the words 'corporeal or incorporeal' be omitted from clause 7.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I object to the usual legal phraseology that is used in granting powers to corporations being cut out of this particular section. These words are found in many similar Bills, as I could show if I had time to look them up. There is certainly no harm done in leaving them in the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES. There are a number of minor legal authorities in the House. There is the law lecturer for Laval; I would like to hear his view on the matter.

Mr. MONK. I am not prepared to take part in the discussion.

Mr. HUGHES. I am informed on good authority that the young legal luminary from Regina, brilliant as he may be in politics, is not an authority in law, when he says that 'corporeal or incorporeal' are words used in a Bill in relation to property.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to post himself, he will find that all property is divided into corporeal and incorporeal, and that division has existed for a thousand years. I object to striking out legal phraseology which is used in other acts of incorporation.

Mr. DANIEL. If the legal members of the House, or any other members, will tell us what these words mean, I have no objection to withdraw my amendment. But nobody seems able to tell us that they mean anything. The dictionary says they mean nothing. They are immaterial.

Mr. JAMESON. In a Bill of this nature we should not attempt to split hairs. While these words may have no meaning to the lay mind, as a matter of fact they have a very important place in the legal vocabulary, and I think the Bill should go through as it has been drafted.

Section agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. The words in the fourth line 'or not' should come out.

The corporation may also sell, convey, exchange, alienate, mortgage, lease or demise any property, real or personal, held by it, whether by way of investment for the uses and purposes mentioned in the next preceding section or not.

They are confined absolutely to certain purposes; therefore there is no reason why we should extend their powers in giving aid, and in buying and selling, not for the purposes of the corporation.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN. I agree that those words 'or not' should come out; also the word 'whether' in the third line.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 96) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. German.

On section 11:

11. Section 2 of chapter 55 of the statutes of 1900, section 2 of chapter 74 of the statutes of 1907, and section 2 of chapter 95 of the statutes of 1908 are repealed.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is one of those sections repealing certain Acts. It is a little difficult to know at all times how far-reaching these are. It was agreed by the committee, I believe, that this section should be added to the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nesbitt). We asked the law clerk to examine it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Senate has introduced several amendments repealing certain sections, and such amendments may be more far-reaching than they seem to be. For instance, the Act of 1904 may be repealed. But, some work may have taken place under that Act, and if we repeal the Act in its entirety we may be doing something, the effect of which we hardly understand. But I think we discussed this with the Canadian Pacific railway representative, and it was agreed that no interest was injuriously affected. But these repealing clauses are dangerous sometimes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 61) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway company.—Mr. Cash.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may be as well to mention a formal point in case somebody should bring it up later. In the orders of the day there is a misprint under which this Bill is spoken of as 'An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.' The word 'Ontario' is there

by mistake. This Bill relates to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS CANAL AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY.

Mr. CONMEE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. I think that as I raised some objection to this Bill when it was last under consideration, I ought to make a reference to what I understand is the present position of the Bill so far as the promoter is concerned. My hon. friend who has charge of the Bill (Mr. Conmee) has recognized the force of some of the objections which I raised to the Bill and he has authorized me to state to the House, and has said that he would state it also if necessary, that when the Bill goes to the committee he will state that he is quite willing to withdraw some of the objectionable provisions of the Bill, more particularly with regard to the Saskatchewan river being included, and also in regard to the definition of the word 'canal' which he admits is altogether too broad. As there are some features of the Bill which might with advantage be adopted, and as the public interest may be served by incorporating a company with proper safeguards, I think it might be as well to let the Bill pass the second reading and go to a committee where all parties interested may be heard. I have had a communication from the secretary of the board of trade of Fort William. They are desirous of being heard and before the committee they and all other parties interested will have that opportunity. Having made these remarks I shall not further press any objection to the second reading.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to have a definite announcement of the time when the Bill will come before the Railway Committee because the people have been writing and telephoning to me, objecting strongly to the passing of the Bill. I notice the minister referred particularly to the Saskatchewan end but these objections come from the Fort William end. They object seriously to it and claim that it will interfere with water-power and other rights in connection with Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt that the chairman of the committee and the Minister of Railways will see that ample opportunity is given for all parties to be heard.

Mr. CONMEE. I am sending copies of the Bill with the proposed amendments to both Port Arthur and Fort William and will be glad to send them to any other places or interests of which I can learn.

Mr. HUGHES. Why not send one to each member?

Mr. BOYCE. I entirely agree with what the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) says with regard to the objection that he has to this Bill from several points of view. Coupled with the interference with the Saskatchewan river there are several interests which are affected by some of the extraordinary powers asked for by this Bill, and, therefore, I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) to see that the date for the hearing of the Bill in committee is so fixed that all parties may have an opportunity to be heard. The powers asked for are of the widest possible nature, very much too broad, and inasmuch as the public and other interests do not seem to be safeguarded in any way, I think that the Bill calls for the severest criticism and the greatest caution. I would ask whether the Bill containing the amendments will be reprinted and distributed amongst members so that we can judge of the extent to which the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River proposes to moderate his Bill, because I hope the amendments will have the effect of moderating and not enlarging the scope of the powers asked for.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think it would be fair to ask the House to allow this Bill to go to the committee without an explanation from my hon. friend from Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). We know nothing whatever about these amendments. The most important clauses of the Bill were objected to by the hon. Minister of Public Works when it was before the House some time ago. I think my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill should state to the House now the changes that he is willing to allow in the Bill and the proposed amendments that he wishes the committee to consider.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not go into an explanation of the Bill to-day because I thought it was not necessary to take up the time of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Explain the changes in the Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. One change is to meet the views of the Minister of Public Works. He was of opinion, when the Bill was up a few days ago, that it might mean that the company would be given some control over waters that are now navigable that the company did not themselves improve. An amendment will be put in to make it cer-

tain that the company cannot have any such control. Then, the Bill extended the powers of the company to the Assiniboine river. That was an error in any case. It was copied from an old Bill introduced a few years ago.

Mr. HUGHES. What is wrong with the Assiniboine river?

Mr. CONMEE. It was never the intention of the company to extend their works to the Assiniboine river, and they do not ask for that power.

Mr. HUGHES. In what section is the Assiniboine river mentioned?

Mr. CONMEE. Subsection d of section 8. That subsection is struck out altogether. To meet the views of the Minister of Public Works in regard to the Saskatchewan river, in which he stated that the government were likely to make some improvements, the company have cut out of the Bill all reference to the Saskatchewan river. Now, their western limit is Lake Winnipeg. Their operations do not go beyond that point.

Mr. HUGHES. What change is made in subsection c?

Mr. CONMEE. Part of the second last line and the last line are stricken out: 'Winnipegosis and Manitoba, and in and along the Saskatchewan river.' In section 12, with regard to plans, before the company commence work provision was made that they should have the assent of the Governor in Council. Now, it is proposed that they shall have the approval of the Waterways Commission and also the Governor in Council.

Section 14 is struck out. Hon. gentlemen will see that section 14 was put in as a safeguard to prevent the company from getting any control over water-powers. Now, that section is struck out and a wider section is put in which, I think, will meet with the approval of the House. The proposed new section reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall be held to give the company a power or exclusive right to or over any water area, river, stream, lake, channel, or over any water privilege not made, erected or constructed, or in course of construction by the company. All water areas, lakes, rivers, streams or water privileges affected by this Act that are not made, constructed, or in course of construction by the company shall remain in the same position in every respect as if this Act had not been passed.

I think that will remove any ground for such observations as fell from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) to the effect that the Bill gives this company too wide privileges. I venture the statement that he will not find on the statute books anywhere a Bill incorporating either a railway or a canal company which has as many good safeguards as are to be found in this Bill.

Mr. BLAIN. What provision is made as to the waters of Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis?

Mr. CONMEE. It does not go near the waters of Lake Manitoba. The company have no control over any waters at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is proposed to strike out Lake Manitoba?

Mr. CONMEE. I will read section 1, which gives the interpretation of the word 'canal.' This Bill has been amended so as to remove the objections which the Minister of Public Works mentioned. Perhaps the language was too wide—I am not lawyer enough to say—I could not see any objection to it, but the minister did see something in it. Section 1 is now amended to read as follows:

'Canal' includes lift-locks, channels, canal approaches, or other waterways excavated, erected or made by the company, and also includes every kind of work necessary to be done in respect to the canals, waterways or channels for the purpose of carrying out the objects of this Act.

It is there limited to the works that the company may themselves construct to whatever artificial work they may do. They get no control over any water-power. That interpretation of the word 'canal' removes beyond all doubt any possibility of the effect being as it was interpreted the other day when the Bill was before the House. If it does not, I may say to my hon. friends that this Bill has to go before the committee and that is the proper place to amend it. If there is any amendment that can be put in to protect the public with respect to powers or any suggestion that will improve, so long as it does not destroy the Bill, I will be glad to have it carried out no matter from what member it comes.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the hon. member going to have his amendments printed?

Mr. CONMEE. I think I can get a dozen copies of the Bill amended just as I have it here for distribution amongst members of the committee, if that will be satisfactory.

Mr. BOYCE. I think the Bill should be re-printed so that the amendments will be available for general distribution. My experience has been that with regard to any Bills my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) introduces or any amendments he may make it is in the public interest to give them the widest circulation possible. Therefore I think this Bill should be reprinted and circulated widely. Does the

hon. gentleman amend the definition of the word 'power' in the Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. I have struck out the words ' or supply ' in clause H.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend gives to the word 'power' a special and somewhat generous and general interpretation.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not care whether that interpretation is there or not. I do not see what good it is; the lawyers put it there; I did not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am probably as familiar as any hon. member in the House outside of my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) with the differences of opinion that have arisen as to water-powers in that vicinity. In the provincial legislature we had for a good many years disputes as to certain companies incorporated to develop Kekebeka Falls and the Kaministiqua river, and I point that out as a reason why the people in that vicinity might like to be heard on a Bill such as this. I have expressed no opinion on this Bill; I shall defer that until it is considered in committee, but I think we had better have the proposed amendments reprinted so that we will all know what they are. It will not take long and it will not cost much and it will be in the public interest. I have gone further than some gentlemen in the House may think proper in having Bills that are of a public nature referred to some committee so that the people interested may get a chance to be heard. I have not followed parliamentary practice in that respect, but we are representing all the people here, and where there are interests involved it is well to give the people a chance to express their views. The chairman of the Railway Committee has taken that view and has fixed days for hearing the people interested in a certain Bill before the committee even though they themselves have not asked to be heard. I think you will find that the chairman of the committee will invite the representatives of any municipality interested to be present at a certain day so as to enable them to state their views. Already we have had communications from Fort William with respect to this Bill, and I think it would not be wise to proceed with it until that municipality has an opportunity to be represented, if it so desires. I think the Bill should be reprinted.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do I understand the minister to say that this Bill shall be reprinted before it comes before the Railway Committee. Why not have it reprinted before it is referred to the committee so that we may know what we are doing?

Mr. BOYCE.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is shall the Bill be referred to the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would make the suggestion that the clerk of the House should have the Bill reprinted and then we will have it in its reprinted form in the committee. That can be done without any red-tape.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time and referred to the Select Committee on Railways.

QUESTIONS.

COURTENAY BAY.

Mr. DANIEL:

1. Has the government made any arrangement in relation to a terminus for the Grand Trunk Pacific at Courtenay bay or elsewhere in or near the harbour of St. John?

2. Have plans and reports been made of the required dredging, with the wharfs, docks, breakwaters and terminal facilities necessary at Courtenay bay? If so, will the government lay the same on the table of the House?

3. What is the extent of the dredging required, and what is the estimate of the quantity of earth excavation and rock excavation, respectively, required to be made?

4. What is the estimate of the total cost of dredging, and what estimate is made of the cost of the wharfs, docks, warehouses and terminal facilities generally, apart from the estimated cost of dredging?

5. Which predominates, rock or earth excavation?

6. Have specification and plans for the dredging of Courtenay bay been prepared, and have any tenders been asked for the performance of such work? If so, what was the amount of deposit required to accompany tenders?

7. Were any tenders received? If so, will the government give the names of each tenderer with the figure of each together with the amount of deposit accompanying each tender, respectively?

8. Has any tender been accepted and a contract entered into? If so, will the government lay on the table of the House a copy of such contract, together with a copy of notices of call for tenders, setting forth terms, with the plans and specifications upon which such contract was based?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. No.

2. Instructions were given to Engineer H. M. Davy to make some test borings in Courtenay bay, in order to ascertain the nature of the materials existing to a depth of 32 feet below lowest water; a report on these borings, accompanied by a plan, is in possession of the department. Preliminary studies for wharfs, &c., have been made, but the plans are not sufficiently determined upon to be submitted to parliament.

3. About 8,000,000 cubic yards, of which there is very little rock.

4. (a) $2,000,000, work to be done by suction dredge. If work is done by means of one or more of the departmental dredges, it is estimated that the cost may be considerably less than this. (b) No definite estimate has been made, as it will depend on the extent of the wharfs, docks, warehouses and terminal facilities generally, which would naturally be a matter of development extending over a number of years.

5. Earth.

6. (a) No special specification was prepared; it was decided by the department that the specification for St. John harbour and plan and report above mentioned were sufficient to give all the information which it was intended to convey to the tenderers (b) Yes. (c) $6,000.

7. (a) Yes.

(b)

Names and Addresses of Tenderers.	——	Price per Cubic Yard.			
		Scow Measurement.		Material Cast Over.	
		Rock or Boulders excavated, 2 cubic yards.	All other Materials.	Rock or Boulders excavated, 2 cubic yards.	All other Materials.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, St. John, N.B.	....	5 00	0 35 / 0 50	5 00	0 35
The Dominion Dredging Co., Limited, Ottawa.	St. John harbour, including Courtenay bay	Beacon bar, 0·50 per cubic yard; Courtenay bay, 0·35 per cubic yard, if dredging is done by dipper or clam shell dredge; 0·25, if dredging is done by suction dredge and the dredged material used for filling proposed breakwater and revetment wall.			
		4 90	0 39½	3 00	0 30
G. S. Mayes, St. John, N.B.	St. John harbour, including Courtenay bay. Area known as Courtenay bay	Scow measurement. Boulders excavated 2 cub. yds., $19.60 per c. yd. Ledge or solid rock blasted, 28.00 "; All other materials, 0.79 "; Cast over. Boulders from 1½ to 2 cub. yds., $9.00 "; Boulders excavated 2 cub. yds., 19.80 "; Ledge or solid rock blasted, 28.00 "; All other materials, 0.79 "			
	Area commencing at C. P. R. wharf and extending 1,600 ft. southwardly towards Beacon Light, being C.P.R. property.	Scow measurement, towed to dumping grounds. Boulders ½ to 2 cub. yds., $ 9.00 per c. yd.; Boulders exc., 2 cub. yds., 18.20 "; Ledge or solid rock blasted, 27.00 "; All other materials, 0.74 "; Materials cast over, same prices.			
	Area from lighthouse northerly to end of C. P.R. 1,600 feet strip above-mentioned.	Same prices as for Courtenay bay area.			

(c) The Maritime Dredging Company stated, when submitting their offer, that they had on deposit with the department a cheque for $6,000 for dredging in the province of New Brunswick and that they understood said cheque would cover the security for the present tender. In view of the extent of the work to be done, the company was asked to furnish a special deposit of $6,000, which was done. Other tenders were accompanied by an accepted bank cheque for $6,000.

8. (a) Action was taken on the offer of the Maritime Dredging Company and a con-

tract was entered into with them for the dredging on the west side of the harbour. No contract was entered into for dredging Courtenay bay, but the company covenanted to also perform the dredging there at the price named in their tender, if called upon by the government to do so. (b) Yes, if moved for.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—ENTRANCE INTO BRANDON.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Has the government or any member thereof received a copy of a resolution passed by the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association at their recent convention held in Brandon re the entrance of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway into Brandon?

2. If so, has the government taken any steps to further the request contained in said resolution, and what action has been taken?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, a copy of the resolution was received by the Department of Railways and Canals on 27th December, 1909.

2. The resolution was acknowledged by the department and a copy of the same forwarded to Mr. E. J. Chamberlain, vice-president and general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

DREDGE CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. MONK:

1. Is the government at the present moment constructing, or has it constructed, at Sorel, a dredge, under the direction of Engineer Kennedy, formerly of the port of Montreal?

2. If so, what is the cost or estimated cost of the construction of said dredge?

3. Is it the case that the said dredge was found to be incapable of carrying its anchors without sinking, even before it had any coal placed on board?

4. Has the said dredge been found defective? If so, in what respect, and for what reasons?

5. Have orders been given to lengthen or widen or change the said dredge, and in what particulars?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government is constructing a dredge at Sorel from plans prepared by Mr. John Kennedy, formerly chief engineer of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

2. Estimated cost, $230,000.

3. No.

4. The freeboard of the dredge was considered insufficient for work in heavy currents.

5. The dredge is being lengthened 25 feet to increase the floating power and the freeboard.

THE PROPOSED WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. MAGRATH:

1. Would the United States, under the proposed Waterways treaty, have the absolute right to the use of the Georgian Bay canal, if constructed, and on the same terms as Canada?

2. And, under that treaty, would Canada have similar rights to the use of the waterways connecting Lake Michigan with the Gulf of Mexico via the Chicago drainage canal?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. The proposed Waterways Treaty dealing with boundary waters, and with streams or canals connecting boundary waters, would not seem to affect any use by the United States of the Georgian bay canal, if constructed, or any use by Canada of waterways connecting Lake Michigan with the Gulf of Mexico via the Chicago drainage canal, but it may be that the provisions of the treaty of Washington (1871) would have application to one or both of the subjects mentioned.

COMMISSION ON TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. What communication was addressed by the government to the premiers of the several provinces with reference to the appointment of a Commission on Technical Education?

2. What replies were received from the premiers of the several provinces?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The following communication was addressed by the government to the premiers of the several provinces:

Minister of Labour, Canada.
Ottawa, December 13, 1909.

Dear Sir,—The Dominion government is considering the advisability of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education, and into the systems and methods of technical instruction obtaining in other countries, particularly in Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States. It is intended that the commission shall be solely for the purpose of gathering information, the information when obtained, to be published in a suitable report to be at the disposal of the provinces and available for general distribution.

I may say that the view of the government is that a commission of the kind suggested might render valuable services to the Dominion as a whole, since it would be in a position to conduct an inquiry on a wider and more comprehensive scale than might be considered desirable or possible in the case of the different provinces, and which if undertaken by the provinces individually must lead inevitably to the duplication and reduplication of energy and expense.

It is recognized, however, that the work of such a commission, to be of national service, should have the hearty endorsation of the governments of the several provinces of the Dominion, and I am, therefore, writing to ask if the appointment by the federal authorities of a commission of the character and scope suggested would meet with the approval of your government, and to inquire, in particular, inasmuch as some doubt has been expressed on the point, whether exception to

such a course would be taken on any ground of jurisdiction.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

The following replies were received:

Premier of Nova Scotia,
Halifax, N.S., December 23, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 13th inst., on the subject of the advisability of appointing a royal commission to inquire into the needs of technical education.

I would be delighted to see such a commission appointed by your government; in fact, I have long advocated such a course being taken and you can accept my assurance that such a course, if adopted, will meet with the hearty approbation of the government of Nova Scotia.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) G. H. MURRAY.

Prince Edward Island, Premier's Office,
Charlottetown, December 18, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th instant regarding the advisability of the Dominion Government appointing a royal commission to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education and into the systems and methods of technical education obtaining in other countries, etc., with the request that the matter should be considered and approved of by the government of this province, and whether exception to such a course would be taken on the grounds of jurisdiction.

In reply, I beg to say that your proposal meets with the approval of our government, and I wish to assure you that no exception will be taken upon the grounds of jurisdiction. We believe it would be in the interest of the country at large that such a commission should be appointed, and that all possible information be obtained upon a subject of so much importance.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. L. HASZARD.

New Brunswick, Premier's Office,
St. John, N.B., December 16, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 13th instant, informing me that the Dominion Government is considering the advisability of appointing a royal commission to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as regards industrial training and technical education, and into the system of methods of technical instruction prevailing in other countries, specially in Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States.

I entirely agree with the view of the government to the effect that a commission of this kind might rénder valuable service to the Dominion as a whole, and I have no hesitation in saying that the appointment by the federal authorities of a commission of the character and scope suggested in your letter would meet with the approval of my government, and no exception would be taken to such a course on any ground of jurisdiction.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. D. HAZEN.

Cabinet du Premier Ministre, Province de Québec,
Québec, 30 décembre 1910.

L'honorable M. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Ministre du Travail,
Ottawa.

Monsieur le Ministre,—J'ai soumis à mes collègues du conseil exécutif la lettre que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser le treize de ce mois pour demander si le gouvernement de la province de Québec approuverait la nomination, par les autorités fédérales, d'une commission chargée de faire enquête sur l'enseignement technique en ce pays.

Nous sommes d'opinion, mes collègues et moi, que tout ce qui touche à l'instruction publique, qu'il s'agisse d'enseignement spécial ou d'enseignement général est du ressort exclusif des provinces, et je tiens à vous l'écrire afin qu'il n'y ait pas de malentendu à ce sujet. D'autre part, comme vous me donnez l'assurance que les autorités fédérales, en insitiuant une commission d'enquête, n'auraient tout simplement en vue que de prêter leur concours aux gouvernements provinciaux en faisant recueiller des renseignements qu'elles mettraient ensuite à la disposition de ces derniers, nous ne voyons pas d'objection à la nomination d'une telle commission.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Ministre, l'expression de mes sentiments bien distingués,

Le Premier Ministre,
(Sgé.) LOMER GOUIN.

(Translation.)

Office of the Prime Minister, Province of Quebec.
Quebec, December 30, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have submitted to my colleagues of the executive council the letter you were kind enough to write to me on the 13th inst., asking me whether the government of the province of Quebec would approve the appointment by the federal authorities of a commission to make an investigation concerning technical instruction in this country.

We are of the opinion, my colleagues and myself, that anything pertaining to public education—whether the subject be special teaching or general teaching—belongs to the provinces exclusively, and I want to write you so, in order that there may be no misunderstanding on that point. As, on the other hand, you give me the assurance that the federal authorities, in instituting a commission of investigation, would simply do it with a view to help the provincial governments, by having collected information which they would later on put at the disposal of the latter, we see no

objection to the appointment of such a commission.

Please accept, sir, the expression of my highest regard,

(Sgd.) LOMER GOUIN,
Prime Minister.

Office of the Prime Minister and President of the Council, Ontario.
Toronto, December 16, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 13th instant.

I understand the object of the proposed commission, to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects training and technical education and into the system of methods for technical instruction obtaining in other countries, will be solely for the purpose of gathering information. This being so, I see no objection to the creation of the commission, and no exception will be taken to it on the part of the province of Ontario.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. P. WHITNEY.

Province of Manitoba, Premier's Office,
Winnipeg, December 16, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of yours under date of December 13th, regarding the advisability of appointing a royal commission to inquire into the industrial training and technical education of Canada.

I appreciate the fact that education is a matter under the constitution entirely vested in the provinces and realize that it is a delicate question on which to give advice such as you solicit.

The matter is an important one and I think, in view of the rapid strides along industrial lines that the Canadian people are making, there is necessity for more attention being given to technical education than what has been the practice or custom in the past.

I shall certainly be pleased to see more interest taken in this matter and our young men better qualified for the opportunities that are offered along industrial lines by having a first-class technical education to qualify them for the responsible and important positions that are awaiting men of that quality.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. P. ROBLIN,
Premier.

Executive Council, Saskatchewan,
Regina, December 21, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. King,—I have duly received your letter of December 13 on the subject of technical education and the proposal now under consideration by your government for instituting an inquiry by a royal commission and which asks whether the proposal meets with the approval of the Saskatchewan government and whether any exception would be taken by us on the ground of jurisdiction.

I may very readily state that the Saskatchewan government will raise no objection against the proposed inquiry by the Dominion government on any grounds; on the contrary we believe that the federal government is the proper authority to proceed in the matter in the way proposed, that it is a subject which can be more efficiently, economically and effectively dealt with by the central government than by the various provincial governments; and, in addition that, inasmuch as industrial training and technical instruction intimately affect trade and commerce, these branches of education ought to be viewed from the national rather than from the provincial standpoint.

Believe me,
Very sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) WALTER SCOTT.

Premier's Office, Alberta,
Edmonton, Alta., December 28, 1909.

Hon. W. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I am instructed by the Hon. Premier Rutherford to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 13th in reference to the advisability of the Dominion government appointing a royal commission to inquire into the needs and present equipment of the Dominion as respects industrial training and technical education.

I am directed by the premier to say that this project meets with the hearty endorsation and approval of his government.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) M. J. MACLEOD,
Clerk Executive Council.

Government of the Province of British Columbia, Premier's Office,
Victoria, January 15, 1910.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I beg to confirm my telegram to you of January 10th as follows:—

Owing to absence of Minister of Education with whom I wished to confer, regret being unable to reply sooner to your favour regarding technical education. He has now returned and an answer will be sent you promptly.

Having since then had an opportunity of consulting with the Minister of Education, I beg to state that the appointment of a commission by the Dominion to inquire into the subject of industrial training and technical instruction meets with the approval of this government.

It is not the intention of the government of this province to take exception to the course you propose on any grounds of jurisdiction.

I might add that this government will gladly afford any facilities in its power to assist in carrying out the object in view.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) RICHARD McBRIDE.

DAM ON THE MONTREAL RIVER.

Mr. WRIGHT:

Has the contract for the dam on the Montreal river, near Latchford, been let? If so, to whom, and when is it expected to be finished?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. W. H. Sinclair and D. B. Campbell.
3. The contract stipulates that the work must be completed by April 1, 1911.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—COMMISSION ON SUPPLIES.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Has the government or any member thereof, or have the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners or any of them received information, or intimation that any person or persons now or heretofore in the service of the government or of the commission have profited or sought to profit by the financial transactions with contractors or subcontractors, or any other persons connected with the construction of the said railway, or with the furnishing of supplies therefor, or have received or sought from such sources any money for property, transferred or proposed to be transferred during the period of their employment in connection with this work?
2. If so, were said persons in position to influence reports on quantities or classification in connection with any contract or contracts?
3. When and in what manner, was such information communicated, and what action has been taken or is proposed to be taken therewith?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

1. The department has no knowledge of any such information.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

WM. ANGUS, MERIDALE, MANITOBA.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Has Wm. Angus, of Meridale post office, Manitoba, been appointed a commissioner under the Naturalization Act for naturalization purposes?
2. Is he in the employment of the Interior Department as fire ranger, or in any other capacity? If so, what salary does he receive?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY:

1. Yes.
2. No.

DOUGLAS ISLAND, DALHOUSIE, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. When did the government acquire Douglas island, at Dalhousie, New Brunswick?
2. From whom was it bought, and at what price?
3. What was the object of the purchase?
4. How many acres does the island contain?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government acquired the eastern end of Douglas island, containing 1-28 100 acres, with right of way thereto, by expropriation on December 21, 1908.
2. When the expropriation plans were filed the island belonged to the Dalhousie Lumber Company, Limited. No compensation has up to date been paid to the company.
3. To secure the site of the lighthouse maintained on the island.
4. Approximately three acres.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—ENGINEER BENJAMIN BOURGEOIS.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Has Mr. Benjamin Bourgeois, a government engineer upon the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway, been dismissed? If so, when and for what cause?
2. Has Mr. Bourgeois resigned his position of engineer? If so, when and for what cause?
3. By whom was Mr. Bourgeois recommended for employment?
4. By whom was his dismissal demanded, and for what alleged cause?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Mr. Bourgeois' services were dispensed with after investigation.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Benjamin Bourgeois was appointed engineer in charge of party on recommendation of H. D. Lumsden, chief engineer, September, 1904. He was appointed division engineer, district 'B,' on recommendation of H. D. Lumsden, June, 1906.
4. Answered by No. 1.

EXTENSION OF PROVINCIAL BOUNDARIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Was notice of the resolution adopted by this House in 1908, whereby it is proposed to add to the province of Quebec a portion of the district of Ungava, and to the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario a portion of the district of Keewatin, given to the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or either of them? If so, when was notice given?
2. Was any objection to such proposed transfer to the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, and Manitoba, raised by either of the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, or any conditions as to the terms affecting said provinces, proposed by either of said governments?
3. If so, has any action been taken thereon, or reply made thereto, and what, if any?
4. Does the government recognize that the four original provinces of confederation, namely, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, have partnership interest in the territory of Keewatin or Ungava?
5. In any disposition of such territory, will recognition be given to the interests of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? If so, in what way; and if not, why not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No action was taken.
4. It does not appear that the four original provinces have any interest different from the interest of other provinces that have entered since confederation.
5. In the resolution of the 13th of July, 1908, the principle was laid down that in any legislation for extension of the boundaries of the provinces of Quebec, Manitoba and Ontario, nothing should be done to impair the representation of any province in this House, and the government is bound by this resolution.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS TO SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE:

What is the aggregate of the subsidy payments made to the provincial government of Saskatchewan from the 1st July, 1905, to the 31st December, 1909, under section 20 of the Saskatchewan Act?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING:

$2,109,375.

SITE FOR BARRACKS ON HUMBER RIVER.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the government disposed of the site on the Humber river, near Toronto, purchased some years ago by the government, upon which it was proposed to erect new barracks? If so, when, to whom, and for what consideration, and was competition invited by public advertisement or otherwise for the said sale?
2. If the said site has been sold, upon whose advice or opinion was the decision arrived at to change the location of the said barracks, and what was the reason for the said change?
3. If a change of location has been decided upon, what site has been secured, what is the acreage, the price, from whom purchased, and all other particulars of the purchase?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. No.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

SALARY INCREASES TO POST OFFICE INSPECTORS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Have the post office inspectors sent petitions and delegates to the Postmaster General asking for increases in salaries? If so, has the government granted their request? If not, why not?
2. Have said officials received any advance since confederation? If so, at what date was increase given, and the extent of the increase?
3. Were said officials formerly given any allowances which are not at present granted to them?
4. Has their work increased in the past ten years? If so, to what extent?
5. Do the inspectors belong to the inside service, or are they part of the parliamentary machinery, collecting facts and reporting direct to the minister?

Hon. R. LEMIEUX:

1. Applications have been received from a number of inspectors for increases in salary, and these applications have not yet received consideration.
2. The scale of remuneration was changed from the 13th August, 1903. The old scale of remuneration was as follows:

2nd class, on appointment..	$2,000
After 10 years service..	2,200
After 20 years service..	2,400
1st class, on appointment..	2,200
After 10 years service..	2,400
After 20 years service..	2,600

In 1903, the statute dividing inspectors into two classes was repealed, and the scale of remuneration was fixed as follows:

On appointment, $2,000, with an increase of $50 a year for the first six years, and $100 a year thereafter, up to a maximum of $2,600.

3. No, except that formerly they were allowed a per diem allowance to cover travelling expenses, whereas now they are paid the actual amount of expenses incurred. This change was made in February, 1893.
4. With the growth of the country this branch of the work has increased in like manner with all other branches of the postal service.
5. Post office inspectors are classified under what is known as the 'outside service.'

POST OFFICE AT WINDYGATES.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

Did the government receive a petition from the settlers at Windygates against the moving of the post office? If so, how many names were on said petition?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

A petition containing 34 signatures, asking that the location of the office might not be changed, was received at the department.

EXPENDITURES ON ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the gross amount that has been expended by the government of Canada in (a) deepening, lighting and otherwise improving the St. Lawrence ship channel (b) improving in any way the harbour of Montreal; (c) improving in any way the harbour of Quebec?
2. What is the gross amount of the present loan by the government to the Commissioners of the Montreal Harbour Board?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

St. Lawrence Ship Canal.

1. (a) Cost of dredging to end of fiscal year 1908-9.. .. ..$7,208,543 50
Expenditure for plant, shops, surveys, &c., up to end of fiscal year 1908-9.. .. .. 3,501,449 96

$10,709,993 46

The cost of lighting the St. Lawrence Ship Channel has not been kept as a separate item, these lights forming part of the general division of lights for the province of Quebec below Montreal.

(b) $1,064,240.91.

(c) $1,691,026.46.

2. $10,870,000.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS IN NEW WESTMINSTER DISTRICT.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

Are there any proposals now before the government, or any department, for the disposal of lands or other property in New Westminster district, on terms varying in any respect from those available to applicants generally, and defined by statutes or regulations which have been published in the 'Canad Gazette,' and which it is desired to have determined without opportunity for public competition? If so, what are the names of the applicants, and the properties applied for in each case?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

The commissioners for the Chilliwak-Sumas Drainage and Dyking district are applying for the ungranted Dominion lands surrounding Sumas lake together with the bed of the lake.

The Vancouver Power Company is applying for certain lands as a site for a dam at the port of Coquitlam lake.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing all written objections to classification upon the Transcontinental Railway made since July 28, 1908, and in reference to overbreak or other over-expenditure since October 2, 1908.—Mr. Lennox.

For a return showing the total cost to Canada of the military college buildings and grounds, and the amount furnished each year by the government towards its maintenance.—Mr. Armstrong.

For a copy of all correspondence respecting the Central Park post office during the year 1909, and including particularly a copy of:—1. Representations made to the department that by changing the location of the office and establishing a post office at Collingwood East, the interest of the majority of the residents would be best served.

2. The evidence taken at the inquiry following such representations, and the official report upon such evidence.

3. Communications from residents of Central Park and others with respect to the closing of the post office there, and the answer made thereto in accordance with the facts.

4. The information upon which it was determined that the removal of the post office would be a greater convenience.

5. The largely signed petition from patrons of the Central Park post office complaining of the management, etc.; and the report of the inspector who investigated the same.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

For a return showing the number of chartered banks that have gone into liquidation since 1888, the date of the charters of each, the date of suspension, the capital stock, assets and liabilities, respectively, at date of suspension, and the per cent of dividends paid to both holders and depositors, respectively. Also, what other banks have disappeared by amalgamation or otherwise, with similar information as above in respect to them.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all papers, affidavits and correspondence between the Interior Department and John A. Dunn, or any one in his behalf, and any official of the department, concerning the application for patent of the N.W. ¼ sec. 34, tp. 35, range 16, west of the 2nd M.—Mr. Roche.

For a return showing the number of persons appointed as temporary employees of the Civil Service in the several departments since the present Civil Service Act came into force, the date of the appointment of each, their names, their salaries while employed, as such temporary employees, the department in which such employee was placed, the duration of their employment, whether in one department alone or in case of transfer to another or other department, with total length of time employed, the names of those who in consequence of having passed the Civil Service examination have been employed permanently, the names of those who while temporarily employed failed to pass the required examination and are still employed in the service, the names of those who are or have been employed over the statutory six months as temporary employees, and the reasons for such continued employment in each case.—Mr. Hughes.

For a copy of all correspondence relating to all coal lands reserved for as well as those acquired by the Bow River collieries by direct application or assignment.—Mr. Northrup.

For a copy of all correspondence between the District Officer Commanding Military District Number 11 and the Department of Militia, with reference to the battery of 12-pounder B.L. guns recently sent to Esquimalt, or with reference to the proposal that No. 1 Company of the 5th regiment, C.A., should train on said guns.—Mr. Barnardo.

For a copy of all reports of surveys of any projected railway lines or routes in the province of Prince Edward Island during the years 1908 and 1909, and particularly reports of the surveys of any such line from Royal Junction, or thereabouts, to Kensington or thereabouts; also of all correspondence, recommendations, documents and papers of every kind, nature and description relating to or concerning the said projected railway lines or routes or the surveys therefor.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all correspondence, advertisements, tenders and other documents, in con

nection with a proposal or proposals to lease a part or the whole of the Black Foot reserve.—Mr. Magrath.

For a return showing: Since the beginning of the autumn train service of 1909 on the Intercolonial railway, at what time the train which leaves Oxford Junction every week day morning for Pictou is due to leave Oxford Junction and arrive at Pictou; the actual time at which the train departed each day from Oxford Junction; the actual time at which it arrived each day at Pictou; the causes of the delay, if any; and what efforts are being made to improve the service in respect of time.—Mr. Rhodes.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens), moved:

For a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents not already brought down, including report of survey made during the past summer and autumn of the harbour at Cape John and Tatamagouche bay, in the counties of Pictou and Colchester, in the province of Nova Scotia, relating to the route of the winter steamers between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting and recommending a change or changes in the said route, and an increase in the number of trips daily of such winter steamers; and also, a copy of all memorials, reports, correspondence and documents relating to the route of the summer mail steamers between Charlottetown and the mainland of Canada, and suggesting a change or changes in that route, and an increase in the number of trips daily of such summer mail steamers; and also with regard to connecting such suggested new summer route or routes with a point or points on the Intercolonial railway, and also, for a copy of all memorials, and correspondence, asking for additional and improved aids to navigation of the harbour of Charlottetown and in Tatamagouche bay and harbour.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before the Christmas vacation I had several short interviews with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) in connection with this route and the steamer service. It was the desire of that hon. gentleman to be present when this motion came up, but, owing to his very regrettable illness, it will not be possible this session, I take it, for him to be present within the time when this motion must be brought forward, if it is to be dealt with at all. The importance to us in Prince Edward Island of this matter of winter communication can hardly be realized, perhaps, by those who do not labour under the disadvantages to which we are subjected through the lack of communication which sometimes exists. I spoke on this question last session, on motion to go into supply, and pointed out that the several governments that had existed since we came into confederation, Conservative and Liberal alike, have made repeated, sincere and energetic efforts to overcome the difficulties with which they have to contend in regard to winter communication. Briefly, I may say that these efforts began almost the very year—if not the very year—when we entered into confederation. The Mackenzie government put on the route a vessel called the 'Albert,' as a test. It was not possible at that early period to procure a boat built for the purpose of ice breaking, and the 'Albert' was a test pending the time when a proper boat could be procured. The 'Albert', which was not much of a success, was succeeded by the 'Northern Light,' built at Quebec, built of wood, sheathed with green-heart wood. The 'Northern Light,' while not well adapted to the work, proved, nevertheless, a very excellent experiment, because, while she was not able to do the work very well, the experience gained from her performances enabled the government, or the government's marine advisers, to design a vessel which did good work later on; and so the 'Northern Light' may be called a very successful experiment. She was followed by the 'Stanley.' This was under the Conservative government. This vessel did good work. Ten or twelve years ago the 'Minto' was put on, and both these vessels continued on the route up to last year. Both these vessels did very good work, but they were not sufficiently strong to maintain the service during certain seasons of the year and under certain weather conditions. Last year, a new ship, the 'Earl Grey' was put on. She is a much larger and more powerful vessel than the others, a vessel to which a good deal of attention had been given and in the production of which great care had been taken in order to embody in her all the best ideas of the time. She cost over half a million dollars, and there can be no question that she is a very excellent ship. She was put on the route this season for the first time. This has not been as difficult a season as some others have been. Still, notwithstanding the mild weather we have had, the 'Earl Grey' has had to contend with a good deal of very heavy ice. She is a splendid ship and ought to be able to do the work if any vessel that can be constructed at this time could do it. I crossed in her myself in the early part of last month on the way back from Prince Edward Island to Ottawa. There was not much ice in the harbour, but there was much ice off Point Prim, on Prince Edward Island, ice so heavy that, as the captain told me, it would have stopped either of the other vessels. But the 'Earl Grey' was able to make her way through it without difficulty, at the rate of four or five miles an hour. I have mentioned these vessels, not because I am going to discuss very much or at all the class of vessels we required on that route. I think the government have now given us

a vessel as good as they could well give. But, boats are like other things, they cannot perform impossibilities. We have to consider the various routes between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and here we strike upon a rather vexed question. There are a number of proposed routes between Prince Edward and the mainland, each of which has its advocates who insist upon that particular route as the one best adapted for winter communication. I think it fair to assume that we in Prince Edward Island, to whom this matter of winter communication is a matter of very vital importance, and who are therefore compelled to pay attention to it, are possibly in a better position to form an opinion upon this matter than are those who are not forced to consider it so carefully.

Now, I do not propose to describe the various routes at length, but I may mention them.

Beginning at the western end of the island there is a route that the people of Summerside and Prince county insist on very strongly, that is between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. That route has been tried once or twice and the Summerside people say it has not been sufficiently tried, but so far I do not know that the experiment has been an unqualified success. If that route could be made a success I for one would be quite satisfied to accept it.

Further down you have the route between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, that is the route of the old winter ice boats which we used sometimes to help haul over with a strap. This is also the site of the proposed tunnel; it is the narrowest place between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, the distance from shore to shore being 7½ to eight miles. If communication could be kept up there it would seem to be the natural connection between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, because it is so much narrower than the other passages. Very strong objections are, however, raised to it by many people. One is the enormous cost of the piers to be constructed there, and in addition to that you have on the New Brunswick side reefs running out 1½ or 2½ miles from the shore, which it is contended would be very dangerous. On the island side there are also flats running out a long distance. The ice between them is always on the move and the current runs about 4 miles an hour. The contention is that a ship might be carried a little out of her way by these currents and touch a reef or flat, which would be the last we would know about that ship.

Further to the east there is a route between Souris or Georgetown and Cape George in Nova Scotia. This route has strong advocates, and if it could be made permanent and could have continuous communication I do not know that I would raise objection to it. It would be at the extreme end of the island and would necessitate more railway carriage than some of the other routes, but we would look on that as a small matter if the route could be established and continuous communication maintained. On that route we have a good harbour on the Prince Edward Island side, at Souris. Although it is not very deep it is generally accessible in winter by craft of this nature, and has frequently open water. Georgetown harbour is one of the best harbours to be found anywhere, a magnificent harbour, and no fault could be found with it. But I do not know what could be done at Cape George because, so far as I know, there is no harbour there, or a very inferior one, and it would require a somewhat extensive breakwater to provide an artificial harbour. I am informed by those who say they know that there is always open water there at the change of the tides, and I presume they are correct. I shall not express an opinion of that route because I have not been able to get as much information about it as I have about some of the others.

Then we have the two routes to which I wish especially to call attention. We have the route which has been used for the last third of a century between Georgetown in Prince Edward Island, and Pictou in Nova Scotia. Georgetown, as I have already said, is an exceedingly good port, we have little or no fault to find with it. It has deep water and is very accessible. But when we come to Pictou we have a different story to tell. In order to understand the objection to Pictou I wish to call attention to the configuration of the Straits of Northumberland. The eastern end of the strait is open to the northeast winds, which blow right into the eastern end of the straits and fill them with ice. There is a space of 250 miles through which that northeast wind blows directly from the Straits of Belle Isle into Pictou harbour, and when that wind is blowing, and it is a prevailing one, it fills the entrance to Pictou harbour full up, it packs it from side to side, and the ice grounds and is packed from top to bottom. It makes a solid and impervious mass through which no ship ever built or ever to be built can force a passage. That state of affairs has continued for a greater or less length of time during different seasons. The longest time I remember was five years ago when one of the winter steamers was shut inside of Pictou harbour for 59 days and the other was shut out of Pictou harbour for 59 days. But while that was the longest it was not the only instance of vessels being unable to make Pictou harbour. I happened to be over there myself in that

particular season, and the ice was so jammed and grounded on the bottom that even the tides were affected by it. No ship that could be built can go through ice if it cannot dispose of the ice as it breaks it. You can put a ship into heavy ice if it is floating and she can break it if there is sea room to let the broken floes of ice be disposed of, or in some sorts of ice if the boat can pass the ice under her, although that, of course, requires plenty of depth. You cannot do that when the ice is jammed between two coasts and grounded on the bottom, and that is the case in Pictou.

I wish to call attention to one or two extracts which I gave last year upon this subject, but which I think are of sufficient importance to be repeated. Owing to the difficulties we had five years ago, surveys and reports were ordered to be made by the Dominion government. Among those who took this matter up under the instructions of the government was Mr. Shewan, the resident engineer of the Department of Public Works in St. John, New Brunswick, who, in his report speaks as follows:

Up to this time the winter steamer has been crossing from Pictou to Georgetown, a distance of about 42 miles, with more or less irregularity occasioned by the ice.

He speaks of more or less irregularity and refers to the ice being driven into the eastern end of the straits by the northeast wind. I am anxious to emphasize this fact that the ice which causes our troubles, with which we have to contend, which the government steamers have to fight against and which the government have to deal with in trying to keep up continuous communication with the mainland, is not ice produced there, that ice does not originate in the straits or Pictou harbour, but to the north up towards Belle Isle and in the sea between Belle Isle and Pictou. It is brought down by the wind and is driven in as I say.

When the ice is packed as in this manner, it is almost impossible for a steamer to force her way through, as will be seen from the following from Admiral Makaroff's description of the voyage of the 'Ermack,' who found it easier to break the ice in the Polar seas with that vessel than in the Baltic, because in the Arctic seas the ice is broken, which in the Baltic is extended from land to land.

That is exactly a parallel case with what happened at the harbour of Pictou. As a matter of fact, Pictou with a northeast wind is simply an ice pocket or rather an ice bottle, in which there is a very tight cork, and I doubt very much if even a corkscrew could go through that cork. Admiral Makaroff, in describing the voyage of the 'Ermack' says:

Floes of ice might be several miles or several fathoms in length. Between the ice floes are the lanes, which are very irregular. Sometimes the ice-floes are pressed against each other and sometimes not. When the ice is not pressed, the progress of the ship is very easy. Floes of ice even nine miles long move away and give passage to the ship. But the fact is that even ice 14 feet thick cracks when charged by the ship, provided there is room to remove the broken parts.

There is where the whole question comes in. You must have room for the removal of the broken parts. A report was also made by Mr. Gobeil, formely deputy minister of Public Works. In the course of his report he says:

From an inspection of the charts it appears that the line from Pictou to Georgetown is where, probably, the ice masses in the greater quantity, and from the direction of the currents, is likely to remain a longer time to prevent the passage of the ferry steamer.

He adds, and this covers a great part of the opposition that may be offered to the change of route:

Of course there is a disposition always to accept whatever is as immutable, and in changing the establishment of anything that has become, worthily or unworthily, by lapse of time an institution, local prejudices will be met.

This will prove the great difficulty now, as, not unnaturally, there will always be opposition to a change, by the port or ports to and from which the service is now carried. This should not affect the question.

I think that the remark of Mr. Gobeil will be accepted as correct, that a matter of that kind should not affect the situation. If the service cannot successfully and continuously be performed on the route where it has been during the last 34 or 35 years from Georgetown, surely it is time to make a change and see if we cannot find a route somewhere else. In regard to Pictou I will also read from a report made by Mr. F. W. Hyndman, who was formerly an employee of the British government and who was a first-class hydrographer. He says:

In order that my remarks may be intelligently understood, it is necessary that you have two charts before you, one of the St. Lawrence and another of Prince Edward Island and the Straits of Northumberland. Both these charts are published by the Hydrographic Office, London, and can be had for a small sum at some of our stores in this city.

If you will glance at the chart of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and get your eye on Pictou, you will see at once that it is open to the northeasterly winds right up to the Straits of Belle Isle, a distance of some 250 miles. Those winds largely prevail in the winter and the consequence is that Pictou is merely a pocket for the drift and rafting ice of the gulf. Only two years ago——

That is five years ago.

—this was shown by both winter steamers on this route being tied up for fifty-nine consecutive days, leaving no means of transporting freight, and forcing passengers and mails to be carried across the straits at Cape Traverse in open boats, a distance of 8 to 10 miles, with much risk and great discomfort on all occasions, and no improvement on the means in use a full century ago.

I referred to one of the stoppages which have taken place there. In the winter of 1898 I was stuck at Pictou ten days and was kept there by a northeast wind which blocked the place with ice. Many other stoppages have taken place. I looked up the other day in the reports of the department to see the record of a few more of these stoppages and I found that in 1898:

The steamer entered upon the winter mail service on the 25th December. It was not considered prudent to continue the 'Stanley' on the Charlottetown and Pictou route; the steamer therefore kept up communication between Georgetown and Pictou until the 22nd of January, 1898, when the ship was hemmed in by heavy packed ice off Pictou island; in trying to get through between Pictou island and the ice jam the ship ran aground on the reef. After emptying the after-ballast tank the steamer was backed off without damage on the 23rd of January. The ice loosening up, the steamer returned to Georgetown, finding it impossible to get into Pictou. On the 24th January the steamer left for Pictou again, but could not get in. The passengers and mails were landed by ice boats. The mails were transferred to the Capes route on the 26th January. The steamer was jammed in the ice at Pictou from the 27th of January to the 2nd of February.

Again in 1901:

The winter service between Charlottetown and Pictou began on January 7, the 'Stanley' running in conjunction with the steamer 'Minto,' each boat making bi-weekly trips. On February 5, the 'Stanley' got caught in the ice off Pictou harbour and remained in the ice until February 20, and did not arrive at Georgetown until February 21.

Again, the same year:

Owing to the heavy ice in the harbour of Pictou between February 5 and 21, and also on account of the shoal water on the bar the steamer was unable to move out of Pictou harbour until February 19. This matter was made more serious by the fact that the steamer 'Stanley' was at the same time ice-bound six miles out of Pictou harbour.

Again, in 1902:

The service between the two latter places was begun on January 10. The service was fairly regular until February 12, when the 'Minto' was caught in heavy ice off the end of Pictou island and remained fast until February 15. She was then able to get into Georgetown.

In 1905:

In leaving Georgetown on January 25, 1905, the ice was found to be very heavy and the 'Stanley' returned to Georgetown, and although repeated attempts were made to force the steamer through the ice, it was found impossible to cross to Pictou until March 3, when the 'Stanley' forced her way to the Pictou ice barrier, and the passengers and mails were transferred over the barrier to the steamer 'Minto' two miles way. The 'Stanley' then returned to Georgetown. It was found impossible to make another crossing until March 16, when the ice barrier, off Pictou, was reached and the cargo transferred to the 'Minto.' On March 21, the 'Stanley' reached Pictou harbour.

I know about that because I was there.

On February 25, 1907, on a trip from Georgetown the 'Minto' was caught by a heavy ice-jam, in a strong gale and thick snow storm, and did not reach Pictou until March 2, and from that date until March 19 it was found impossible to reach Georgetown again, although several attempts were made. The return trip to Pictou was accomplished only on March 26.

Last year was a very good year, but even last year passengers left Georgetown on Monday and got back to Georgetown on the following Saturday. Several other cases occurred in which passengers were prevented for several days from getting across. I have gone into some detail with reference to this question because I wished to emphasize the fact, which I mentioned in my opening remarks, that our difficulties are due not to ice that is made in the straits but to ice that is driven down and fills up the harbour and straits. It is practically polar ice that is driven in there. That ice does not go through the straits. It is held up, to some extent, by Pictou island, and to some extent, by Cape Bear. Some of it passes these two points and is held up at Point Prim which is a long narrow point running out three or four miles from the Prince Edward Island shore. This polar ice does not get beyond that. In Charlottetown we have often complained, and complained without reason, of the steamer not getting backwards and forwards. We knew the condition of the ice in Charlottetown harbour and between Charlottetown and the mainland to be all right, but we could not see over Point Prim to discover what was there. We invariably found that the difficulty lay east of Point Prim where the ice was massed. You cannot judge of the conditions upon the state of the weather there. If you know the direction of the wind you may form an opinion. If it is northeast you may make up your mind that there is going to be trouble. After giving the Georgetown-Pictou route a trial for over a third of a century, and having proved successfully and absolutely that it is impossible to keep up winter communication by that route I do say that it is fair, it is right and that it is reasonable to

ask that some other route should be tried to find whether there is a possibility of keeping up that communication.

We believe, after years of experience, that we have the most simple and direct route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Efforts have been made to show that Charlottetown harbour is blocked up in the same manner as Pictou during the winter months, but that is absolutely incorrect, and the fact is that the channel route into Charlottetown harbour was never known to be blocked with ice. There are, of course, flats on both sides of Charlottetown harbour and points running out upon which the ice grounds and stays, but we never purposed running steamers over these flats or over these points. Our purpose is to navigate the deep and splendid channel between these points. I may say that the question of the ice in Charlottetown harbour has been investigated time and time again. Even since I brought the matter up in the House last session there are those who have insisted that the channel leading into Charlottetown is too narrow to make in winter. I have here a copy of the admiralty chart and it shows that where the main channel debouches from the deep water of Northumberland straits towards Charlottetown some three or four miles out the entrance to the channel between the eighteen-foot marks—on these admiralty charts—I believe they give the low water so that the figures I shall read are taken between the eighteen-foot marks—this shows that the entrance to the harbour on the outside is three and one quarter miles in width.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WARBURTON. When the House rose at six o'clock I was making some reference to the harbour conditions of Charlottetown during the winter season, and I proposed to make some references to the admiralty chart of the harbour, a portion of which, covering the entrance to the harbour, I have had copied. I may say that the soundings of which I propose to give the figures, were taken at the lowest spring tide, the lowest water to be found, according to the custom of the admiralty, so that the soundings will be accurate and safe, and a vessel cannot be misled in accepting them. At the extreme outer end of the channel extending from the harbour, where it breaks away from the deeper water of the straits, the measurement between the 18-foot lines—the two lines on opposite sides of the channel, where the minimum depth is 18 feet—the width across the channel is three and one-quarter miles. We are sometimes told that the entrance to Charlottetown harbour is so narrow that a vessel cannot make it in the winter time, or, some people say, at any other time, without special aids to navigation. Across the channel at that point the depth of water varies from the minimum of 18 feet on the one side to 21 feet, 34 feet, 34 feet again, 35 feet, 31 feet, and back to 18 feet on the other side. About two miles farther in other measurements were taken. There the channel passes between the island of St. Peter and Governor's island, which lie on either side of the entrance, but at some distance from it. From these islands shoal water runs out for a considerable distance; but there the width of the channel between the 18 feet lines is one and three-quarter miles; and any sailor who cannot make his way through a channel of that width ought not to be let off dry land. At that point the depth varies from 18 feet on one side to 26 feet, 34 feet, 32 feet, 28 feet, and back to 18 feet on the other side. Towards one side of the channel at that point there is the Fitzroy rock about which some trouble has been made. Some have said that it is impossible to navigate the channel with that rock there. It is not a very large rock, and I find that the lowest water over it is 20 feet at low spring tide, and the depth varies from that to 21 feet, 27 feet, 28 feet, 25 feet, 22 feet which shows that vessels could sail over it with perfect safety. At about three miles from that point the channel suddenly narrows off from the reef that runs about three miles from St. Peter's island and another from the mainland of Prince Edward Island, but even there it is three-quarters of a mile wide, and the depth of water is 72 feet. At a distance of another mile and a half the channel becomes one-third of a mile wide and there the depth of water is 57 or 58 feet. That width continues right to the mouth of the harbour between the Blockhouse light and the land on the other side. There, between the two points forming the entrance, which is the narrowest part, the channel is one-third of a mile wide, and between these two points there is deep water almost up to the shore, so that it would be almost impossible for any man to get out of his course there. At that point the water is 73 feet deep. From there the channel continues for a couple of miles to the basin of Charlottetown harbour on a straight line according to the range lights; and in it the depth of water varies from 73 feet to 77 feet. About half way to the wharf there is a short bend to the right, and then a straight line to the wharf. From the point where this change is made the channel continues of a uniform width of about one-third of a mile. Inside there is a large harbour of deep-water varying from 61 feet to 44 feet, and the wharf will

accommodate a vessel drawing 26 feet of water, while 100 yards from the wharf there is a depth of 58 feet. It is said that this channel gets filled with ice. To begin with, there is no wind that can drive ice into that harbour. We who have spent our lives at Charlottetown know that; but people who desire to deflect the vessel from her present course there try to make out that ice drives into the channel. The mere fact that the channel has a depth of 70 feet and has two inward and two outward tides every day, with a tremendous current which would prevent the ice getting very thick, is sufficient to convince any man that that channel could not get blocked with ice. At the narrow entrance at the Blockhouse light there is no difficulty, because the only ice to be encountered there is harbour ice, which is never more than from 18 inches to 2 feet thick, and the 'Earl Grey' will go through that at the rate of from six to eight miles an hour. The 'Minto' or the 'Stanley' going through such ice was a sight worth seeing, but this much more powerful ship goes through it at much greater speed.

We have taken the precaution for many years to have this thing tested, because I do not pretend to come before this House without being able to put the facts before you, which we have proved to be true. The board of trade in Charlottetown took measures to test this for a number of years, and they employed Captain John Gillies, an old experienced sea captain who has been residing in Charlottetown for a great many years, to make observations of the harbour ice, and of the channel ice, particularly of the channel ice leading into the harbour. I will read from a part of his report:

I have been asked by Mr. L. B. Miller, secretary of the board of trade here, to give a condensed report of the conditions of the ice in the Hillsboro' bay and Charlottetown harbour during the three years (winters) 1904-5-6 that I was engaged to make actual surveys of the same.

In each of the aforementioned years the surveys were made during the month of March, when it was considered the most ice would be found, and the hardest task to make the harbour.

I would call attention to the fact that that year was the year in which steamers could not get in and out of Pictou for 59 days.

From the reports submitted at various times the ice varied in thickness from 28 inches to 18, and the average ice in 'the ship's course' was 24 inches, covering from 7 to 9 fathoms of water.

While it is true the 'Minto' tried to make Charlottetown in March 1905, and got stuck off St. Peter's Island bar in a reported thickness of 15 feet of ice, it is equally true that I was almost immediately sent to make a survey and found, by actual measurement, there was only 5 feet where she stuck. I can account for the discrepancy in one way only: In my case the ice was measured, and in the other case it must have been judged from the bridge of the ship. Only one week after my survey was made and reported the 'Minto' made another attempt to reach Charlottetown and was successful.

In making the aforesaid survey, I found where the 'Minto' had stuck, there being 5 feet of ice and 9 fathoms of water. I then measured 40 yards from this spot toward St. Peter's island and I found 2 feet of ice with 7 fathoms of water, and 60 yards nearer the island I got the same thickness of ice with 5 fathoms of water, while at the block-house (entrance to the harbour) there was but 18 inches of ice.

This is a point I wish to emphasize, because that is the point made by those who are opposed to this route:

As the ice does not raft in this bay to any appreciable extent owing to the board ice and the prevailing northeast winds, it is my belief that with better aids to navigation there should be but little difficulty in making this a winter port, there being plenty of sea-room and water, and ships will have to centend with no running ice.

Again last year, although it was a mild winter, we had difficulty getting into Pictou harbour. There was no ice-breaker. The 'Earl Grey' was not ready, and this work was done by the old vessel. In some cases last year passengers got on board at Georgetown on Monday and were out all the week trying to get to Pictou and back to Georgetown on Saturday, without having reached their destination. The last time that occurred, passengers were delayed from three to five days, though the winter was a favourable one; there was not one day last winter in which those steamers could not have got in and out of Charlottetown harbour. Now, last year,—and I suppose it was done at my request—and in view of the fact that I had brought this matter up in the House, observations were ordered to be made, and the board of trade sent two master mariners to investigate, Captain John Gillies, whose earlier report I have already read, and Captain C. E. Myers, who has been living in Charlottetown for the last 15 or 20 years. On March 16 they made a report to the board of trade, of which the following is an extract:

Having been commissioned by you in your capacity as president of the board of trade, to secure data of the conditions of the ice between this harbour and Point Prim, we beg to report as follows:—

We began our survey of the ice in the harbour this morning, and found open water from Murphy's point (red buoy) to Trout point at harbour's mouth. At the latter place, in range with Brighton light ranges (ship's course), we found open water 12 fathoms deep. From that point we proceeded due south 100 yards with only 4 inches of

ice continuing on same course another 100 yards we found 6 inches of ice with 12 fathoms of water. We kept on the same course for 150 yards and found 8 inches of ice alongside a vein of open water in channel. We then made a circuit around the open water a disance of about 150 yards, estimated—the ice being too dangerous to carry us for actual measurement—and came in line with the range lights and again found 6 inches of ice with 11 fathoms of water. Proceeding 200 yards on the ranges (about south) we got 4 inches of ice and 10 fathoms of water. Continuing on ship's course seaward 200 yards we measured 5 inches of ice and sounded 11 fathoms of water. On the same course and distance we found 4 inches of ice and unsafe to take soundings. Ice from this point unsafe to continue in channel to St. Peter's Island bar, consequently we left the centre of the channel and proceeded to the east edge of same until we came to 6 fathoms of water and found 4 inches of ice. We continued on south by west in order to get into deeper water for a distance of 400 yards. Here the ice was parted in line with Lowther's point, south shore, and Pownal Head.

Those are two points 8 or 10 miles outside the harbour.

Beyond this it was unsafe to proceed any further for the ice was only 2 inches thick.

We found open water from the black buoy extending seaward past St. Peter's Island bar, Point Prim, and as far seaward as we could see with glasses.

From our survey we are in a position to state there is no ice from Point Prim to Charlottetown to hinder a steamer making this port. In fact, following the ship's course from the three tides out the ice mentioned in the foregoing report was of such a nature as not to present a serious obstacle to many of our summer boats.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does appear to me that these facts ought to satisfy any reasonable person that Charlottetown harbour is quite accessible during the winter season. I wish also to say something about the harbour across the straits at Tatamagouche, or Brulé. But first let me speak of the work that has been done this season. The 'Earl Grey' and the 'Minto' were put upon the route between Charlottetown and Pictou. The 'Minto' made the trip and changed to Georgetown. The captain of the 'Minto' could not be induced to get away from Charlottetown, but the captain of the 'Earl Grey' kept on the route—I crossed over with him myself. The ship passed backwards and forwards from Pictou, making the trip one way each day; she used to make the trip in three or four hours, and the last day in five hours. There was no difficulty whatever. On one occasion, on the 17th of January the 'Earl Grey' left Charlottetown intending to return. The harbour ice presented no difficulties, but when she got round Point Prim she struck, some miles down the straits, the Polar ice which had filled up the eastern end of the straits. The Polar ice does not drift past Point Prim. Point Prim is the farthest western point where that ice reaches. So once you are west of Point Prim you are sure to have water and ice conditions through which the vessel can go without much difficulty. But this time when the vessel was going to Pictou she got into this heavy ice and was stopped three times. She kept on to Pictou, and the captain was afraid to risk the new vessel without instructions, and decided to go to Georgetown next day. But he made that trip to Pictou notwithstanding the fact that he met this heavy ice east of Point Prim, and where he had to stop the boat and butt the ice three times. He had to go round the eastern entrance to Pictou, which lengthened the route to over 60 miles, and he did it in five hours. Captain Brown, the captain of the vessel, was empowered to make the effort again. I thought this matter of sufficient importance to Prince Edward Island for me to get such information with regard to it as I could, so I telegraphed and wrote to the secretary of the Board of Trade and to this same Captain Myers, who wrote the report a few years ago, asking particulars of the cause of the 'Earl Grey' being transferred to Pictou, when, I understood, the entrance to Charlottetown harbour, the harbour itself and the straits outside the harbour were in the best condition for the steamer to get through. The report I had here, indirectly, as I mentioned, was that the vessel had met with heavy ice. However, I thought it better to be definite. So, I wrote to Mr. Miller, the secretary of the Board of Trade. I now quote his reply so far as it relates to this matter:

I have taken considerable pains to ascertain the facts in connection with the sudden change in going to Georgetown and find the captain acted solely on his own judgment. When he left Charlottetown he intended returning, but when he got round Point Prim and down towards Wood Islands he met such heavy ice that even the 'Earl Grey' had to make three smashes to penetrate it. As it was a very cold day and the ice was making fast, the captain concluded it would be best to go to Georgetown. Under the circumstances, I do not think any person could blame him.

I agree with that.

To-day he is back again in Charlottetown, and may be depended upon to give this port a fair trial.

He came back to Charlottetown on the 25th having been away a week. And, from that time until now, he has been making his regular trip. And the 'Minto' has joined in the service and both are making the trip. And they will be able to make the trip so long as there is no continuance of northeast winds. We are liable to have an

east wind, which will fill up the eastern end of the straits and Pictou harbour, so that the vessels will again be unable to make their course. Captain Myers, the man who made the report and survey a few years ago, gives me as the reason the following:

The boat made the time to Pictou (from Charlottetown) in five hours, very good time for mid-winter, but she had to go round Pictou island at least fifteen miles further, the reason was that the ice was packed in Carribou channel, and between the Indian Rocks and Carribou the ice stopped the boat three times and was very much rafted together. She left here (Charlottetown) and never stopped until after she rounded Point Prim. The trouble all lies between Carribou channel on account of the scarcity of water and the ice around Indian Rocks, that lies straight across the straits. The boat could cross from here to Cape John any day since she had to leave here.

It seems to me that the reports of men who know what they are talking about, thoroughly sound and accomplished men, ought to carry weight and convince every reasonable man as to how matters stand in this regard. Before leaving Charlottetown harbour again, I wish to point out that, in order to make Charlottetown harbour, a perfect winter port, some effective aids of navigation must be provided. When the ice comes in the autumn, the buoys are taken up, so, when the ships come into the harbour, they have to depend entirely upon the lights. Again, in winter, especially when there is ice, there is at times a haze rising from the water, and this haze prevents the men on board the steamers from seeing the lights which are four or five miles away. What is needed in order to make the harbour accessible in any weather is a lighthouse on St. Peter's island bar outside of Charlottetown. This bar runs out from St. Peter's island, and is a sandstone bar, and at low tide there is a depth of five or six feet of water on it. There should be a light there and also a steam whistle. Once the vessel picked up the whistle or the light it would have no difficulty in getting into Charlottetown, because these aids to navigation will overcome the trouble arising from the haze. Of course, there is no difficulty at all so long as the weather is fair. These important aids to navigation are not required solely in the interests of the winter service; they have been looked for by shipowners and others for some time. I have here a copy of a memorial presented to the Charlottetown Board of Trade on this point. It is as follows:

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island,
February 9, 1909.

To the President and Council,
Charlottetown Board of Trade,

Gentlemen,—The undersigned master mariners and owners of sailing vessels sailing to and from the port of Charlottetown respectfully request your board to use its influence in having a lighthouse with a steam whistle attached—erected on the end of the bar extending from the east end of St. Peter's island—outside Charlottetown.

Now that very large steamers sometimes visit our port, this light has become a necessity, and if built with a steam whistle attached, vessels could make the harbour without difficulty, whereas at present, especially after the buoys are lifted, Charlottetown is an extremely difficult place to make, owing to this long bar.

Charlottetown has one of the finest harbours in the lower provinces, and is a superior and safe port for shelter. With the requested aid to navigation installed—lighthouse and steam whistle—it would not only facilitate ordinary trade, but would be of inestimable benefit to the shipping interests in stormy weather.

This is signed by a number of vessel owners and agents of steamship lines. I think this is sufficient with regard to Charlottetown harbour. The most likely harbour on the mainland coast would be situated in Tatamagouche bay. I cannot say whether it would be best to place it inside Cape John on Tatamagouche bay or the peninsula sometimes called West Brulé point; or it might be on the Tatamagouche side. My opinion is that in one of these sections you will find plenty of water on which to make a pier. After last session, being very much interested in this matter, I went over with some others to look at the bay. We sounded off Peninsular point at half tide and found 27 feet of water. Also we found deep water on the Cape John side and on the other side. When we spoke of this matter last year, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) said that he would take measures to have a survey made. He carried out his promise, and men have been there surveying the county to ascertain where the pier could best be built. To carry out the idea would require a pier and a short spur of railway. The Oxford branch of the Intercolonial is within half a mile of the Tatamagouche side and within three miles of the Cape John side. The pier would be, perhaps, 900 feet long. I do not think it would be more; 900 feet is what I estimated roughly. Again, if the line of railway were built through to Truro—and it has been mooted for some time and it will certainly be built—it would afford the most direct line, at a distance of from 30 to 32 miles, for a connection with the main line at Truro and with the Dominion Atlantic railway, giving the shortest route by 100 miles or more between Prince Edward Island and Boston and other eastern ports of the United States. If the government were to undertake the building of that line, it would seem the businesslike thing to do. But there is strong reason to believe that, if the government do not want to build it, the Dominion

Atlantic would be ready to do so. I believe that the Nova Scotia government would be ready to give a bonus of $5,000 a mile, and I am under the impression that the Dominion government would pay $3,200 a mile. There would be no difficulty in building the road, and there can be no question that, when running, it would increase the Dominion Atlantic receipts very much. The only question is whether it would not be wiser, as it is close to the Intercolonial and will connect at Truro, for the government to build a branch if it is to be built. However, that is a matter for them to decide, on which I do not propose to offer an opinion. Then at the mouth of Tatamagouche bay, almost exactly in the centre of a line crossing the mouth, is Amlet island, on which there is a lighthouse now. It is a small island, not much larger than these buildings. That lighthouse ought to be equipped with a steam whistle, and that I think would be all the additional aid required on that side. The more inquiry there is made about the Tatamagouche bay site, the more satisfied people must become that it is an ideal winter port. No wind that blows can block it; it is near the centre of the strait where the tide meets so that there is little fluctuation and the current is only about half a mile an hour; it is protected on the east by Pictou island, and by Cape Bear on the Prince Edward shore. On the north it is protected by Prince Edward Island itself. The western ice never gets up to the middle of the straits, it blocks at the western end. The western end of Prince Edward Island looks like part of the mainland; in fact, when Jacques Cartier discovered the island he sailed around there and not finding a harbour sailed back, he did not see where the entrance to the straits was, and did not know he had discovered an island. Then the western ice is never as heavy as the ice from the east that causes the difficulty at other places. Last year at the board of trade of the maritime provinces this matter was taken up, and after thorough discussion the following resolution was passed:

Whereas, the terms of union made and entered into between Canada and the province of Prince Edward Island in the year 1873, provided for continuous steam communication winter and summer, between the said province and the mainland.

And whereas, the routes hitherto in use by the winter steamers have failed to fulfil that condition—resulting in serious loss and inconvenience to the people of the province, and considerable loss to the Dominion by way of compensation for said non-fulfilment of the terms of union.

This board of trade of the maritime provinces desires to express its opinion that in justice to the province, as well as to the whole Dominion, an attempt should now be made by the new winter steamer 'Earl Grey' to solve the question of continuous winter steam communication, and recommend to that end that a complete survey of the approaches and possible pier sites in the Bay of Tatamagouche be made by the Dominion government without delay; and that if found feasible and practicable that route should be adopted hereafter, being considerably shorter in distance, and very much less liable to be packed with gulf ice than Pictou harbour, as found by actual and long experience of over thirty-six years.

That survey has been made and for that report among other papers, I am moving.

The officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries have taken considerable trouble in this matter; they sent their representative down to make a thorough and accurate survey of this section. His instructions were to survey only inside of Cape John, but I suggested to the department that while they were about it they should survey all around and I believe that was done.

In speaking of the summer route I shall not refer to the steamship service at the western end, between Summerside and Point du Chêne. They provided an excellent service and I do not know that any one has found fault with it. The Steam Navigation Company of Prince Edward Island have two fine steamers running between Charlottetown and Pictou and Summerside and Point du Chêne. But like many people who have been for thirty or forty or fifty years in one groove, it is hard to get them out of that groove. Forty-five or fifty years ago the summer steamer was run between Charlottetown and Brulé in Tatamagouche bay, but when the railway was built to Pictou she transferred from Brulé to Pictou to make connection with the railway which of course was the most sensible thing to do at that time. Had the railway been built to Brulé at that time, they would not have left Brulé, because it is more convenient. The Brulé route would shorten the distance materially. As we are now situated in summer it takes three days to get to Halifax and do a day's business and return, unless you leave Halifax at seven o'clock in the morning which is too early to do any business, you cannot get away until the next day, so that it takes three days no matter how short the business may be. Taking the other route it would be practicable to make two round trips a day between Charlottetown and Brulé. The distance is twenty-five miles while the distance to Pictou is fifty-four miles, and the distance on land is also somewhat shortened. By the present route from Charlottetown to Pictou and from Pictou to Halifax we have to travel 170 miles. Crossing over to Tatamagouche and going by Brulé, you cut sixty miles off that distance, making the trip 110 miles. It will at once be seen what a handicap this distance is. The service is not run to

accommodate our people at all, they have to stop at Pictou and other places and we do not think that this delay is right, fair or necessary. If the route I suggest is adopted for the summer steamers there would be no difficulty, with proper connections, in doing business in Halifax, which ought to be our principal winter port, within a reasonable time. I brought this matter to the attention of the Department of Trade and Commerce and also of this House last session, and pointed these things out to them. They brought the matter to the attention of the Steam Navigation Company. I pointed out that the reason there was so little trade and passenger communication with Halifax was that the means of communication were so poor that the transportation facilities were so bad and slow that we simply went elsewhere, and I thought it was in the interests of our friends in Halifax and along that line to back us up in getting an improvement made. I put down the smallness of the traffic then at Halifax to that fact of the deficient accommodation, but when the department applied to the Steam Navigation Company the secretary wrote and said it would not do at all as only 3 per cent of their passenger traffic was to Halifax. In other words they gave the reason why they did not do business as a reason why they should not attempt to do business. No business man who is alive and looking after his own interests would make that as an excuse; he might know that the reason he did very little business was that the facilities were not afforded. Give the facilities and the business will be done. That could almost be called a business maxim, improve the transportation and you will improve the trade. The Steam Navigation Company have splendid ships and do good work on their line, but you cannot get them out of their groove. They have a contract to carry the mails and carry them well, they treat you well on board and it is hard to say anything against them, but I am talking business.

They say there is no reason why they should make two trips a day backward and forward, and they say it is not required all the time. I think it is not required all the time, but it is required part of the time. They say that they have to take in freight and that it is impossible for them to make two trips a day each way. To a certain extent I admit that. There are certain times of the year when they are handling a great quantity of freight and therefore what they say at that time will be perfectly true. At that time we do not want them to make two trips a day. There is no passenger traffic in the spring and fall when the steamers are leaving Charlottetown and Summerside loaded down with freight, but, in the summer months, from June until the latter part of September, they have very little freight, and they are carrying a very large and rapidly increasing number of passengers. The passenger traffic on these boats during the summer months is such that the boats are absolutely over-crowded. The crowd is so great that it is almost impossible to get a seat. The saloons and every place where people can find standing room are crowded, but that does not last the whole season. We do not ask them to make two round trips in the spring and fall when the press of freight traffic is on, but all we ask them to do is to make two trips a day when the big passenger and tourist traffic is on. Not only has the passenger and tourist traffic increased rapidly, but it is bound to go on increasing. Prince Edward Island is becoming rapidly recognized as one of the most desirable summer resorts during the mid-summer months, the number of tourists last year was greater than ever before, and I expect that the number during the present year will be greater than that of last year. So that, as far as that contention goes, I think there is nothing in it. If, when tenders are next called for the carrying of the mails, and you give the companies the alternative of running between Brulé and Charlottetown and between Pictou and Charlottetown, the contention is set up that the companies find it impossible to give a good service between Brulé and Charlottetown, I will undertake to say that I will find a company to do it.

I understood from the minister before Christmas that it was the intention to send an inspector to Tatamagouche bay to inspect the ice conditions there during the present winter. I understand that a man is down there and I hope in the not distant future to have his report. I have gone into this matter somewhat exhaustively and at greater length than I had intended to, but I thought when I was about it that I would like to make a clear statement of the conditions as far as I was able to do it. I wish to refer to a statement I made last year about which I was hauled over the coals at a local election in Prince Edward Island and also in the press. I am not looking for the pound of flesh; I am not one of those who believe in the pound of flesh theory. It has been the custom for Prince Edward Islanders to look for the pound of flesh, or rather, for members who represented the people of Prince Edward Island, or papers who pretended to represent them, to insist upon their pound of flesh. It was not the true voice of Prince Edward Island and I do not propose to speak in that way. I think it is a poor way of going about this business. What I want to do is to take a fair and reasonable view of this matter. I believe that

anything that tends to the improvement of transportation between different ports of the Dominion tends to build up the Dominion, and I like to place anything in the shape of a public work on the principle of the general good of the country, not upon the principle of the pound of flesh, not upon any hard and fast, cut and dried resolution, but on the ground that it is going to be for the general good of Canada. Improvements in transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, while almost vital to us, are of very great importance to the people of the mainland. There is no part of Canada in which the merchants and manufacturers like better to sell their wares than in Prince Edward Island. Prince Edward Islanders have the reputation of being the best payers there are; they are the largest buyers per head and the farmers, taking them man for man, are the best off amongst the farming population of Canada. There are no wealthy men, there are no poor men, but they all buy and use manufactured goods. An enormous quantity of manufactured goods is sold and paid for in Prince Edward Island considering the population of the island. It is upon that ground and upon the ground of union and consolidation that I wish to place this matter before the House. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for taking up so much of your time, but I now close by moving the resolution which stands in my name.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I have not had the pleasure of listening to the long and interesting statement of the case presented by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton). Those who are interested in the advocacy of the cause which he presents cannot say that my hon. friend has not brought to bear upon his proposition a great deal of industry, a great deal of care and that he has not presented it with some elaboration. I do not propose to follow him through the various phases of the subject as he has discussed it, and there are one or two points only to which I would like to refer. My hon. friend has spoken of the fact that the boats of the Prince Edward Island Navigation Company do not give that service to the people of the island which is desired or which he thinks is in their best interests. I have taken occasion in a previous discussion of this question, to point out that the solution of the inconvenience which my hon. friend complains of would be arrived if by these boats, instead of running from Charlottetown to the mainland in the morning and returning at night, would start from the mainland in the morning and return there at night. The result would be, in so far as connection with Nova Scotia is concerned, that not only would the outside world be able to get on this tight little island very much more expeditiously than they now do, but the people there could get away from it and get back whenever they had business to do very much more satisfactorily than they can under the present arrangement. I am surprised that my hon. friend should once more undertake to entertain the House about this imaginary ice bar that forms in front of the mouth of the Pictou harbour. I was born in the little town of Pictou and have lived there some forty years. Only once in all the years during which communication has been maintained from that place with Prince Edward Island has an ice barrier existed there at the time of winter navigation. Since that accidental circumstance which occurreed some years ago hon. gentlemen in discussing this question have talked about as if it were a permanent and continuous obstruction that came as sure as the winter came. Any hon. gentleman who wants to make an argument for better facilities for Prince Edward Island, whether by increased facilities or a change of route, and who rests his argument upon the basis which has no existence in fact and which is an accidental circumstance which should not be used as the basis of any argument for a change in the conditions of affairs. The unfortunate thing for my hon. friend's proposition is that other hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island do not agree with him. I have not heard the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who come from the east of the island, but I venture the prediction that they will not agree with my hon. friend from Queens in the proposition that the present winter port should be changed and that a new and experimental route should be established between Charlottetown and Tatamagouche.

There are some things in my hon. friend's proposition which are worthy of consideration, but the government and the country would naturally expect that before conditions are to be changed there should at least be absolute unanimity on the part of the people who are making the request. At Pictou you have had for years large sums expended on terminal facilities. We have had facilities existent there for almost half a century, and an established trade, and before all that is abandoned there must be some good reason given for a large expenditure elsewhere. When the hon. gentleman talks about Tatamagouche and Brulé, those of us who live on the mainland, whose judgment is formed not by theory or on the strength of the accidental visit of a gentleman who goes over on a junketing excursion in the summer time know that it would cost $1,000,000 to the people of this country to provide at Tatamagouche and Brulé the facilities that

the hon. gentleman speaks of. The dredging that would have to be done to enable you to reach either of these points, outside of every other consideration, would be so vast that hon. gentlemen on the other side who sometimes think that the Minister of Public Works is very enterprising, would stand aghast at it. There is only one possibly feasible point on the mainland in Tatamagouche bay, with deep water and possible conditions, and that is Cape John. If my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) can induce the good people of Prince Edward Island, who are interested in this matter, to press for communication there in the summer time at least, before we make experiments in the winter, I would be glad to aid in anything that can be done in furthering a favourable consideration of that proposition. But, the proposition as advanced by my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) is one that should be approached with the greatest possible care. Communication between Charlottetown and Cape John is the only phase of the proposition made by my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) that is worthy of consideration or investigation, and that may be feasible. But there are difficulties in the way; difficulties with regard to expenditure and with regard to changing existing conditions, and these would have to be considered. The proposition to go to Tatamagouche bay or Brulé cannot be considered as a reasonable proposition. I would like my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) to get the people of Prince Edward Island to agree on his proposition before he attempts to dangle it before the eyes of the people of Nova Scotia. We on the mainland have practical knowledge of the conditions, and we would like to see some unanimity and consensus of opinion with regard to these suggestions in order that they may be fully and fairly considered, and in order that the country might look upon them as worthy of consideration.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (Cape Breton South). Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the House to the fact that as an inducement to Prince Edward Island to enter confederation, the parliament of Canada promised the people of that province continuous communication between the island and the mainland. For over 40 years the harbour of Pictou has been used as a port of entry from Prince Edward Island, but I would point out that Pictou harbour is open to the northeasterly gales which prevail during the spring months and is but a pocket for the drift ice which is carried from Hudson bay and the Arctic into the Northumberland straits. For the last 36 or 37 years the port of Pictou has been tried and found wanting. It was promised to the people of Prince Edward Island that under this administration the communication would be made at Brulé or Tatamagouche bay, the distance from which across the Straits of Northumberland is less than the distance by the present Pictou route. It must also be remembered that the tide flow at Brulé is considerably less, and that the drift ice cannot form as it does at Pictou harbour. As was pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Warburton) such is the formation of drift ice in Pictou harbour that in the winter of 1905 communication with the island was cut off for a period of 59 days. It is not alone the concern of the people of Prince Edward Island that there should be continuous communication by steam navigation throughout the year, because the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick are also interested. Prince Edward Island can produce all the meats and vegetables that are necessary to supply us, and we should naturally get our supplies from the island, but on account of the uncertainty of communication we are obliged to buy from Ontario during a large part of the year. But the supply is not continuous, the people of Nova Scotia are obliged to buy from the people of Ontario. There is no assurance that purchases made in Charlottetown or in Sydney for delivery during the winter months will be delivered, there being no continuous communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I wish to point out that the harbour of Pictou lies directly exposed to the gales of the northeast and to the flow of ice from the straits of Belle Isle, which retard the spring. This ice field, becoming embanked behind the island of Pictou, and in the Strait of Northumberland behind the island of Prince Edward, lies in such a way that the prevailing temperatures congeal it into hard ice; and I regret that the hon. member who moved this resolution did not press the question on the government as to how often the boat leaving Pictou was obliged to exchange its passengers with the boat leaving the island by reason of the formation of ice between the two. If the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) were present he would be able to point out to this House that so favourable was the Liberal government of Nova Scotia to the purport of this resolution that in the elections of 1906 such members of that government and supporters of it as the Hon., now Mr. Justice, Lawrence, and the Hon. B. F. Pearson, pledged themselves to insist upon the permanent route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland being by Brulé or the harbour of Tatamagouche, or they would resign their seats. They said that a line of railway constructed from Tatamagouche bay to the town of Truro would save passengers from the island to the mainland at least twelve hours. In view of the fact that the currents in Northumberland strait move in an easterly direction, and the fact that the dist-

ance between Georgetown and Brulé, although greater in miles, is in such a geographical position as to exclude the drift ice which comes down from the Strait of Belle Isle, it is up to this government to make an effort towards keeping their pledge by installing a steamer between Prince Edward Island and Brulé. At the time the province of British Columbia came into confederation the parliament of Canada promised it continuous communication by rail between the Atlantic and the Pacific. At that time there were only 11,000 people living westward of the Rocky mountains, yet the government of that time, under the late Sir John A. Macdonald, with Sir Charles Tupper as Minister of Railways, did not hesitate to make good their pledge to the people of British Columbia by securing the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway. Efforts were made from time to time by the late Conservative administration to connect Prince Edward Island with the mainland. It was hoped that this might be done by means of an ice-breaking steamship. The 'Stanley' was introduced. She has been tried and found wanting. Since that effort, which was a progressive effort on the part of the Liberal-Conservative administration, great innovations have taken place. It remains for this government either to grant a tunnel to the people of Prince Edward Island or to change the route for steamship travel from Pictou to another and more favourable route, which will maintain continuous steam communication between the island and the other provinces of the Dominion. In the province of Nova Scotia there are many consumers of such products as are produced on the island of Prince Edward. There are people who bring to Nova Scotia during the summer months, Prince Edward Island beef, eggs, butter and other farm products. These people would be glad to continue their patronage to the island during all the twelve months of the year; but this bar of non-continuous communication with the mainland prevents them doing so. If this resolution were given effect to, and if Tatamagouche bay instead of the harbour of Pictou were made the point of arrival, with a branch line of railway to the town of Truro, the people of Nova Scotia would consume, during the winter months, Prince Edward Island beef instead of Ontario beef, as they do now, and Prince Edward Island would be placed in a position that would enable it to compete with the western provinces of Canada all the year round.

Mr. L. E. PROWSE (Queens, P.E.I.). I desire to add a few words to the discussion of this very important question. It may not appear very important to other parts of Canada, but to the province I have the honour to represent, with my colleagues, it is a vital one. The transportation question for our farmers has been for many years a burning question, and I congratulate my hon. friend and colleague from Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. Warburton), on the diligence with which he has collected data, and the ability with which he has presented it to this House to-day. I was a little surprised to hear the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) say that after having lived in Pictou for so many years he had never seen barrier ice there but once in his life. Well, Sir, I can say for my part that I have waited outside Pictou harbour for a week or several days at a time, without being able to land. On one occasion the steamer was held in the ice outside Pictou harbour for fifty-nine consecutive days, and at that time it was estimated that the farmers of Prince Edward Island lost over $200,000 on their potatoes alone. They had large quantities of potatoes which they were obliged to leave in their cellars to rot; they could not ship them on account of the steamer being tied up by the ice. I admit that this government has made some honest efforts to improve our transportation facilities. But there is one thing that this government and no other government can do, and that is to change the conditions of the harbour ice. Of course I do not blame the hon. member for Pictou for defending his local harbour. I do not know of any representative in this House that works harder for his constituency than does that hon. gentleman. Sometimes we have to run up against him, because we think that he works a little too hard for the interests of Pictou and incidentally against those of Prince Edward Island. I am sorry the hon, gentleman is not present at this moment, because I do not want to say anything about him in his absence that I would not say in his presence. I was hoping that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would see his way clear this winter to have left the 'Stanley' there, so that a thorough test could be made of this new route, and that the government could have all the information they need as to the feasibility of this route. No doubt it would be a great advantage to the people of Prince Edward Island if this new route were adopted, because it would do away with the three short hauls which are now an obstacle to transportation. The freight costs almost three times as much as it does from Montreal. Let me give the House a few figures. From Montreal to St. John it costs ten and a half cents per 100 pounds for 735 miles. From Montreal to Halifax ten and a half cents per 100 pounds for 832 miles. From Montreal to Sydney sixteen and a half cents per 100 pounds for 977 miles. The regular rate on grain carloads from Tignish, P.E.I., to St.

John, is twenty-six cents per 100 pounds for 432 miles. From Tignish to Halifax it is twenty-three cents per 100 pounds for 309 miles; from Tignish to Sydney, twenty-six cents per 100 pounds for 308 miles. So you see that the farmers on the island are greatly handicapped on account of the excessive rates of freight. I believe that if this new route could be adopted there would not be any trouble. A company could be formed that would put a large car-carrying steamer on the route, and that would do away entirely with the three short hauls, because the large cars of the Intercolonial could be brought over and placed on the wharf and reloaded on island cars. This would be a great convenience to our population over present conditions.

Mr. A. L. FRASER (Kings, P.E.I.). The importance of this subject to my province justifies me in making a few remarks. Year after year this House has listened to a discussion of this question, and it is still necessary to recur to it frequently. While I am pleased to say that some progress has been made during the last few years in giving us better transportation facilities, much remains to be done in that line. I think if this government put forth a little more effort and paid a little more attention to this question than they have been doing, that without much expense they could considerably increase our transportation facilities. I will not say much as to the relative advantages of the different ports on the mainland, because I do not pretend to have as much knowledge of the Brulé route as those gentlemen possess who have made a special study of this question. But I want to tell the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who I see is not in his seat, that if there is one thing upon which the people of Prince Edward Island are united, it is in the opinion that the Pictou harbour is the poorest harbour on the mainland for winter navigation. Let the government make no mistake on that point. The hon. member for Pictou almost taunted us to-night because we were not unanimous upon any route; but we are unanimous in the belief that the Pictou harbour offers the poorest harbour for winter navigation of any that can be mentioned. Let the government take that much for granted. Then I trust they will go on and make a good survey, and obtain sufficient knowledge to enable them to give us a better harbour. This is not my opinion only. I have studied the records and the reports of the surveyors that have been sent down by this government and by other governments, and I find there is a unanimous expression of opinion from these surveyors in their reports that Pictou harbour, on account of its shape and its situation, is certainly the least feasible on the mainland for winter navigation. It is a V-shaped harbour, opening towards the northeast, and without any protection whatever. When the northeast and easterly winds blow the ice into that harbour, the whole harbour is blocked with ice, and navigation is completely stopped.

As to whether the people of Prince Edward Island are entitled to continuous navigation with the mainland, I do not think that question needs to be debated to-night. I was surprised on a recent occasion to hear the Minister of Finance, who I regret is not in his seat, though he seldom is absent, express the opinion that he did not believe it was binding on this government or on any government to give us continuous communication with the mainland. But I believe it is. The obligation is surely in our contract, and it would not be there if it was not meant to be valid. It surely must mean something or it would not be there, and if it means anything, it means that this government is obliged to give us continuous communication with the mainland in winter and in summer. A large percentage of the people of Prince Edward Island are united on this point also, that a tunnel will be the only complete and satisfactory solution of the difficulty. When this subject was before the House on a previous occasion, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) promised as much perhaps as he could in anything, that during the coming summer, or in the near future, and of the advisability and possibility of the tunnel would be thoroughly gone into. Speaking on behalf of those who have placed their hopes of the solution of this difficulty in the construction of a tunnel, I hope and trust that this government will, at an early day, make a proper survey of the Straits of Northumberland with a view to having a tunnel constructed if possible. This would obviate the difficulty we have in winter navigation.

Our difficulties of winter navigation are not our only difficulties. We have at present great drawbacks in our summer navigation. At present, the transportation of our mails and passengers and of a great deal of our freight is in the hands of a concern called the Steam Navigation Company. The people of Prince Edward Island, in the last few years, have become dissatisfied with the rates and with the service of that company. For my part, speaking as a passenger, I have no fault to find with the passenger service given by that company. But the rates charged and the facilities offered for transportation of freight are not up to date and not such as will satisfy the people. So that to-day a large percentage of the people of Prince Edward Island are thoroughly dissatisfied with the summer navigation of the Straits of Northumberland as conducted by the Steam

Navigation Company—almost as large a percentage as are dissatisfied with the winter navigation. And, as the hon. member for Queens county (Mr. Warburton) has said, I hope that when tenders are again called for, this matter will be earnestly considered by this government, with a view to giving the people better transportation rates and facilities.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) say, as I understood him, that the solution of the difficulty would be to send all steamers from the mainland in the morning and get them back in the evening. That, as I understood him, would solve the question of the navigation of the straits in winter.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. In summer. They do it now in winter.

Mr. FRASER. I cannot see how navigation could be made better, winter or summer by the steamers leaving one particular side every morning. I am aware that the government has spent a great deal of money in Pictou. No doubt it has inured to the benefit of the hon. member for that county. No doubt he is one of those who, in the last election, said to the people: See all the money I have got for the county; see what I have done for you. But that is not saying the money was spent all for the public benefit.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. member (Mr. Fraser) intimates that the money was not spent for the public benefit. I think I have a right to ask what he means by that. Has he any statement to make with reference to the money spent in Pictou or the results to the country?

Mr. FRASER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman undertook to say that the money spent in Pictou was not spent for the public benefit. Will the hon. member state to what expenditures he refers?

Mr. FRASER. I did not say it was not spent for the public benefit; I said that the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) himself received a great deal of benefit from it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. In what way?

Mr. FRASER. Politically.

Mr. JAMES W. RICHARDS (Prince, P.E.I.). The question of transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland is, no doubt, one of very great importance, not only to the people of the island, but to the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as well. The question of winter navigation has been so completely dealt with by my hon. friend from Queens, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Warburton) that I shall not repeat what he has said. There is no doubt that a great improvement has been made along these lines from the time when the 'Albert' was the only vessel on the winter route. We now have the 'Earl Grey.' With such improvements in the past, there is every reason to hope that there will be further improvement in the future. But we must take into account the fact that our province is an island and that it is surrounded with ice for a certain portion of the year. In some seasons we have much more difficulty in keeping up communication than in others. For instance, the present season is a very favourable one, and the winter steamers have been able to make their trips very regularly. But there can be no doubt that in the time to come we shall have severe winters, when possibly no boat ever built will be able to make the trip every day. With regard to the different ports that could be selected for the winter service, I am not prepared, for my part, to say which is best. My hon. friend from Queens has explained very fully the position of Charlotetown harbour and Tatamagouche. I have no personal knowledge of Tatamagouche bay, or Brulé, or whatever it is called. But, if that route, after investigation, proves practicable and the best route, I would not for a moment put any obstacle in the way of adopting it. The route that can be used most regularly and with the least difficulty is the best, not for one section only but for the whole province. It is true that we have had to fall back upon the Georgetown-Pictou route when other routes are abandoned. Georgetown is a very fine harbour. It is said that there is sometimes difficulty in entering Pictou harbour on account of the ice. I have no personal experience of this condition in crossing. But we have in the county which I have the honour to represent the harbour of Summerside, and many men in that town and in that county who are qualified to give an opinion about such matters, are firmly convinced that the best winter route is between Summerside in Prince Edward Island, and Cape Tormentine in New Brunswick. The distance there is no more than about seventeen miles, and at Cape Tormentine there is a pier which was built by the government of Canada.

The run is made very quickly, in something over an hour when there is no very heavy ice in the way. That route has never been thoroughly tested, but we have had the winter boat there at the close of summer navigation, and for some time afterwards, in order to take away the freight that had accumulated after the summer boats had stopped. I contend that that route has never had a fair trial and, as I have stated, men who have given the matter serious consideration and are qualified to pass an opinion are firmly convinced that that is the shortest, the most direct

and the surest route to make connection with the mainland. In 1909 the steamer 'Minto' was there for two or three days carrying frienght and passengers. It appears that the arrangement made was that the 'Minto' should join the 'Earl Grey' on the eastern route as soon as the summer boats ceased running between Charlottetown and Pictou. That was the understanding as stated by the Marine Department here, although some of my good friends in Summerside took the view that the steamer 'Minto' was to remain in that port for some time longer, until it would be necessary to abandon the Charlottetown Pictou route an go in the Georgetown-Pictou route. However, the boat coming there in the fall of the year, just about when the summer boats are obliged to lay up, is a great advantage not only to the county of Prince, but also to a large section of Queens county represented by my two hon. friends who sit beside me. I may state, on what I believe to be good authority, that nine-tenths of the freight from Prince Edward Island goes out of the port of Summerside in the summer months, and that if that route were fairly tested and found practicable there would be a large trade from that port in the winter. From Cape Tormentine there is a railway running up to Sackville some forty miles, and for people travelling to or from Montreal or western Canada that shortens the route very greatly as compared with the journey via Charlottetown and Pictou.

I might go on to show many reasons why that route should have a fair trial, because if it is feasible it is the shortest and the best and the natural route. Then I think some steps should be taken in in order to give it at least a fair chance when another winter comes. At any rate, in order to give us the transportation we need in the town of Summerside, we should have a boat there every year after the summer boats stop running in order to carry away the freight that accumulates there as it generally does after the close of navigation. We, particularly on the western part of the island, had hoped that the 'Stanley' which is a good ice breaker would have been left with us in the island this winter as we were anxious to have the different routes tested. We have two boats there now it is true, the 'Earl Grey' and the 'Minto,' but they are required on the service on which they are now engaged and there was a strong expectation that the 'Stanley' which was built as an ice-breaker would be kept there in order to test some of the new routes proposed, thus affording the Marine Department some trustworthy information as to the best route to adopt permanently. There was a considerable feeling of disappointment and regret that this boat had been taken away from the island service. However, the department in consequence of having, I think, lost a boat somewhere in the Bay of Fundy, found it necessary to take the boat there, but I do hope that another year they may either be able to send the 'Stanley' back to test these routes or give us another boat for the purpose. Our people are looking forward anxiously to having the different routes thoroughly tested with a view to deciding which is the best, and, having found that, to stick to that route. I do not think, as I said before, that in very severe winters with the heavy ice coming in from the north, we can keep up regular communication by boat. To my way of thinking the only plan by which continuous communication can be kept up throughout the year is by the construction of a tunnel. We are looking forward to the day, and I hope it is not far distant. when we shall have a tunnel. At any rate we expect that we shall have a survey for that purpose in order that our people may know whether or not the tunnel can be built at a reasonable cost, at such cost as we think we would be justified in considering as a not extravagant price or one beyond the needs of the trade and resources and importance of the business from Prince Edward Island. We are anxious to have this matter taken in hand in order that that great question may be settled and after that is done our people will be satisfied. They will then say if the surveys prove it: This work is going to cost us more than we have a right to expect or there may be such difficulties in the way that it is not practicable to build it at anything like a reasonable or moderate cost. I am quite in sympathy with my hon. friend from Queens in bringing this matter so fully and prominently before this House, because I can assure you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House that this question of transportation is a very live question in the province of Prince Edward Island. For a small province, the products are very large, not only in the agricultural line but in the fishing business and in the export of sheep, horses and cattle and other commodities. We feel that although the government has done a good deal in giving us a new winter boat and all that, yet something further can be done in order to meet our transportation needs, and I hope and trust that out of this discussion something will come that will help to improve the conditions as regards transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of Canada.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM (Antigonish). Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up the time of the House in discussing this matter. As a matter of fact, I had not anticipated taking any part in the discussion, and would not

but for some observations that were made. I desire to call the attention of the government and of the House to the fact that there is still another route that has not been emphasized by hon. gentlemen who have spoken, a route that I claim will furnish a solution of the whole difficulty. It is idle to say that there is no grievance, that the people of the island are satisfied. All one has to do is to look at the 'Hansards' ever since Prince Edward Island became a part of confederation and he will find year after year complaint on the part of the people of the island because of the treatment they were receiving in the matter of winter communication particularly. In the mass of information that was brought down last session, the session before last and in previous sessions, you will find resolutions of the Charlottetown Board of Trade, of the Maritime Board of Trade, of the Halifax Board of Trade, of the legislature of the province of Prince Edward Island, all bemoaning the treatment that Prince Edward Island was accorded in the matter of communication. The difficulty should be easily solved. It is a question of what is the best route, of ascertaining which is the most feasible route to maintain communication. Several routes have been tested. The Capes route, to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Prince, has been tested and has been declared to be 'a political and not a practical route.' There was a great deal of information brought down two years ago in reference to that route. Tests were made in the winter seasons of 1901, in 1902, and in 1903, and after it was tested the route had to be abandoned. Then, you have in summer time, the Charlottetown and Pictou route. When navigation closes, Charlottetown has to be abandoned, and it struck me as rather extraordinary when I heard my hon. friend from Queens advocating the Charlottetown-Brulé route. If the Charlottetown-Pictou route has to be abandoned as soon as winter opens, how is the Charlottetown-Brulé route going to meet the requirements? If Charlotteown is not available as a winter port, then I contend that connecting it with Brulé or Tatamagouche bay, is not going to better the situation.

Mr. WARBURTON. The northern ice that is driven down the straits by the northeast wind is stopped up short at Point Prim, ten miles east of Charlottetown, and it does not interfere with the Charlottetown route.

Mr. WM. CHISHOLM Yes; but as I read the documents that have been brought down upon this subject, they state that Charlottetown is not a good winter port. On the contrary, it is very much the opposite. It is approached by a long, winding, narrow channel, and although they have spent a great deal of money in the way of improvements and aids to navigation, and have done a great deal to improve Charlottetown harbour, it is conceded on all sides that Georgetown is the only winter port on the island. It is true that this year they have been running between Charlottetown and Pictou late in the season, and perhaps up to this date, but at any moment Georgetown is liable to be substituted for Charlottetown. Every one admits that Georgetown is one of the best harbours in Prince Edward Island. No one has every thrown any doubt upon the fact that Georgetown is open the whole winter long. The winter port on the island side is Georgetown. What you want to do is to test the various routes suggested by speakers on this subject and adopt whatever route proves to be the best. I submit that as far as Brulé, or Tatamagouche bay, is concerned, we have not very much to hope for there because the conditions, if I understood the Minister of Marine last year aright, are very much the same as those which are found in Pictou harbour, and it would take an immense amount of money to have piers built and provide the accommodations that will be necessary, and even then it is very doubtful if a satisfactory winter route can be found. There is, however, another route, the route which I suggest, and it is the Georgetown-Cape George route. This is a most desirable route by reason of the fact that there is plenty of sea room, and by reason of the condition of the tides and currents between Georgetown and Cape George ensuring open water all the year round. Three years ago, some time in March or April, when Pictou harbour was blocked for about ten days and was inaccessible, a schooner laden with coal went from Hastings across to Georgetown, and I am told by sea captains and people who have spent all their lives along the coast, that Cape George has at all times open water. Two years ago when the ex-member for Kings, Prince Edward Island, was coming up here to Ottawa he was detained five or six days at Pictou harbour, while there was no difficulty about landing along the coast near Cape George. This is not a new route. This was suggested as far back as 1874 by the hon. member representing Kings at that time (Mr. McIntyre). He stated, what is generally conceded in the locality, that there is always open water between Georgetown and Cape George. During that same session the then member for Antigonish county (Mr. McIsaac) pointed out that to his own knowledge, passengers had been landed at Malignant Cove, Arisaig and Cape George, when they could not get near Pictou. I know that a few years ago, when Pictou harbour was inaccessible, they had

to land their passengers and mails somewhere near Cape George. I wish to direct the attention of the government to the necessity of properly testing this Georgetown-Cape George route, and if it is found to be what we claim for it, by all means adopt it. A promise was made by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a letter to me, dated November 3, 1905, that this route would be tested at the proper time. I had a similar promise from the present minister, whose absence we all regret, in a letter dated the 28th August, 1906, in which I called his attention to the rumour in the newspapers that there was a test to be made of the Brulé route. He promised then that he would see that the Georgetown-Cape George route was tested when the proper time came. In view of what has been done in the way of surveys of Tatamagouche bay, I think the time has come when the promise of the minister should be taken seriously to heart. Representations have been made regarding the proposed route on the floor of this House time and again, almost as far back as 1874. These representations were made by the member for Kings to whom I referred, by the member for Antigonish, my predecessor, and by his predecessor. I think that these representations and the representations made by me to the department verbally and in writing are sufficient to justify a test being made, and I hope as I sincerely believe the government will carry out the promise that was made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his predecessor and have this test made as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—CO-OPERATIVE LOAN AND CREDIT BANKS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I would like to ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it would not be possible to give a second reading to Bill (No. 26) on Co-operative Loan and Credit Banks. The reason I am asking this is that throughout the course of the discussion on the first Bill presented respecting co-operation, the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) will remember, that there was no objection whatever as to the feature of co-operation. There was strenuous objection to productive and distributive co-operative societies, but no objection was made at any stage of the Bill to small banks, and loan and credit societies. Under these circumstances this year I presented a Bill for the purpose of legally organizing loan and credit societies feeling certain that upon that feature at any rate there would be no opposition whatever. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) has presented a general, comprehensive co-operative Bill which, I understand, is opposed by certain interests, but there are no interests whatever that have any such opposition to these credit banks. They have been approved of by the bankers association. Under these circumstances and as that feature of co-operation has developed very much in the province of Quebec principally, and as there has been no objection to the first Bill in regard to that particular aspect of it. I think my request commends itself to the right hon. the Prime Minister. If my Bill were read a second time now and even a third time, if possibly there is any opposition, it might be offered in the Senate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand it is the wish of the House that this Bill should be considered, I have no objection at all that it should be read a second time and submitted to the committee, I cannot agree that it should be read a third time because I know there are some persons who want to be heard in opposition to it. I withdraw my motion that the House adjourn.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) respecting co-operative credit societies.—Mr. Monk.

Bill (No. 50) respecting co-operation.—Mr. Monk.

On the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, February 8, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

On the orders of the day being called.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear a statement in the report presented to the House in reference to the estimate of the Hudson Bay railway project. Hon. gentlemen will have noticed that although the amount for elevators, docks, &c., appears in the items, it does not appear in the totals. In order to make it clear I wish to put the following statement upon 'Hansard':

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY SURVEYS.

Churchill Route.

Railway construction..	$11,351,520
Railway shops and accessories.. ..	7,757,152
Port work..	6,675,000
	$25,783,672

Nelson Route.

Figures are shown as $16,426,340 and should read:—

Railway construction..	$ 8,981,800
Railway shops and accessories.. ..	7,444,540
Port work..	5,065,000
	$21,491,340

FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION RE COMPANIES.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention of the government to refer the Insurance Bill which is now being considered by the Senate to the Supreme Court in order to obtain a decision as to its constitutionality? There was a rumour to that effect when a judgment was rendered by Mr. Justice Leith at Montreal a couple of months ago in the case of King vs. Witlis, Fabre & Company to the effect that that legislation was unconstitutional. It seems that it would be an advantage to find out the opinion of the highest court on that subject before we go more fully into the study of the proposed Act.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the interesting question to which the hon. member has called your attention is but one phase of a larger question as to the powers respectively of the Dominion parliament and of the local legislatures in regard to the incorporation of companies. That question was not long since raised for the decision of the Supreme Court, and the members of that court differed among themselves very decidedly in the opinions they expressed. The question being of such large practical importance, communication was had from the department of which I am in charge with the Attorneys General of the various provinces with a view to arriving, if possible, at some means by which these difficult and very weighty questions of the construction of the British North America Act may be definitely settled. That correspondence has resulted in a proposition from several of the provinces that a conference on the subject be had between representatives of the provinces and representatives of the Dominion government and such a conference is being arranged for. Communications are now being addressed to the various lieutenant governors of the different provinces proposing a meeting of representatives of the provinces and of the Dominion government to discuss the whole subject, not the mere question of insurance legislation but the larger one as to the right to incorporate companies in the provinces and in the Dominion respectively.

THE NATIONAL ANTHEM.

Mr. BURRELL. As the naval debate is to be resumed to-day I beg to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the following paragraph in the Toronto 'Globe' of February 4, referring to the Prime Minister's speech:

Its conclusion was marked by the inspiring spectacle of the whole House rising and singing the National Anthem.

The House knows that the inspiring spectacle referred to took place at the conclusion of the speech of my friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I am not saying for one moment that this statement was sent out intentionally, but in view of the fact that it was given prominence not only in the recognized organization of the Liberal party but also in the Hamilton 'Times', the St. John 'Sun'. the St. John 'Telegraph', the Halifax 'Chronicle', the Montreal 'Daily Herald', the Belleville 'Daily Ontario', the London 'Advertiser', the St. Thomas 'Journal' and the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and in view also of the fact that the Prime Minister was very severe last session on the immorality of false telegrams, I think I am voicing the sentiment of everybody on this side, and I am sure also of many on the other side, when I say we should be glad to have some little statement from the right hon. gentleman.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not understand what my hon. friend means. What have I to do with that?

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. CROSBY. I find in the Ottawa Evening 'Citizen' of February 5, a statement made, at Hamilton, Ontario, on the 4th of February, to the Trades and Labour Council.

A letter was read from Hon. Mackenzie King, stating that he had not moved postponement of government action in regard to technical education, but the protest came from the opposition.

I want to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) how that letter came to be put in that shape in view of what had taken place in that debate, and of the fact that he himself moved the adjournment of the debate on that occasion.

Mr. KING. I have written no such letter. I should be pleased to lay before the House any letters I have sent to the Hamilton Trades and Labour Council. I take it that the hon. member (Mr. Crosby) is reading from a press report which does not

do justice to any communication I have sent.

Mr. CROSBY. Is the report I have read wrong?

Mr. KING. Yes.

THE EDWARD MEDAL—HEROISM OF CONDUCTOR REYNOLDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to point out to the government that by warrant under the Royal Sign Manual of the 13th day of July, 1907, His Majesty created a new medal to be entitled the Edward medal to be awarded for heroic acts performed by miners, quarrymen and others who endanger their own lives in endeavouring to save the lives of others from perils in mines and quarries. And, by a further warrant, under His Majesty's Royal Sign Manual, on date of 1st of December, 1909, it is provided that this medal shall be awarded to those who, in the course of industrial employment, endanger their own lives in endeavouring to save the lives of others from perils incurred in connection with such industrial employment. I would ask the government whether this medal can be awarded to those who perform acts of heroism in saving the lives of others who are engandered in connection with the work of the railways of this country? The reason why I ask is that a very notable act of heroism has been performed by a conductor of the Canadian Pacific railway, Conductor Thomas Reynolds, who, at the risk of his own life and with unexampled courage, succeeded in saving the lives of nine others who had been imprisoned in the dining car which fell into the river and through the ice in the recent accident on the Sault line. If this medal could be awarded in connection with such acts of heroism, I earnestly hope that the government will bring Mr. Reynolds' signal heroism to the attention of the imperial authorities.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure that hon. members will agree that, if any are entitled to medals for heroism, Conductor Reynolds stands at the head of their number. There is a society which generally looks after these things, and calls the attention of the government to acts of heroism. As soon as we have received such recommendation, we shall be glad to call the matter to the attention of the proper authorities.

ALLAN STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. CROSBY. On Friday last, I asked a question with reference to the line of Atlantic steamers running via Havre, calling at Halifax. The first minister promised me an answer on Monday. I desire to ask if he has that answer?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have the information for my hon. friend. I have to inform him that, under the contract with Messrs. H. & A. Allan for the Canada-France service, the call at Halifax or St. John is optional with the contractors. Recently, however, to meet the view of the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Halifax Board of Trade, the Allans advertised calls at that port on eastbound voyages for the remainder of the winter season in order to carry forward lobsters and such other export traffic as might offer. Such call, however, is contingent on there being something to carry. With reference to westbound voyages, the Allans claim there is little or no westbound freight offering for Halifax; but they state that should there be a reasonable amount of westbound freight offering to at least pay the cost of such a call, they will make a call at that port; but that at other times, should they have any freight for Halifax but not sufficient to warrant a call at that port, such Halifax freight will be forwarded from St. John without further charge.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden, and the amendment to the amednment of Mr. Monk thereto.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). In rising to address the House on a subject of such vital importance to Canada, involving, as it does, not only our present status, but our future relation to the empire, I believe, upon the conclusion of this debate, we will have reached and passed an epoch marking mile-stone in the history of the Dominion of Canada; and I believe that it is our bounden duty, our paramount duty, indeed, to consider not only whether the Bill before the House meets the requirement of the naval defence of Canada, but also whether it will tend to lead either to the consolidation or disintegration of the empire. A word or two first with reference to the question of militarism. I desire to place myself on record as not being in any manner a champion of the spirit of militarism. The question we are considering is simply a question of defence; it is not a question of aggression; it is not a question of doing anything towards the acquisition of territory; it is purely and simply a question of strengthening the central armament of the empire, for the purpose of preserving peace as we have had it preserved during the last hundred years. And I make the statement that, the supremacy of the British navy, the unchallenged supremacy of that navy, has been the cause of our peace

for over a century. We know that peace has been the constant and devoted companion of Great Britain's supremacy on the sea of time for the greater part of a century; and we know that so soon as the supremacy of Britain upon the seas is menaced upon the international horizon appear war clouds and rumours of war. We know that because of the threatening of that supremacy through the naval progress of the greatest military power in Europe to-day, we have, for the first time, the threatened Armageddon. We have New Zealand making a magnificent offer of a Dreadnought' ; we have Australia contributing to the empire a unit of the imperial navy. And it is because of these circumstances that we to-day are considering the question of naval defence. So, in speaking of this matter, in defending any form of naval defence, I am doing it because I believe that in strengthening of the forces of the empire we are maintaining the peace not only of the colonies of Britain, but of the nations of the world. It has been the expressed policy of British statesmen, time and again, that the object of their navy is not for territorial aggression or anything of that kind, but simply for the preservation of peace. I would like to read to the House the words of the British Foreign Secretary, spoken last June before the imperial press conference to show what the foreign policy of Great Britain is on this question. Sir Edward Grey said:

> And I would say this: the foreign policy of this country is to keep what we have got, to consolidate it, and develop it, to quarrel as little as possible with other people in doing so, and to uphold in the councils of the world in diplomacy those ideals in every part of the world by which we set so much store at home.

This is nothing more or less than the policy of, 'what we have we'll hold.' And I think we are quite justified in contributing in some measure to a policy of that kind.

The first question that occurs to one is what have we to hold? We have, I think I am safe in saying, an empire unrivalled in the history of the world. It is an empire of 400,000,000 souls, that is to say one-fifth the population of the globe; an empire that covers 12,000,000 square miles, or one-fifth the area of the globe. Of the entire population, 60,000,000 are Anglo-Saxon; 44,000,000 reside in the 'little isles in the foggy sea,' and 16,000,000 are scattered throughout the colonies of the empire. And, of the whole territory of 12,000,000 square miles, only 120,000 square miles are comprised within Great Britain itself. In that respect it is entirely different from all other empires of ancient or modern times. It is an empire of all climes, of all races, of all classes, of all creeds, of all longitudes, of all latitudes, of all seas, and in that respect it is entirely different from any of the empires of ancient or modern times. The Macedonian empire, the Assyrian empire, the Roman empire, the Russian empire and all other great empires were contiguous and continuous. Their geographical position was such that an army could be landed on one portion of the empire and could march to any other portion. How different it is with the British empire to-day, which is divided by so many seas. But notwithstanding the fact that it is separated by these seas, there is no doubt that the various portions of the empire to-day are four or five times nearer to Great Britain than they were a hundred years ago, because time and distance have been almost annihilated by reason of present facilities of intercommunication in the shape of steamships, telegraphs, cables, wireless telegraphy, and probably in a short time, by reason of an aerial communication. For these reasons then we have the more cause for upholding that which is the all essential to the preservation of the empire, namely, naval supremacy upon the sea. Now, I make this formal statement that the existence of the British empire and of all her colonial dependencies depend upon the actual supremacy of the British navy upon the seas.

We are apt to forget what it is costing Great Britain to maintain that supremacy, we forget it because we do not pay a single cent towards the maintenance of that supremacy, either on land or sea, although we obtain all the advantages, and all the benefits and all the prestige and protection which we would obtain were we citizens of Great Britain herself. We are apt to forget, I say, what it is costing the mother country to-day in order to maintain that supremacy. Take the case of the British navy. What is Great Britain paying to-day for the maintenance of her navy? I think the annual naval estimate for 1910 is $75,000,000, that is $480,000 for every single day of the 365 days of the year. Now, I maintain that we, as a colony of Great Britain, are getting the advantage and protection of that expenditure of money just as fully and just as effectually as any citizen of Great Britain herself, and we are not contributing one cent thereto. In addition to that, she is maintaining a great standing army which is costing her $430,000 a day. It may be said, perhaps, that we do not get the same benefit from that army as do the citizens of Great Britain herself. But we must remember that it is the British navy that bears the British army upon its back; and if we were attacked in Canada by any great power, say that of the United States, for instance, we could depend upon the British navy to bear the British armies to our defence. So in that respect, without the supremacy of the British navy, the British army is of

no practical use to this country. With the supremacy of the British navy we receive the same benefit from her army as any other portion of the empire or as Great Britain herself. Moreover, it is a matter of history that for the last 150 years, all the wars which Great Britain has fought have been fought across seas, and its troops have been borne across seas on the back of the navy, and all this money and treasure have been expended in fighting the battles of distant portions of the empire.

We do not lack for illustrations of that. We have seen Great Britain send out into Persia an army for the purpose of relieving certain of her citizens who had been maltreated and imprisoned by the Persian emperer. When Canada herself was faced by the first rebellion in the Northwest, Great Britain sent out a body of troops wholly at her expense for the purpose of suppressing that rebellion. We know that when the rights and privileges of a certain number of citizens in South Africa were menaced, Great Britain did not hesitate at once to send out an army of 300,000 men from her shores; with the assistance and by means of British naval supremacy the navy was able to carry upon its back that army of 300,000 men, and to protect the ships and transports bearing provisions for them into South Africa. Of those troops, 18,000 never came back, and 65,000 or 70,000 bear to-day upon their persons the scars of that war; and not one cent was contributed before that time by South Africa towards imperial defence. Now, Sir, we know that Great Britain would do exactly as she did in South Africa in case Canada were menaced in like manner; in other words, we would receive the benefit of the army and navy upon which she expends over $900,000 a day for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the empire of which Canada forms a part.

Now let me illustrate that in another way. Supposing you went into the office of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, and you wanted to know what that war in South Africa has cost. You look upon the credit side, and you see a precedent created that, no matter where a British subject is found, once his rights have been invaded, Great Britain will at all costs fly to his rescue. On the debit side you will find 18,000 men who have lost their lives, and you will find throughout Great Britain many a hearth and many a home that now

Long for the touch of the vanished hand,
Asd the sound of the voice that is still.

You will find in addition to that, 65,000 or 70,000 men who went out to fight the battles of the empire, bearing upon their person the imperial phylacteries of devotion and loyalty to the motherland. You will find in addition that, in the office of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the debit side, a war costing $1,000,000,000, and you will find the Chancellor of the Exchequer raising at three per cent $30,000,000 every year for the purpose of paying the interest on that part of the national debt incurred by the South African war. Is that not a proof that we would derive the same benefit, and would derive the same material assistance, were national complications to arise between Canada and any foreign nation? We have that precedent of British assistance in South Africa, and we have the right to assume that she would do the same thing for Canada.

Then, if we consider the matter from a totally selfish and material standpoint as it affects our own country, what do we find? We have here a coast lying on the Atlantic and on the Pacific oceans wholly unprotected. We have a number of thriving cities upon those two coast lines, wholly unprotected except by virtue of the supremacy of the British navy to-day. We enjoy the advantage, the prestige and the protection of all the diplomatic and consular service throughout the world, and it is unnecessary to say that such service is the greatest in the world. We know that Great Britain is paying to-day over $3,000,000 a year for her diplomatic and consular service alone, and we are getting the benefit of that as effectually as any other citizen of the British empire, while not contributing one cent towards it. Now, I make this broad statement, that Canada is rapidly growing, and as the increase in her commerce is going to be to a large extent an increase in her natural products, and as in that respect Canada will have a surplus of agricultural products, and as that surplus would go, not to the United States, but to countries beyond the seas which cannot now raise enough agricultural products for their own needs, it follows that as our trade increases, and as our export of agricultural products increases, the surplus for export must cross the seas, and in order to protect that vast commerce, we must have the supremacy of the British navy. The whole question resolves itself into this, that an invincible imperial navy is nothing more or less than an insurance policy insuring every portion of the empire against the contingency and horrors of war, and is a guarantee to each part of the empire of its peace, progress and prosperity.

Now let me say a word or two in reference to the speeches of the Right Hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). As to the character of the speeches, were I to look upon them from the standpoint of eloquence and rhetoric, I would say that they were par excellence. Both of these hon. gentlemen read quotations and extracts from the speeches of many eminent politicians, statesmen and

ecclesiastics. No doubt they did this for the purpose of suiting the political exigencies of these hon. gentlemen in various parts of the country. I do not know that it was necessary to go back and read these quotations from these gentlemen, many of whom had been dead for generations, some of whom have been dead for centuries, and I think it was rather a rude thing that they should go back and disturb Peter the Hermit from the peaceful hermitage where he has so long slumbered. What had all this to do with the question at issue? The question at issue is whether Canada, by reason of its position in the empire to-day, or by reason of the impending difficulties and necessities which beset the empire, is going to make a contribution to imperial defence, and, if so, what is to be the manner of making that contribution? Upon that aspect of the case I say that the precedents which the First Minister and the Postmaster General have quoted are wholly irrelevant to the matter at issue, because the matter at issue is simply the question of a voluntary gift by this government to the mother country for the purpose of assisting her in the difficulties which have beset her, and there is no constitutional authority which has anything to do with the question of whether we choose to make a gift to the mother country for the purpose of strengthening our national defence. I see upon the order paper a resolution authorizing the government to make a grant of $50,000 to the city of Paris for the purpose of aiding those who have suffered by reason of the recent flood which has taken place in that city. With that I am quite in accord, but why would it be necessary for any one to get up and cite constitutional authorities as to whether we should or should not grant to the city of Paris something to relieve the present situation? Yet, such an argument would be on all fours with the argument put up by these hon. gentlemen in regard to the navy.

But, I would not have found so much fault with the speeches of these hon. gentlemen, and especially with the speech of the right hon. the First Minister, if the right hon. gentleman had confined himself to what was the policy of his own party, though, no doubt, there was great reason to find fault with that. What did the First Minister say? He said:

> This policy is in the best traditions of the Liberal party. This policy is the latest link in the long chain of events which followed from the principles laid down by the reformers of the old times, Baldwin and Lafontaine, which, step by step, stage by stage, have brought Canada to the position it now occupies, that is to say, the rank, dignity and status of a nation within the British empire.

He was not satisfied with that, but further he went on to say:

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

I am bound to say at the same time that it has been censured and criticised—severely censured and severely criticised—by those who within the party boast of their imperialism, who carry abroad upon their foreheads the imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty.

The right hon. gentleman has been leading the Liberal party for about twenty years, and had the policy which he has advocated been carried into effect it would have led us, according to the right hon. gentleman, to the position we occupy to-day as the first colony in the British empire, the brightest jewel in the British Crown! Well, I think that the right hon. gentleman, having made this statement, it is only fair and just to this side of the House that I should see whether the policies which he heretofore advocated would have led us to the position we occupy to-day. I do not need to go back a century, I do not need to go back more than twenty years, it is within the memory of the youngest member of this House, to compare the policies which the right hon. gentleman has enunciated within the last twenty years with the position we occupy to-day. Less than twenty years ago the right hon. gentleman advocated several distinct anti-British trade policies. The right hon. gentleman first advocated continental freedom of trade, then unrestricted reciprocity, and then commercial union. We all remember that upon the platforms of this country the right hon. gentleman said time and again: Place me in power and I will give you continental free trade, unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union. We know that if the country had taken him at his word and placed him in power we would have had either commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. It goes without saying that had the right hon. gentleman thrown down the customs barriers which then existed and which exist now between this country and the great nation to the south of us, the first step would have been commercial union, and the next step would have been political union. During all that time, while these anti-British policies were being advocated by the right hon. gentleman and his followers, the Conservative party, led by that grand, old, patriotic, loyal chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, said: We will have none of it. Sir John Macdonald consistently and persistently argued and preached the gospel that the destiny of this country was inseparably bound up with that of the motherland. It was upon that policy, upon that issue that he uttered those famous words: A British subject I was born, a British subject I will die. Imbued with these anti-British policies the right hon. the leader of the government passed over to the

most literary city upon the other side of the line, to the city of Boston, and he gave utterance to his opinion eighteen or twenty years ago. What was his opinion there? Were his opinions there such as, had they been carried out, would have led us to the position we occupy to-day as the brightest jewel in the British Crown, or were they such as, had they been carried out, would have made us an independent nation? I will quote what the right hon. gentleman said:

The conduct of England and Canada during the civil war of 1861-66 was a disgrace to the civilization of England and Canada. . . It is a great, a fatal mistake to make allegiance, British allegiance, the basis of trade. . . The present position of Canada cannot last, even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and that the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place. I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and of Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States of America.

Then, Sir, being subsequently twitted with these assertions by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on the floor of this House, being asked if he still maintained these views, because there are occasions sometimes when a man will say in the heat of the moment and before a public audience perhaps what he does not really mean; but, when these statements were cast up to the right hon. gentleman on the floor of this House did he repudiate them? I say: No, and we will see what he said on the floor of this House. He said:

He (Mr. Foster) speaks as if Canada were to remain for ever a colony. Light as our dependence may be on the mother country, that dependence is not to remain for ever. If we were to admit that, if we were to say that we were always to remain in a dependent condition we would be the scorn of the world and it would be scorn well deserved. . . It is the destiny of the colonies to become nations as it is the destinty of a child to become a man, and while no doubt the idea of separation from the motherland causes a pang in the heart no doubt of every one, yet there is not a child who leaves his father's house who does not do so without a pang if his heart is in the proper place. . . I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in course of time. If we were true to our record we will again exhibit to the world, the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its own independence by slow degrees and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree. . . The Minister of Finance reproached me a moment ago, that I had stated at Boston that the Canadian people had commercial interests different from the British people. Sir, I said so in Boston and I say so now on the floor of this House.

That was the policy advocated by the right hon. gentleman away back in these days. Let us follow him down to the present day. The next instance that arose to elicit an expression of the right hon. gentleman's imperialism was the South African war. Remember, he has just a few days ago said on the floor of the House: 'I do not pretend to say that I am an imperialist,' and that is the frankest admission we have had from him so far. Now, when the trouble broke out in South Africa, when little New Zealand was the first to make her offer to send troops to assist the motherland, when Australia and all the other colonies followed suit, men were wondering what was the matter with Canada and the answer from the right hon. gentleman was: 'I do not think I can send troops to South Africa, I do not think I have the power.' But, the newspapers of this country reflected public opinion, and to them great credit is due, and I particularly mention the Montreal 'Star,' because the Montreal 'Star' sent telegraphic despatchees to the mayors of every city and town in the Dominion with the purpose of ascertaining the true sentiment of the Dominion, and the practically unanimous answer was: By all means send troops to South Africa and assist the mother country for there may come a day when we ourselves will need just such assistance. From the confines of the two oceans there started a great wave of patriotic loyal sentiment gathering force as it went along, until finally it thundered against the doors of this parliament, and then and then only the right hon. gentleman awoke from his imperial slumber to find that he could do what he before said it was impossible to do under the constitution, namely send a contingent to South Africa. He realized then that the question was of such magnitude that if there was not a precedent, Canada was bound to create a precedent, and I say Sir, at the present time if there is no precedent for what the Conservative party propose should be done, we are bound to create a precedent. So that whatever credit or prestige and advantage which Canada obtained from her participation in the South African war is not due to the right hon. gentleman himself, but to the patriotism, loyalty and devotion of the Canadian people, and to that irresistible wave of loyal sentiment which passed over this country and which forced the right hon. gentleman against his own convictions to send Canadian troops to South Africa. We now pass to the imperial conference of 1907. Up to that time the right hon. gentleman was free to act as he chose; if he were an imperialist and desired to do something which would show his practical interest in the motherland and his desire to contribute towards the defence of the empire he could have moved

in that direction at this conference. But, not only did he not move, but he took a step which clearly expresses the sentiment which he himself has stated a few days ago in this House, namely: 'I do not pretend to be an imperialist.' What occurred at that conference? Dr. Smart introduced a resolution. If that resolution had said that the overseas Dominions must contribute in a certain manner; if the resolution had said: You must give so much money, or you must build a local fleet, or you must give two 'Dreadnoughts' to the British navy, there might be some excuse for the right hon. gentleman not agreeing with the resolution. But, the resolution was so fair and so reasonable that I shall read it:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to mainain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contributions towards the upkeep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contributions to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with varying circumstances.

That is the resolution and it says in effect, that it is the duty of the different portions of the empire to do what they may deem the best in the way of a contribution towards assisting the motherland in the imperial defence, and yet the right hon. gentleman dissented and said he would have nothing to do with it. It is in line with the sentiment he expressed in the House the other day when he said: I am not an imperialist. Well, matters remained in that position until something occurred and when that something occurred did the right hon. gentleman act on his own volition? No. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) put upon the order paper a resolution, which said in effect: it is time we should do something towards assisting the motherland in relieving her of the burden of defence. It was a move from this side of the House, and following it came the emergency and the pressure of public opinion again. The newspapers, reflecting public opinion, showed that Canadians believed that Canada must do something to assist the motherland in the crisis, and under pressure the right hon. gentleman consented to the adoption of a resolution having for its object the giving of a contribution to the motherland for the purpose of assisting in the defence of the empire. That resolution was passed in March, 1909, and the right hon. gentleman sent over delegates to the conference in the old country and they brought back the proposition which we have before the House. When he submitted that proposition to the parliament in the first place he said: This navy shall not go to the assistance of Great Britain until the parliament of Canada is called. Again public opinion as expressed in the press demonstrated that the people of Canada would not stand for that, and when the right hon. gentleman came before us next time his declaration was: This navy may go to war and parliament need not be called but it shall not go to war until this government says it shall, and if it does go to war then parliament shall be called. To that extent he receded from his former position, but he gave way mightly little, because it simply means that if the right hon. gentleman sits still, as he did in the South African war, if he does nothing, as he said he would have done in the case of the Crimean war, then nothing is done and parliament is not called and Canada does not go to the assistance of the empire. I would like to put this proposition to the right hon. gentleman: Suppose Great Britain took the same stand he has taken; suppose Great Britain said to us exactly as he has said to Great Britain I do not pretend to be an imperialist, the inevitable conclusion is that if Canada should get into difficulties we would not or could not expect to receive one particle of assistance from the motherland. Now, what is the position of Australia? The other day when our honored leader was making some remarks, on the position Australia had taken with reference to her naval unit, the Minister of Militia rose in his seat and said, that from the report contained in the imperial conference it appeared that the Australian parliament had to consent to its fleet going to war before it could go to war. Am I right in that? At any rate while I do not pretend to be as familiar with this question as the hon. Minister of Militia is, I take it that the passage to which the Minister of Militia refers is that contained at page 57 of the imperial conference report:

In peace time and while on the Australian station this fleet unit would be under the exclusive control of the Commonwealth government as regards their movements and general administration, but officers and men should be governed by regulations similar to the King's regulations, and be under naval discipline, and when with vessels of the Royal navy, the senior officer should take command of the whole. Further, when placed by the Commonwealth government at the disposal of the admiralty in war time, the vessels should be under the control of the naval commander-in-chief.

Now, because this memorandum says that the Australian fleet unit may in war time be placed by the Australian Commonwealth at the disposal of the admiralty,

the hon. Minister of Militia says that the parliament of the Commonwealth must first consent to its being placed on actual war service, if I may so put it. What I say is that that means when so placed in the manner mentioned in paragraph 8 of the memorandum submitted by Australia to the conference, which paragraph is to be found at page 5, and reads thus:

8. In time of war or emergency or upon a declaration by the senior naval officer representing British government, that a condition of emergency exists, all the vessels of the naval force of the Commonwealth shall be placed by the Commonwealth government under the orders of Lords Commissioners of the admiralty. The method by which the vessels shall come under the orders of the senior naval officer would be by furnishing each commander of an Australian vessel with sealed orders and instructions (to) the effect that upon the declaration to him by the senior naval officer representing British government that a state of war or emergency exists, such sealed orders shall thereupon be opened, and, in pursuance of their provisions, he shall thereupon immediately place himself under the orders of the senior naval officer representing the British government.

Now, to prove that that is correct, I read the next paragraph, which states the only exception made to that provision:

It is, however, to be understood that if the services of any of the coast defence vessels be desired in seas remote from Australia, the approval of the Commonwealth government shall first be obtained to their removal.

In other words, the approval of the Commonwealth government is not to be first obtained for the service of any vessels except coast defence vessels. An armoured cruiser is not a coast defence vessel, it is intended to go on the high seas and make an aggressive movement. Therefore, the hon. gentleman is not right in his contention that the assent of the Commonwealth government is to be obtained before the Australian unit can be used in the defence of the empire, because the memorandum which was placed before the conference by Australia says that in case of war it shall be immediately placed under the command of the senior officer of the admiralty.

I sometimes wonder whether hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House really understand the meaning of this Bill. As I understand, the right hon. leader the government's position is that this is purely a voluntary gift on the part of this country, and that we may accompany it with any conditions we choose. The right hon. gentleman says, I will not now agree to trust to Great Britain for one hour as to whether or not we shall assist her in case of war; I reserve to myself the absolute right and privilege of saying, after the war has commenced, whether it is such a war as I can countenance, and whether, in view of the circumstances, I can come to the assistance of the mother country. I say that that position taken by the right hon. gentleman is a less loyal and less patriotic position, and displays less trust and confidence in the motherland, than the position of an ordinary independent ally, who says: In case of war I will trust you and come to your assistance. Here is the position of Japan in the treaty made with Great Britain five years ago and which is in force to-day:

The governments of Great Britain and Japan, being desirous of replacing the agreement concluded between them on the 30th of January, 1902, by fresh stipulations, have agreed upon the following articles, which have for their object—

If by reason of unprovoked attack or aggressive action, wherever arising, on the part of any other power or powers, either contracting party should be involved in war in defence of its territorial rights or special interests mentioned in the preamble of this agreement, the other contracting party will at once come to the assistance of its ally, and will conduct the war in common, and make peace in mutual agreement with it.

Here is Japan, on the 12th of August, 1905, going to Great Britain and saying: I have enough trust and confidence in you now, that for the period of ten years I am going to bind myself, if you become involved in war at any time during that period, to come to your assistance. In that respect I say the proposition of the Prime Minister is less loyal and less patriotic than the position of Japan in that treaty. The right hon. gentleman charges us with bearing imperial phylacteries on our brows and walking boldly into the temple and there proclaiming that we are not as other British subjects are. I can only say that we are willing to go into the temple and proclaim that we are not as other British subjects are if that is the kind of imperialism with which right hon. gentleman is imbued.

Now, let us come to the question of emergency; and I want to point out that in the Bill before the House, and in the speech he made on that Bill, the right hon. the Prime Minister has entirely overlooked the circumstances which have brought that Bill to this House. That Bill would not have been before this House to-day, I venture to say, unless a condition of emergency had existed in Europe; and yet the right hon. gentleman, in bringing the Bill into the House, totally disregards the very reason for that Bill, by failing to make any provision whatever for the emergency which has caused it. He admits himself that it will be five years—I venture to say that it will be ten years—before a single ship of the Canadian navy will be completed, equipped, manned and ready to do her part in active service. According to the best experts in Europe the crisis is going to come within the next ten years, and we are making no provision to meet

it, although it is the very reason for this Bill being before this House. By an emergency I do not mean a present actual crisis. I mean a condition of things which, if allowed to proceed in the manner determined upon, will eventually and inevitably lead to the destruction of that which is all-essential, both to ourselves and to the British empire, the supremacy of the British navy at sea. If we find a condition of things existing to-day which, if allowed to continue, will bring us to that culmination, I call that an emergency, and it is upon that I propose to make my argument now. Let me point first of all to this fact, that ten years ago the German nation decided that they should have a very powerful navy. A Bill was brought into the Reichstag appropriating $1,000,000,000 for the purpose of starting their naval programme. Since that time they have not only kept up that programme, but have accelerated it by increasing the appropriation by $500,000,000, part of it in 1906 and part in 1908. Since that time there has arisen in the Reichstag what is known as the 'Expansionist party,' who are in favour of increasing German armaments. We know they are increasing German armaments. We know that the German nation is to-day increasing in population at the rate of about 900,000 every year. I do not mean to say that the German people are not right in taking the stand they do. If by their sacrifice, their perseverance and their energy they are able to place the German fleet on a par with the British fleet, they have a perfect right to do so, and looking at the matter from their standpoint, it is a credit to them that they do so. At the same time the same reasoning applies to us; and if we are weak enough to allow them to do that we have nobody to thank but ourselves.

Now take the German construction; compare the German construction to-day with the German construction ten years ago, and what do we find? We find that the German construction to-day is $36,000,000 more than it was ten years ago. The British construction to-day is only ten millions more than it was ten years ago. The total annual naval expenditure of Germany has increased in the last five years by $47,000,000. The total annual naval expenditure of Great Britain has increased only $10,000,000. Then we have this very significant fact that by reason of the advent of the Dreadnought type of armoured cruiser, all types prior to that have been practically relegated to the scrap heap. We have the authority of the Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, for that statement. He said in the imperial House of Commons:

> There will come a day when, by an almost automatic process, all ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnought will be relegated to the scrap heap. The maintenance of our superiority then will depend upon our superiority in Dreadnoughts alone. The German power of constructing this particular type of vessel is at this time almost if not fully equal to our own, owing to their rapid development within the past eighteen months.

If that is the case, it means that the greater part of the German navy will be essentially more powerful than the British navy, because the greater part of the German navy not being as old as the British navy will be constructed of the modern type.

I wish to refer to a speech made by the right hon. the Prime Minister in Toronto not long ago, I think on the 6th of January, 1910. He said:

> However, in the province of Ontario another position is taken—I will not say by the whole of the Conservative party—that we should make at once a contribution to the British navy, that we should contribute at once, one to three Dreadnoughts, that we should contribute at once thirty million dollars. The cause, they say, for this urgency is that danger is imminent for Britain. Danger? Where is it coming from? They tell us from Germany. Let us look at this. We know that the displacement of the British navy is nearly two million tons, and that of the German navy is six hundred thousand tons. In 1912 the British navy will have a displacement of more than two million tons, and the German navy one of about a million tons. So that the disparity is too great to say that danger is imminent.

The right hon. gentleman brushes aside the question of emergency with the statement that because in 1912 the German navy will have a tonnage of only 1,000,000 tons, whereas the British navy will have a tonnage of 2,000,000 tons, therefore, the question of emergency cannot arise. I would point out to the right hon. gentleman that according to his own statement there will be a difference of 400,000 tons between the German navy now, and the German navy in 1912. That means that in the space of two years Germany will have added to her navy 400,000 tons. Divide that into Dreadnoughts, that is by 20,000 tons, and it means 20 Dreadnoughts. Now, supposing I cut off 25 per cent of that and make it 15, it will mean that Germany will have 15 Dreadnoughts built in the next two years. Then I take the statements of the Rt. Hon. Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, and the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, who say that if you build 15 Dreadnoughts you must relegate to the scrap heap all of the pre-Dreadnought type, and so the 400,000 tons which the Germans will add to their navy in the next few years will be worth four or five times the same tonnage of the old obsolete British warship. It is not tonnage that counts, it is the class of vessel, the range of guns, the protection of the cruiser,

and last but not least, the efficiency of officers and men. We have abundant illustrations of that. It was not because the Russian fleet in the Japanese sea was so inferior in tonnage, it was not inferior, but it was that the Japanese fleet was modern, up to date and equipped with modern guns. That battle as we know lasted only forty minutes. It was not that the tonnage of Spain was so inferior, it was the superior guns and arms and the efficiency of the officers and men of the United States navy that sent the Spanish fleet to the bottom of the sea in a few minutes. So it is no argument to say that because the tonnage of the British fleet is greater than the tonnage of the German fleet there is no danger of war. The tonnage of the German fleet may be only half that of the British fleet, and still it may be a more eective fighting force than the whole British fleet.

Let us see what authority there is for the statement that there is an emergency. I do not think it is fair to the people of Canada for the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General to brush aside in a light manner, and with the levity displayed by them on this occasion, the question of emergency. Let us see what the greatest authorities in England themselves think of the emergency, let us take the opinion of men who know what they are talking about and who have given this matter serious consideration. You have heard our leader, in his speech on the second reading, state that Mr. McKenna had said in the House of Commons that all vessels prior to the Dreadnought type would be obsolete in a very short space of time and would have to be relegated to the scrap heap, and that Germany's power of construction is almost equal to our own. You have heard it stated that when the German programme is carried out she will have 33 Dreadnoughts, the most powerful fleet in the world, and as to the necessity of the entire rebuilding of pre-Dreadnought fleets. You have heard the Liberal Prime Minister (Mr. Asquith) admit that by 1912 Germany would have at least 13 Dreadnoughts ready for service. I propose now to give you some information given prior to the British elections. I do not propose to read, as the Postmaster General did, any utterance of the statesmen of Great Britain during the elections. Three months after the British House of Commons closed, at the Imperial Press Conference in June last, Lord Rosebery said: '

> Now gentlemen, you will forgive me if I come next and at once to what is by far the most vital topic that you will have to discuss at this conference, or which concerns our empire as a whole—I means that of imperial defence. (Cheers.) I do not know that in some ways I have ever seen a condition of things in Europe so remarkable, so peaceful, and in some respects so ominous, as the condition which exists at this moment. There is a hush in Europe, a hush in which one might almost hear a leaf fall to the ground. There is an absolute absence of any questions which ordinarily lead to war. One of the great empires which is sometimes supposed to menace peace is entirely engrossed with its domestic affairs. Another great eastern empire which has furnished a perpetual problem for European statesmen has taken a new lease of life and youth in searching for liberty and constitutional reform. All, then, forbodes peace, and yet, at the same time, combined with this total absence of all question of friction, there never was, in the history of the world, so threatening and overpowering a preparation for war. That is the sign which I regard as most ominous. For forty years it has been a platitude to say that all Europe is an armed camp, and for forty years it has been true that all the nations have been facing each other armed to the teeth, and that has been, in some respects, a guarantee of peace. And now what do we see? And now, without any tangible reason, we see the nations preparing new armaments. They cannot, indeed, arm any more men upon land, so they have to seek new armaments upon the sea, piling up this enormous preparation, as if for some approaching Armageddon. And yet this is in the time of the profoundest peace. We live in the midst of what I think was called by Petrarch a 'latens bellum'—a silent warfare, in which not a drop of blood is shed in anger, but in which the very last drop is extracted from the body by the lancets of the European statesmen. I admit there are features of this general preparation for war which must cause special anxiety to the friends of Great Britain and of the British empire.
>
> When I see one country alone asking for 25 millions of extra taxation for warlike preparations; when I see the unprecedented sacrifices which are asked from us on the same grounds, I do begin to feel uneasy as to the outcome of it all, and to wonder where it will stop. . . . Gentlemen, we can and we will build 'Dreadnoughts' or whatever the newest type of ship may be as long as we have a shilling to spend on them or a man to put into them. All that we can and will do, but I am not sure that even that will be enough, and I think it may be your duty to take back to your young dominions across the seas this message and this impression: that some personal duty and responsibility for national defence rests on every man and citizen of the empire. Yes, gentlemen, take that message back with you. Tell your peoples—if they can believe it—the deplorable way in which Europe is relapsing into militarism and the pressure that is put upon this little England, to defend itself, its liberties—and yours! But take this message also back with you—that the old country is right at heart; that there is no failing or weakness in her; and that she rejoices in renewing her youth in her giant dominions beyond the seas. For her own salvation, she must look to herself, and that failing her she must look to you.

I cannot add anything to that. But I will quote now the opinion of Sir Edward Grey, who, as you know, is foreign secre-

tary. He spoke at this same conference. This was after the British parliament rose last March, and I may say that all these speeches were revised by the speakers themselves, except that of Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, as stated in the preface of this Imperial Press Conference report itself, so that these are matured and clear expressed opinions of these eminent gentlemen:

Take the question of expenditure upon armaments. The other day, when we expressed our views of how serious the expenditure on armaments was becoming, there came at once, and in a way which admitted of no mistake, a response from other parts of the empire which made us feel that the empire beat with one heart. I would refer for a moment—merely to emphasize it—to the serious way in which Lord Rosebery spoke the other evening on this subject. I endorse every word he said. We are in comparatively calm weather, not in stormy weather, in foreign politics at the present moment, but the excessive expenditure on armaments makes the weather sultry. And the seriousness of that expenditure cannot be over-rated; but you should know to-day how conscious we are at home that we have far too much at stake to allow our naval expenditure to fall behind, however great the burden, and you from beyond the seas have made it clear to us how great the resources of the empire are. In upholding the empire surely we are going more and more towards the ideal to which Mr. Kirwan referred in his speech yesterday —of a union of allies—of self-governing dominions.

Then, Right Hon. Reginald McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, speaking at the same conference, said:

We look to the future and we see growing difficulties surrounding our empire. We foresee possibilities in which we should be called upon to unite our whole strength in a common defence.

Right Hon. Alfred Lyttleton, who was colonial secretary in the previous government, said:

Well, my belief is, the actual position, the actual situation of affairs at this moment is different from that which it has been since the battle of Trafalgar. We are in the presence for the first time of powers equal to ourselves in wealth, equal to ourselves in mechanical skill and efficiency, equal to ourselves in national self-consciousness and aspiration, unhappily superior to ourselves in population. As these things stand, unless fortune takes some unusual turn, I believe that Lord Rosebery spoke the absolute truth, and I was delighted to hear Sir Edward Grey on this occasion endorse what he said—that this country may always be relied upon to spend her last shilling if it is necessary for her own defence and for the defence of the empire, but that a time might come when it would be necessary for her own safety and for their own safety that the dominions over seas should assist her in a tremendous struggle. I firmly believe myself that the ultimate destiny and fate of this empire will depend—

must depend—upon the achievement of a really closer and more consolidated unity and a more perfect organization of defence.

Now, I will take the speech of the Right Hon. Mr. Balfour, which appears at page 170 of the report of this Press Conference:

The fate of Australia, the fate of New Zealand, of Canada, South Africa, India, that is not going to be decided in the Pacific; it is not going to be decided in the Indian ocean; it is going to be decided here—and everybody who attempts to read the signs of the times will, I think, agree with the weighty words which fell from Lord Rosebery less than a week ago, and from Sir Edward Grey yesterday, and will recognize that no man can now speak on this subject of imperial defence without some note of anxiety in his voice. Not panic! There is no question, gentlemen, of panic, but we all have to look around us at the gathering forces, the arrangement of possible foes, the strategic import of possible combinations—we have got to look at them, not with a frightened but with a careful eye and, so looking at them, everybody, I think, will be impelled to recognize that the language of the foreign secretary—unusual, let me say, in the mouths of foreign secretaries—does not go beyond the necessities of the situation.

Now, take the great military authority, Lord Roberts, who is reported at page 179 of the report of this conference as saying:

Recent events, however, prove conclusively that a new era has commenced, and that our whole empire may again have to fight for its own, as the people of these islands have many times had to do in the past. The question is: Are we prepared to do this? Fleets and effective armies cannot be improvised to meet the rapid movements of modern times. Nothing but forethought and preparation, extending over years, can give us a naval or military strength which may be relied on in any great emergency, and which is in itself the greatest guarantee of that peace which we desire and need more than any other nation. I think I know what your main difficulty will be. It is not easy to convince the mass of the people in this country of the existence of real danger. It may be even less easy to convince the populace of colonies that have enjoyed for a century protection, which has given them security from attack, that real dangers threaten them also. . . The growth of the colonies in wealth makes them more and more objects of envy to nations which do not possess such valuable areas of the world. So, if we are to be secure, we must stand side by side in common effort and common sacrifice.

I will give only one more authority. I quote from the speech of Admiral Beresford, delivered in July last:

The first grave warnings that came before the public came from the lips of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary, and those of the foreign secretary were even more serious than the Prime Minister. These warnings were often repeated by those respected and esteemed statesmen, Mr. Balfour and Sir Edward Grey. Sir Edward Grey considered the situation so grave and serious that

we must rebuild the whole fleet. In those words I agree, and I will endeavour to prove the Foreign Secretary was right.

And, after all this, we have the word of the right hon. Reginald McKenna, the Foreign Secretary Sir Ed. Grey and the Premier Mr. Asquith spoken in the House of Commons itself. After all these opinions, we come back again to the First Lord of the Admiralty speaking on July 26, 1909 in the House of Commons:

> After very anxious careful examination of the conditions of shipbuilding in foreign countries, the government have come to the conclusion that it is desirable to take all necessary steps to ensure that the second four ships referred to in the programme shall be completed by March, 1912.

Now, I do not ask you to accept my word, but I say that we are bound to take the opinion of these gentlemen who know what they are talking about in preference to the opinion of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) and the right hon. leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We find the Postmaster General stating this in his speech the other evening:

> But we all know that this German scare exists only in the imagination of party politicians. It was started by the party press of Great Britain, controlled by Lord Northcliffe, and was written up during the elections by the well-known Socialist, Mr. Blatchford, in the pay of a certain party in Great Britain.

Well, does the Postmaster General honestly think that Sir Edward Grey, Lord Roseberry, Right Hon. Mr. Balfour, Prime Minister Asquith, Right Hon. Mr. McKenna, the first Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Roberts, probably the greatest military authority in the world, and Lord Charles Beresford, the greatest naval authority in Great Britain—does the Postmaster General really say now, after hearing the words of these gentlemen, that this scare was started for party purposes? But, in order to justify himself the Postmaster General goes on to say that the result of the British elections has answered the war scare.

By what manner of mathematical computation does the Postmaster General conclude that the British elections have answered the war scare, that the British elections do not show a popular belief in the existence of an emergency to-day? Take it any way the hon. gentleman chooses and he cannot show that. According to the press reports that have come back to this country, within the last few days his contention is not correct. Now, what do we find? The latest cable reports disclose that, excluding only those Irish constituencies in which a Nationalist was running against a Nationalist, or a Nationalist against a Unionist, the result of the polling in Great Britain shows that the Socialists, the Liberals and the Labourites and Nationalists together obtained 2,847,893 votes, and the Unionists 3,080,072. So the whole electorate of Great Britain voted by a majority of 235,000 that there is something wrong with the administration of the admiralty of Great Britain. They have said by a majority of 230,000 that there is an emergency. But I will take as further proof the candidature of Lord Charles Beresford himself, and every body knows that he was and is a very vigorous exponent of the defects in the government's navy policy. It was in consequence of his advocacy that the British government accelerated its naval programme. Lord Charles Beresford condemned the government for the inaction they had taken, as I have before pointed out and further, he said: We should spend $275,000,000 to $300,000,000 to increase the navy, and he went to the country upon that platform, and what was the result? He went to the constituency of Portsmouth where he and his running mate advocated the policy I have outlined, and what was the result? Not only in Portsmouth, but in the surrounding British cities on the coast opposite the continent of Europe the electors spoke. In Portsmouth they converted a government majority of 4,796 into an opposition majority of 7,575. The Postmaster General must not forget that the issue which Lord Charles Beresford presented to his constituents was the naval question almost exclusively, and upon that issue the people said by a turn over of 12,000 votes, we agree with him. In the two Davenport seats there was a reversal of 3,722 votes. In the three Bristol seats a former Liberal majority of 10,440 was changed to a minority of 3,338. In West Bristol the Unionist majority of 365 was increased to 1,278. In Plymouth a Liberal majority of 2,857 was pulled down to 311. The government's majority in Southampton was curtailed, while the Unionist vote in Dover was increased. So wherever the test was applied upon the naval question, and the necessity of maintaining naval supremacy, the British electorate said in an unmistakable manner: We believe there is a crisis, and we believe the navy of Great Britain ought to be strengthened.

Now, what is the best means of strengthening the navy of Great Britain? I think I have proved that there is an emergency, I think I have shown a condition of things which, if not remedied, will culminate in the overthrow of British supremacy at sea. That being the case, what is the best means of meeting that emergency? Let me quote what Mr. Balfour says upon that question. On page 167 of the proceedings of the imperial press conference, 1909, Mr. Balfour expressed himself in this manner:

> I think it is desirable and necessary that each of the self-governing constituents of the empire should consider whether it ought not, whether it must not, provide both land and sea forces to prevent raids, to prevent insults

to their ports, and to see that they do not fall an easy prey to the first comer. But after all, gentlemen, local defence, though it be necessary, is really subordinate to imperial defence, and it is subordinate from the point of view of the localities themselves, not merely from the point of view of the empire as a whole. The individual constituents of the empire never can be safe, never can be powerful enough, never can be strong, whatever their local defence be, if that defence is only local. On the other hand, a serious menace to their independence is, I believe, quite impossible as long as the imperial system of defence is adequate, as long as we retain, as I hope we shall ever retain, that maritime predominance which is the very condition of our being.

Again at page 169:

The fate of the empire is not going to depend on that. The fate of the empire is going to depend upon the fleet power that we can bring against other fleet power, and that gives, if I may say so, to this country and to this quarter of the world, a strategic importance which otherwise it might not possess. We must—we inhabitants of these islands—we must for many years to come bear the main burden of imperial defence, because we are the largest population at present, and at present the wealthiest portion of the empire. We shall bear that burden cheerfully. But in addition to that reason for our special and peculiar position in the system of imperial defence, there is another depending on purely strategical and geographical considerations. If I am right—and I think all will agree I am right—that the fate of the empire depends on fleet superiority, that superiority must be shown in home waters. The German ocean, the channel, the neighbourhood of these islands, possibly the Mediterranean—those are the places at which, if there is to be an Armageddon, the Armageddon will take place, and it is folly for us to attempt, to dare, to dissipate these fleet constituents, so that when the time of crisis arises we shall not be able to have that concentration upon which our whole imperial destinies, and the destinies of each separate portion of the empire, really and substantially depend.

Now let us see what Mr. McKenna the First Lord of the British Admiralty, says upon this question of concentration. He says:

You will have your own views as to the proper development of defensive forces in your dominions. It is only by your working out your problems for yourselves that you can ever gain the experience which we have had to gain, and lessons that were told you from the experience of others would never come home to you with the same force as lessons that can be learned for yourselves, even though you have learned them through your own mistakes. We will assist in every way in our power, and whatever be the method by which we are asked to assist. And we are sure that in the long run out of this process of self-development every dominion will come ultimately to the same conclusion, that the naval problem of defence is one and the same the whole world over, and that the maintenance of supremacy in all seas alike.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Now let us see what Sir Edward Grey, Britain's Foreign Secretary, says:

The navy is the common security of the whole empire. If it ever fails to be that it will be of no use for us to discuss any other subjects, and the maintenance of the navy in that position, therefore, must be the first care, not only of us at home, but of the self-governing dominions beyond the seas.

Can there be any doubt then as to the opinion of these eminent gentlemen upon that point? But, because the right hon. the Prime Minister the other day quoted the opinion of Lord Milner with respect to the question of local defence, I will now quote from a later speech made by Lord Milner on the 20th of April, 1909:

It is a real imperial navy, a navy constituted by the combination of the forces of the self-governing colonies, forces organized at the outset on a common pattern and controlled ultimately, as I hope, by a common authority. That is the goal towards which we should ultimately strive.

That being a later speech than the Prime Minister quoted, I think it would carry greater weight. Now let us see what the British admiralty themselves suggest as to the best means of meeting the emergency. Take first what is contained in the report of the imperial conference last July and I will read from page 23 to see whether this government have followed the suggestions of the admiralty:

In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war. Under certain conditions the establishment of local defence flotillas, consisting of torpedo craft and submarines, might be of assistance in time of war to the operations of the fleet, but such flotillas cannot co-operate on the high seas in the wider duties of protection of trade and preventing attacks from hostile cruisers and squadrons. . . . The fleet unit to be aimed at should, therefore, in the opinion of the admiralty, consist at least of the following: 1 armoured cruiser (new 'Indomitable' class, which is of the 'Dreadnought' type), 3 unarmoured cruisers ('Bristol' class), 6 destroyers, 3 submarines.

Then at page 25:

As the armoured cruiser is the essential part of the fleet unit, it is important that an 'Indomitable' of the 'Dreadnought' type should be the first vessel to be built in commencing the formation of a fleet unit.

In not one single one of these respects have the government followed the suggestions of the admiralty. They have not followed the suggestions of the admiralty as to a contribution which, if they were looking at the matter from a purely strategical standpoint, would be the best way of assisting to imperial defence. I do not blame

the government for not doing that, because I am not in favour of a fixed and stated compulsory contribution towards the maintenance of the British fleet. The next request is: If you will not do that, give us a fleet unit having at its head one of the most modern armoured cruisers of the Invincible and Dreadnought type. Have they done that? No, they have shorn the fleet unit of that which gives it its imperial aspect and that is the armoured Dreadnought. The little colony of New Zealand did follow the advice of the admiralty; she did give a Dreadnought. The Commonwealth of Australia did follow the advice of the admiralty, and she did give a fleet unit. Canada is the only colony that did not follow the advice of the admiralty. We gave neither a contribution, nor a fleet unit, nor a Dreadnought. In that respect we have neither followed the advice of the admiralty, nor that of the best men in the motherland who know what they are talking about and who say that we should at least contribute a fleet unit. Now, what have we got? We have got, or we are going to get, or it looks as if we were going to get, four Bristols, a Boadicea and some destroyers and submarines. The four Bristols that we are going to provide do not equal in tonnage, the one Dreadnought which we should have given. The four Bristols are not equal in fighting capacity to the one Dreadnought that New Zealand is giving, because the Bristols have only a tonnage of 4,800 tons as compared with one Dreadnought with a tonnage of 20,000 tons. There is no comparison between the guns of a Dreadnought and the guns of a Bristol. A Dreadnought will stand out there in the ocean while the four Bristols dare not go within firing distance. She is absolutely impregnable to the attack of a vessel of the Bristol class. Practically the only thing that the Bristol is good for is to act as a scout and see that the enemy is coming, and, if the enemy is coming. get out of her way as quickly as she can. Let us see exactly where we are. The minute that this fleet proposed by the right hon. gentleman comes into view the absence of an armoured head in the shape of a Dreadnought means: 'I do not pretend to be an imperialist.' 'Res ipse dixit.' The thing itself speaks. It says in effect: I do not pretend to be an imperialist, because the head and shoulders and fighting qualities of an imperial fleet have been lopped off by the right hon. gentleman. Notwithstanding this though the idea of the right hon. gentleman, according to his speech, was that in case of danger, from all points of the earth, the fleets of the colonies would rush upon the common enemy. We will suppose that the Armageddon has arrived. The call goes to Australia and up comes her fighting fleet unit with its armoured head; the call goes to New Zealand and up comes its Dreadnought with its 20,000 tons armoured Dreadnought capable of putting our four Bristols out of commission. Then the call comes to Canada and up slinks her four unarmoured cruisers of the Bristol type to take their places in the battle line. We see Australia and New Zealand in the fore front, but where do we see Canada? We hear the officer in command of the naval squadron saying: Where are the armoured cruisers of Canada, where is the portion of the fleet which is going to do service on behalf of the empire?—and the answer of Canada is: It is here. Where are Canada's Dreadnoughts? Not here. Where is the balance of the fleet; where are the Bristols? The answer is: They are not here, either; they have slunk behind to get out of danger. Well, they cannot take any part in the battle. They are no match for Dreadnoughts, and because we cannot afford to waste the fighting power of our Dreadnoughts in their protection, they had better go back at 25 knots an hour from whence they came. If that Armageddon results in British victory they will be safe from further attack; but if the Armageddon results in disaster to our naval supremacy, then the victor will come to the shores of Canada and our fleet will have to show its heels at the rate of 25 knots an hour until it can show them no longer. But, as a matter of fighting force and efficiency in the defence of the empire these four Bristols are actually a negative quantity and, as our leader has said, in time of war, they are positively a danger and they would be better to be as far removed from the fighting line as possible. Then, the Postmaster General, for some reason—I do not know why—gave us a list of eighteen independent nations and self-governing colonies which have a population of less than 10,000,000 that have navies of their own. His illustration would have been good, I admit, if he could have pointed to self-governing colonies that have navies of their own. I do not know whether it was a mistake or not, but the statement made by the Postmaster General was this:

> I have here a list of independent countries, and self-governing colonies, whose population does not exceed 10,000,000 people, and is in many cases less than that, who have navies of their own.

Then he gave a list of eighteen countries. On examining the eighteen countries he referred to as independent countries and self-governing colonies, I find that there is not a self-governing colony in the whole eighteen. If he cited that illustration for the purpose of proving that a self-governing colony ought to have a navy of its own, since there are no self-governing colonies in this list, the conclusion is that we do not need a navy; or, to put it in another way, we do need a navy because we in

Canada are going to be an indepedent nation. His illustration is absolutely without force unless he puts it on one of these two grounds, either that self-governing colonies have navies, and I have proved that there is no self-governing colony in this list, or that we are going to be an independent nation and need a navy.

Now, in conclusion, let me say that I have read very carefully the resolution which has been placed on the order paper by my honoured leader in amendment to the proposition of the government. I am thoroughly in accord with every proposition contained in that amendment. It repudiates the idea of non-imperialism and independence that pervades the whole policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and also pervades the premier's speech in the introduction of the Bill. It makes provision for the impending necessities of the empire, which is the very reason that we are considering the Bill in question. It embodies the principle of effective co-operation on imperial lines, which is the only salvation of the empire, and, having satisfied the emergency, it gives the people the right to say what they shall do as to the permanent policy of this country with respect to naval questions. This is in line with the loyal, patriotic policy that has been advocated by the Conservative party within the memory of the oldest member of this House. So far as I know that policy is distinctively in line with the policy of the Conservative party on imperial matters. It is a policy which has for its hope and aspiration, not as the right hon. the Prime Minister says, that this country should sever its relations from the motherland as naturally as the ripe fruit falls from the parent tree, not that the goal of our ambition should be the independence of Canada, not that we as a child should leave the parent with a pang in her heart; not that, but it is in line with the idea that the undoubted position of this country should be that we should cultivate a sentiment of loyalty and devotion to the motherland, not only in ourselves but in those who shall succeed us, so that beyond all peradventure they will recognize that the destinies of this country are inseparably bound up with those of the empire. We have sufficient confidence and trust in the motherland to know that in her foreign policy she will always act in the same generous, magnanimous spirit which has actuated her in the past, and that she will never do anything that we need be ashamed of. We know that wherever the British flag floats order is restored, liberty is established, religious toleration prevails, education is fostered, and that peace, progress and development with their beneficial results inevitably follow in its wake. We know that the proudest boast of the Roman citizen in the days when the world acknowledged the supremacy of Rome was: 'Civis Romanus sum.' I am a Roman citizen, and if that was the proudest boast of a citizen of an empire far less great and noble than the British empire of to-day, how much prouder ought not we subjects of Britain be when we are able to say: 'Civis Brittanicus sum.' I am a British subject. But apart from all that there is this object lesson we ought to teach: That who ever meddles with the child meddles with the parent, and who ever meddles with the parent meddles with the child. That principle, Sir, is inconsistent with the declaration of the Prime Minister when he says: I do not pretend to be an imperialist. I say, Sir, that we cannot set a better example or precept than by passing the resolution proposed in amendment by my honoured leader, because its passage by this parliament will show the nations of the world that who ever meddles with the motherland must reckon with every part of the empire, and when that is thoroughly understood hostile nations will realize they are undertaking a herculean task. Let me conclude by quoting a few lines which I have taken the liberty to slightly paraphrase so as to adapt them to this phase of the question:

> Ye who would reckon with Britain,
> Ye who would sweep from the seas,
> The flag that Rodney nailed aloft,
> And Nelson flung to the breeze,
> Count well your ships, and your men,
> Count well your arms, and your guns,
> For they who reckon with Britain,
> Must reckon with Britain's sons.

Mr. F. L. FOWKE (South Ontario). Mr. Speaker, I regret that my necessary attendance at a meeting of a sub-committee of one of the committees of the House prevented me from having the privilege of listening to the opening sentences which fell from the lips of the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro). But, I came into the chamber in time to hear him attempt to define to this House the policy of the Liberal party and of the Liberal government, and I am bound to say that in that attempt I found the hon. gentleman in the position of one sparring with rather soft gloves. That is not surprising, however, in view of the fact that his restricted vision, owing to the political school in which he has learned his lesson and grown up in until this hour, prevents him from enjoying a proper appreciation of the life and purpose of the Liberal party in this great country. We are now in the last year of the first decade of the twentieth century, and during these ten years, and in fact for a bakers' dozen of years, the Liberal party has been in power in Canada under the leadership of the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and, if the hon. gentleman

wants to know what is the policy of the Liberal party, I would refer him to the history of Canada during that period to which I have referred. Let him go to the statutes of this country, let him consider the marvellous development which has taken place in Canada in progressive legislation, in developing the natural resources of the country, in extending commerce, in attracting the attention of the British empire to our country; let him take into account the prominent place which Canada holds to-day, not only in the estimation of her own people, but in the estimation of the British public, and he will have something of a better definition before him of the life and labours of the Liberal party in Canada and the policy of that party as administered under the Prime Minister of to-day. Now, Sir, while Canada in one respect has a very short history, for our history proper began only in 1867 at confederation, we nevertheless have a history antedating that by some 300 years. And, let me say that if to-day we rejoice, as we have for some years past, in the possession of a free constitution—as free perhaps as that enjoyed by any people in the world—that constitution did not rain down from Heaven upon us. Sir, we have that constitution, and we enjoy it to-day because of the struggles of the Canadian people and largely because of the sacrifices of that portion of the Canadian people who have always been found within the bounds and limits of the Liberal party of Canada. Now, Sir, in this country we have had influences coming upon us from without as well as from within; we have not always had an easy course. We have gained our present position through stress and strain and struggle; we have had foes from without and sometimes enemies from within. 1776 is a date familiar to the members of this House as is 1812 and 1837-8 and 1866 and 1870, and the meaning of these dates have not been lost upon the people of Canada. Let me say, Sir, that because of the struggles, largely of those who stand as fathers of Liberalism in Canada we enjoy the free constitution under which the laws of this nation are being administered at this very hour, and one of the very distinctive principles of the Liberal party in the past has been that this nation should enjoy its freedom and autonomy within the empire and in the face of all the world. And, if to-day we stand as a growing and prosperous nation within the bounds of the British empire, no one presuming to dictate to us as to what our course shall be in any given particular, it is largely because of the fidelity of the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier to these principles of Liberalism which are embodied in the lives of those who are known in history as the founders of the Liberal party. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) has undertaken to defend the loyalty of the Canadian people, and he has spoken in particular of the loyalty of His Majesty's opposition in this House, and by inference he has endeavoured to create the impression that the Prime Minister of Canada is lacking in a proper spirit of loyalty towards the mother country at this present time. Sir, that hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) will find that the task of Mrs. Partington with her broom endeavouring to sweep back the waves of the ocean, was a very pleasant pastime indeed in comparison with the efforts that he or others may engage in to endeavour to convince the Canadian people that the leader of the Liberal party is anything but a devoted subject of King Edward, as he is to-day the first son of Canada. And in no single particular is that fact more brilliantly displayed than in relation to this very naval programme which is under discussion at this moment.

Now, Sir, what are some of the things which help to determine a nation's destiny? One of these things surely is the possession of a national purpose. Have the Canadian people a national purpose? I feel that they have, and that national purpose is to achieve greatness in this greater half of the greatest continent of the world, with the government of which they are specially charged, and to maintain those ties and connections which have always in modern times bound us to the throne of England, and bind us at this hour. It was only yesterday that we passed from a state of tutelage, from a system of authority to a system of liberty. It is only very recently that we have felt our feet as a nation, and have begun to feel that we have a right to exercise all the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of nationhood; and to-day we stand on our own feet, 'the heirs of all the ages in the foremost files of time,' and are willing to be judged on our merits. This is the spirit of the Bill submitted to the House by the premier. In the introduction of that Bill the other day by the premier, in a speech which I have no doubt will remain classic in the literature of Canada, which will be read by the youths of this country in days to come, when they wish to understand all the influences which led to the securing of a free constitution by this people, as the Gettysburg speech of Abraham Lincoln is read by the youth of the United States to-day, and will be prized most highly because of the manner in which it gives us a proper conception of the place and importance of this young giant nation of the north, not only in the discharge of its own internal duties towards itself, but in relation to the duties and responsibilities it feels towards the empire and towards the great world at large. We are very delighted to-day to feel that, as a result of the legislation of the admin-

istration of the day, we have a prosperous and growing country a country possessing a great foreign trade, a trade which is reaching out towards the east and towards the west, a trade which it will be the bounden duty of this country to protect as well as to foster and enlarge; and one of the great purposes in the construction of a Canadian navy to-day ought to be, that we are prepared to protect our own trade routes and our own coasts to assume the duties and responsibilities of nationhood in this regard; and in order to do that we accept the principle that we should on our own account commence the construction of a navy, that we should have navy yards of our own, that we should man that navy, and that the control of that navy should be subject to the will and authority of this Dominion. Briefly this is the attitude we assume in this regard. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) spoke very eloquently of the place and importance of the British empire in the affairs of the world, and of what he regarded as our proper place in that empire. No one in this House will be at all inclined to dispute the fact of the greatness of the British empire, nor our share in that empire, but every one will rejoice in all that that empire has accomplished in the last three hundred years in propagating and protecting a grand and noble civilization in the various parts of the world where her interests are to be found. That British empire has grown and strengthened until to-day she controls probably one-fifth of the area of the world and governs probably more than one-fourth of the population of the world. We are not at all disposed to minimize the effect of the British empire as a great world force. If the hon. gentleman would desire that the British people should control the whole world, we have to admit that never in the history of this world has any one people been able to achieve that position; but we do rejoice that Great Britain has controlled the seas and the trade routes of the world, and for that reason has to a large extent controlled and dominated for their good the civilization of the various peoples of the world; and to-day, by the very purpose of the Bill before us we are planning not only to look after the interests of Canada, as we are bound to do, but also to manifest to Great Britain and to the whole world, that if there be any disposition to beard the lion in his den, to try issues with the British lion in his home, then we with the other colonies of Great Britain say that they certainly must expect to reckon with the lion's whelps as well. This is all included in the proposition brought down to us by the government of the day. Some one has said, and I think said very properly, that if you would know the times in which you live, you must know your Canada, your South Africa, your Australia and your New Zealand; and if you would know your Canada, your South Africa and your New Zealand, you must know the times in which you live; and it is a fact to-day, which no hon. gentleman will dispute, that the chief glory of Great Britain is regnant, not only in the power she must exercise over foreign affairs, but in the possession of overseas dominions which are loyal to her and part and parcel with her in all that goes to make up that which is best in human civilization in this twentieth century.

Now, I had no thought of trespassing at length upon the attention of the House in reply to the hon. member for North Grey; but I do not wish to let pass the opportunity for a brief discussion of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as that of the third party, as submitted in the amendments proposed to the Bill before the House. One of the propositions is involved in the idea that instead of acting the part of a nation, and doing things in a national way, in a way that will be permanent—instead of establishing a navy of our own, we should out of hand grant to Great Britain two 'Dreadnoughts' at a cost of perhaps $25,000,000. I would like to ask on what theory is that suggestion based? Sir, it is based on no other theory than this, that at the moment the empire is in danger. And yet the hon. gentleman puts the danger ten years in the future; and some one has said that the life of one of the very Dreadnoughts which he would present to the British government at this time is only ten years at the most. So that by the time the boats would require to be put into commission they would have gone to the scrap heap.

We have all heard more or less of the German scare. Hon. gentlemen may entertain such opinions as they choose in relation to the truth or falsity of the German scare. For my own part I do not know why the German people should not be allowed to have a German navy as they have a merchant marine if they choose; and having made up their minds that as the Emperor of Germany expresses it, as in the case of Britain so for themselves, their future lies upon the water, why should their desire to have a navy then be understood as a menace altogether to Great Britain? Great Britain, I am willing to think, is abundantly able to take care of herself as her statesmen have very well demonstrated, but there has undoubtedly been a German scare, if that scare does not exist to-day. One year ago the German scare was rampant in Great Britain. I am sorry to believe that in Great Britain as in the republic to the south of us there is such a thing as yellow journalism. That

yellow journalism devoted itself to the work of creating a scare in the minds of the British public and some British people became susceptible to the influence of that yellow journalism and absolutely I fancy believed that the nation was endangered by reason of the undertakings of the German people in the construction of their navy. That question was imported into the politics of Great Britain, and in the course of time a British statesman answered the plea for more Dreadnoughts and the answer came in a very unexpected way I have no doubt to those who were promoting the German scare and who claimed that if there were to be further Dreadnoughts the money for them must be raised by a change in the fiscal policy of Great Britain. We are asked to have a great deal of sympathy for the poor tax-payer of Great Britain. To change the fiscal policy of Great Britain would certainly be shouldering the burden of taxation still further on the now oppressed tax-payer of that country; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer had views of his own as to how the taxation of Great Britain should be regulated in order that a fuller measure of justice might be meeted out to all the tax-paying portions of the British people, and so you have the Lloyd-George budget which proposes that the classes who hitherto have escaped their fair share of taxation shall do the honest thing and ameliorate the position of the struggling masses in relation to this matter of paying taxes. So fully have the privileged classes of Great Britain been seized of that fact that they no longer clamour for Dreadnoughts, but only that the present administration may be put out and those who favour the parsons, publicans and peers may take their places in order that if possible the privileged classes may maintain their privileges, and the masses may still further have shouldered on them the great burden of taxation in relation to their relief from the German scare and all other costs of government in the motherland. I am very pleased to believe that the result of the appeal to the electors in the mother country has eventuated very satisfactorily and that the German scare has very largely become a thing of the past. That is, has become a thing of the past is made amply clear to us by the sayings of British statesmen. Let me read the remark of Dr. McNamara, parliamentary secretary of the admiralty on this subject:

He says in relation to the German scare and the ability of the British people to meet it:

> In Dreadnoughts we have at present seven, against Germany's two, and, in addition, three more were rapidly approaching completion. In April, 1912, the so-called point of danger, we should have twenty Dreadnoughts to Germany's thirteen.
>
> At the same date we should have forty pre-Dreadnought battleships, under twenty years of age, with an aggregate displacement of 585,000 tons, mounting 656 guns from 6-inch. to 12-inch., including 152 12-inch. guns. At the same date Germany would have twenty pre-Dreadnoughts under twenty years of age, with an aggregate displacement of 241,000 tons, and mounting 384 guns from 5-inch. to 11-inch.
>
> In the matter of cruisers, and leaving out the Invincibles, which I have counted with the Dreadnoughts, we should have in April, 1912, 35 cruisers of an aggregate displacement of 416,000 tons, and mounting 470 guns of from 6-inch. to 9·2-inch., while Germany would have eight cruisers, with an aggregate displacement of 78,542 tons, and 112 guns of 5·9 inch. to 9·4 inch.
>
> Of docks big enough to take Dreadnoughts we have to-day twelve in home waters, against Germany's six.
>
> To this may be added the statement made in the 'Navy League Annual' (1909-10) giving the personnel of the navy at 128,000 of all ranks. This number does not include the reserves.
>
> The same publication gives the German navy's personnel as 53,769.

As usual you find that the Britisher at home feels that he is quite able to take care of himself whether it be against the German aggressor or against the aggressor from whatever quarter he may appear on the scene.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If there is no emergency what is the need for building a Canadian navy at the present time?

Mr. FOWKE. I am not at all sorry that the hon. gentleman has put that question. Let me say to him and to this House that the question of building a Canadian navy is not merely one of yesterday. Since 1902, that question has been under advisement. A year ago the subject was debated in this House, and when last year the conference met in London, and it was attended by our representatives, it was only in pursuance of a well-defined policy which was in the minds of British statesmen as well as in the minds of the statesmen of Canada and all other portions of the empire. At that conference these three propositions were submitted for the consideration of the conference and of the Canadian delegation. One of the these propositions was a fleet unit. This government chose to accept one of the other two propositions as that best adapted to the requirements of Canada and to the purposes of Canada in relation to her desire to be of assistance to the mother country and other parts of the empire. What were those two propositions? One was:

> It was represented on the part of the admiralty that it would be difficult to make any suggestions, or to formulate any plans, without knowing approximately the sum of money which Canada would spend. The Canadian

representatives then suggested that two plans might be presented: one incurring an annual expenditure of £400,000, and the other an expenditure of £600,000, omitting in both cases the cost of the present fishery service and hydrographic surveys, but including the maintenance of Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, and the wireless telegraph service, estimated at some £50,000 a year.

Sir, it is in every way creditable, as I am very pleased to think, and as I believe the Canadian people will think, that the government chose the middle course in dealing with this question. I am glad that in this country we have a statesmanship which does not struggle after the impossible but which is willing to apply itself to the accomplishment of the practical and the possible. Therefore it was that the government decided that they would not adopt the principle of very large expenditure which would be involved in the creation of a fleet unit, and which for other reasons was thought not exactly suitable to our requirements in the matter; nor did they choose a cheese-paring policy and say: We will render as small a service as possible to Canada and to the empire in respect of this matter of navy building. They decided to take an intermediate course, and they pledged the Canadian people to an expenditure of £600,000 per annum in addition to the £50,000 per annum of which we have already relieved the imperial authorities in undertaking to care for the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt. And, Sir, I say in all candour and sincerity as a member of this House of Commons, that, in my belief, the government have acted wisely, they have propounded a sane policy, a policy which will meet with the approval of the great mass of the Canadian people, as do the other great policies of this government put into effect during the last dozen years in the administration of the affairs of the nation.

Now, Sir, gentlemen opposite have proposed that we vote a large sum of money for the building of two Dreadnoughts, that we levy upon the taxpayers of this country for perhaps twenty-five millions of money, in regard to the expenditure of which they shall have no determining voice whatever. I say that would be an undemocratic and un-Canadian policy. Therefore, I am not surprised that the government refused to countenance a proposition of that sort. I was delighted, on the other hand, when I heard from the Prime Minister's lips that it is the purpose of the government, as far as possible, to build the proposed navy in Canadian waters, with Canadian capital, by Canadian labour. This is one of the great evidences of the fact that we are a power in the twentieth century. It will be a navy constructed on Canadian ideas, and Canadian principles and by the Canadian people, to be owned and operated by them, and to be held subject to the control of this parliament. Now, Sir, why is it that parliamentarians in this House are so seriously objecting to control of the navy being vested in this parliament? Is it that they are distrustful of themselves? Is it that they are afraid to trust the Canadian people? Is it that they have greater confidence in Britishers because they happen to live in the British islands, and have so small opinion of themselves as to desire to divest the Canadian parliament of the control, not only of the expenditure of money in building the navy, but of power to say how, and when, and under what conditions, that navy shall take part in the defence of the nation and of the empire? Sir, one great cardinal principle for which the people of this country stand is that they will not submit to taxation where there is no representation. And it is because we here represent the Canadian people that we say we will control the revenues derived from the Canadian people. And so I rejoice in the fact that control of the navy is to be vested entirely in the parliament of Canada. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) a few moments ago quoted a line of poetry that, I believe, finds an echo in his own breast, but with a different application entirely from that which he gave it. Sir, I can well imagine the Conservative party of Sir John Macdonald—if there be such a Conservative party in Canada to-day—crying out:

> Oh, for the touch of a vanished hand,
> And the sound of a voice that is still.

But, Sir, the windowless house of Cataraqui gives out no sound, no sign of motion. If to-day, you could have the motion of the hand, the sound of that voice, of the old chieftain of other days who was ever a true Canadian as well as a true Britisher, I am sure it would be to counsel the party that sits at your left, in this House to-day, Mr. Speaker, to show themselves worthy of their Canadian citizenship by standing for the principle of a proper autonomy, for the control of the expenditure of Canadian money by the Canadian parliament and for the direction of the proposed Canadian navy by the representatives of the Canadian people. And, Sir, I have a right to conclude that that is the sentiment which would animate the great chieftain if he were here to-day, for we have it from his first lieutenant of those days. Surely, I am right in saying that Sir Charles Tupper was Sir John Macdonald's angel; and if Sir Charles Tupper is to be credited with having manifest sanity and with giving good political advice it was in the advice he tendered to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when he told him distinctly that his duty to his party and his country lay in supporting the principles of the policy of the right hon. leader of the House as he

enunciated them the other day in moving the second reading of the Naval Bill.

Now, I should be wrong in trespassing further on the time of the House than to say that I view the policy of the government as a thoroughly Canadian policy, a Canadian policy altogether in keeping with the aspirations of the Canadian people towards nationhood within this great empire of which we form a part. It is a great thing to be able to stand before the world to-day and to assert that we are citizens of Canada and of the British empire. And it is a fine thing to reflect that we occupy no inconsiderable place in the development and life of the British empire. One-third of the area of the empire is comprised within the boundaries of the Dominion of Canada. More than one-half the white population of the British empire outside the British islands reside in this Dominion of Canada. To-day, our population is increasing by leaps and bounds, as is also our national wealth. We should be lacking in self-respect, in that proper dignity which ought to be ours as a people, were we to divest ourselves of the right to decide for ourselves how we should act in relation to our own affairs and how we should act in determining our relations to the empire. And if to-day, we stand before the world rejoicing in the double position which we hold as a nation and as part of the empire, it is because we feel that, as a nation and as part of that empire we are exercising in a large way a controlling influence in determining the progression of events towards the creation of the highest possible civilization to which the world may look forward or to which Canada may ever attain. I stand here to-day with a great deal of pleasure, indeed, to support the naval policy of the government, and to say that, in my humble judgment, it ought to commend itself alike to the judgment of this parliament, of the Canadian people and of the people of the empire at large.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, under our representative system of government every man who sits in the House and who regards with any degree of seriousness his duty to those who have delegated him as their representative and his duty to the state at large must, or should, experience a constant sense of responsibility in the discharge of those duties, even during what may be called the routine work of parliament. But there comes times, and this essentially is such a time, when a peculiar and unusual responsibility rests on him. The party banner, the party cry, the party vote, necessarily, though perhaps too often dominate and determine the discussions in this Chamber. But there are some questions, and I think this is one of them, that should lose their party aspect when they come to be discussed.

This question, Mr. Speaker, was brought before this House on Thursday last by the leader of the government, and his speech in upholding the government policy was accorded a thoughful attention by members on this side of the House. I may perhaps be allowed for a moment to refer to a matter that I touched on in an earlier part of the afternoon. At the conclusion of the right hon. gentleman's speech outlining the policy of the government on the Naval Bill, the leader of the opposition also in a powerful and closely reasoned speech, at its close moved an alternative proposal which represents, as we believe, the best interests and wishes of the people of Canada. When he closed that speech, as we all very well remember, there was a spontaneous outburst of sentiment in this House, presenting a very unusual spectacle, namely, that hon. members stood up on their feet and sang the national anthem. Well, Sir, as we also know, this incident was described, I will not say intentionally, in a leading organ of the Liberal party on the next day as occurring at the close of my rignt hon. friend's address, and intimating therefore that that address was so powerful so moving, so much in line with the sentiments of this House irrespective of party, that the imprimatur of the whole House was put upon it in that extraordinary way. That report in the recognized organ of the Liberal party in Canada, and in a great many affiliated papers, went out through the length and breadth of Canada; and it is perfectly natural for the people to think, assuming that that report was true, that my right hon. friend's speech was a speech not only of extraordinary merit, but that it must have created a great deal of enthusiasm on the opposition side of the House. Now, I am not taking the ground that because that report was incorrect the fault should be laid at the door of the press gallery in this House, because it may have been unintentional. But, we do claim from the right hon. gentleman and his party, as this matter was given such extraordinary prominence in the papers throughout the country, he should have used his undoubted influence to have got, in an equally prominent position, a correction of the report and a true statement of what took place in this House. When I put that question to the Prime Minister this afternoon what was his answer. His answer was! What have I got to do with it? Well, let me say that the right hon. gentleman had far more to do with that question than he had with another question on which he expended a great deal of power and energy last session. Everybody remembers the occasion last session when British Columbia affairs

came up, that there was introduced a garbled telegram, and the Prime Minister waxed indignant upon the immorality of publishing a telegram of that character, though it had not half as much to do with the right hon. gentleman as this particular episode has to do with him at the present time.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—the report he has referred to was corrected by the paper he alludes to on the following day.

Mr. BURRELL. I have just intimated that I knew that. It was corrected, but we all knew that the correction appeared on the fifth page, an inside page, in a small paragraph, with no heading to indicate that it was there.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. It was corrected at the close of the parliamentary report of that day.

Mr. BURRELL. I am not denying that, but I say it appeared on the fifth inside page, at the bottom of a parliamentary report dealing with routine proceedings, with nothing in the shape of a heading showing its nature. Of course the question has its amusing side. I have in my pocket here a letter sent from a gentleman in Winnipeg who had seen this same report in the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' another organ of the Liberal party, which paper, so far as I can see, did not correct the statement that was sent out. This gentleman says that he sees the Prime Minister has made a wonderful speech, and that there was so much enthusiasm that the House sang 'God Save the King.' And he says, 'I would like very much to get a copy of that speech.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister can be content with the merits of his speech as they exist, without attempting to put upon them such a seal as this, and allow it to go out to the country that such a seal of approval was set on it that the members had to get up in their seats and sing the 'National Anthem.' This shows the false impression that is created throughout the country by the erronous report to which I have alluded. So I say that I was surprised at the right hon. gentleman at taking me up so sharply in that matter this afternoon.

Now, I think we all have a right to expect that the Prime Minister of Canada, in opening this debate, would have spoken in a manner worthy of the high subject with which he was dealing; but I say, and I say it emphatically, that it was amazing, it was disappointing, to find that, instead of starting out on that high plane showing a proper realization of the magnitude of the subject, he at once launched out in a manner so partisan, so small, that upon him must rest the responsibility of injecting into this debate the party virus in its worst form. Now on that occasion, and on other occasions in dealing with naval matters, he has said a good deal about Rome. Let me bring to his notice a well worn word that describes the lofty patriotism which made Rome great in an hour of supreme danger, and will make any nation great:

> Then none were for the party,
> Then all were for the State,
> Then the great man helped the poor,
> And the poor man loved the great.
> Then lands were fairly portioned,
> Then spoils were fairly sold,
> The Romans were like brothers
> In the brave days of old.

Well, was that the spirit in which the right hon. gentleman made the greater part of his speech? There was ridicule of our silence from the start, ridicule of the attitude taken by this side of the House, ridicule at our alleged indifference, spiced with jests to create laughter and applause, I was going to say upon his back benches, but it is rather significant that three of those back benches were empty during the whole of his speech. I say that nothing more narrow, more far removed from the spirit of true statesmanship, has been heard in this House than the speech of the right hon. gentleman. What do these tactics mean? Why does the Postmaster General follow suit? Why do they taunt us with being—I think the expressions used were Pharisees of imperialism, superloyalists, and the Postmaster General paraded his mock heroics about 'crimes committed in the name of loyalty.' We are familiar with these methods. Their unworthiness and their meaning cannot be hidden by floods of rhetoric in the peroration of minister's speeches. These tactics were adopted deliberately as a means of closing up their own ranks. Not once or twice, but many times we have seen the same thing. When lack of unanimity prevails amongst their followers when fatal weaknesses are exposed in a policy or in administration, my right hon. friend is astute enough to see that a wholesale charge that the Conservatives are attacking the great Liberal party is the best rallying cry to whip his own followers into line. Yet we must realize that a solemn and imperative duty faces every man, whether on the government or opposition benches, of deeply weighing the effect of his spoken works on this question, or even his silence, and of the vote which forms the final expression of his convictions.

The Bill now before parliament is a formal pronouncement of the government policy on a question of infinite importance —a question, which, in one shape or another, has been agitating the mind of the country for some time past. Above conflicting cries—and in spite of divergent

opinions, one great fact stands out strongly; Canada has evidently felt, and openly acknowledges, the vital—the paramount importance to Canada, of British naval supremacy, and the great need of a broad imperial unity.

Time was, and not so long ago, when he who raised his voice to urge Canadian duty in this high matter of assistance by the Dominion in the imperial naval defence was as one crying in the wilderness. It is now clear that in the hearts of a people, crowded with other pressing duties, this sense of responsibility this high sentiment did exist and in that moment when the note of danger, of trouble, was sounded across the seas a response was evoked from the Atlantic to the Pacific which expressed in unmistakeable language the strength of the popular convictions. This one thing then, amidst the many divergencies of opinion is at least clear gain. But Sir, the question, while in some respects concerned with the present day and hour, is not solely so concerned. To the rise, the development, the decadence of nations a vast number of factors, great and small, contribute, and as in the upper range of the mountains a pebble may deflect the course of a rivulet and determine its final destiny, so small, so obscure may be the causes which shape a nation's course and fate. But the student of history also knows that sometimes in national discussions the parting of the ways lies plain to the eyes, that some questions are so inevitably bound up with great issues that to fail to recognize their gravity is impossible.

Such a question is this now before the parliament of Canada. It is a time to speak out, a time to welcome the most absolute frankness of expression. There are some people—my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has expressed such an opinion—who believe that Britain's great colonies are destined to drop like the ripe fruit from the tree—a process of separation. I like better to take the simile of the family —the clan—to believe that manhood reached, the son while managing his personal affairs, is still of the family and the clan and inspired by a deep fealty springing from the ties of love and blood will unhesitatingly, in the face of a common danger, take his place by the side of his sire against even a world in arms.

The attitude of every man in this House towards the government proposals must naturally be affected and his course in regard thereto be determined, first, by his views as to the imminence or non-imminence of danger to British naval supremacy and, second, by his views on the general question of empire and Canada's part and lot therein, or whether indeed she is to deliberately shape her policy so as to remain a permanent factor in that empire or assume a position of independence. One thing we have all agreed on, viz.—that the supremacy of the empire is essential, not only to its component parts but to the civilization for which that empire stands. The stability of England is the security of the modern world. Is that stability then threatened, and if seriously threatened, what is to be our attitude?

And, first, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not share the anxieties of those who fear that the present time is marking the first steps of a decadent period in British history, that the old spirit which drove England to first place amongst the world powers is weakened; that her civilization, her polity is, in any sense of the word, moribund. It is true her problems are changing. We have witnessed a national struggle, indeed are still witnessing it, in which certain hysterical features seem to be noticeable, and prominence has been given for political purposes to phases in the national life far from beautiful, far from comforting. Nevertheless, those of us who have been long enough there to read beneath the surface of things realize the amazing vigour which characterizes the people of those small islands. It is treason to doubt, nor can we doubt, that the spirit which lies behind English liberties and English progress is as strong to-day as in past days. In the fiercest shock of adversity the cry will still be:

> In the fell clutch of circumstance
> I have not winced nor cried aloud,
> Under the bludgeonings of chance
> My head is bloody but unbowed.

Sixty years ago, in a time of trial, depression and fierce stress, England was visited by a clear-eyed, keen-brained son of the great republic to the south, probably her greatest son, as great at all events in intellectual as was Lincoln in state affairs. I refer, of course, to Ralph Waldo Emerson. His message, his words then have an absolute fitness to the present hour and are as true to-day as when he delivered them in Manchester in 1847.

> And so, gentlemen, I feel in regard to this aged England, with the possessions, honours, and trophies, and also with the infirmities of a thousand years gathering round her, irretrievably committed as she now is to many old customs which cannot suddenly be changed; pressed upon by the transitions of trade, and new and all incalculable modes, fabrics, arts, machines, and competing populations—I see her not dispirited, not weak, but well remembering that she has seen dark days before; indeed, with a kind of instinct that she sees a little better in a cloudy day, and that in storm of battle and calamity she has a secret vigour and a pulse like a cannon. I see her in her old age, not decrepit, but young, and still daring to believe in her power of endurance and expansion. Seeing

this, I say. All Hail, mother of nations, mother of heroes, with strength still equal to the time; still first to entertain and swift to execute the policy which the mind and heart of mankind requires in the present hour.

But, Sir, though acquiescing in this great tribute to a great people we cannot shut our eyes to the far-sweeping changes which have come over the political and industrial map of the world since those words were spoken. The marvellous expansion of overseas Britain which has made the empire at once more strong and more vulnerable; the rise of an eastern nation to the rank of a first-class naval and military power, the tremendous development of the Pan-Germanic nations; these things necessitate a new review of the world forces, and we in this great and growing Dominion have recognized at last that we cannot longer remain passive spectators, cannot longer abstain from offering our willing assistance in the work of consolidating the defences of the empire against any or all foes who might threaten that empire's integrity. First, then as to the question of whether there is imminent or real danger, for the answer to this practically determines our views as to what Canada should, or should not do at the present time. I take it that most of the members in this House have read the verbatim reports of the speeches delivered in the British House of Commons in March, 1909, the speeches especially of Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty. Mr. Balfour, and Sir Edward Grey. Any man who has done so and attached the weight to those grave and deliberate utterances, which they deserve, can hardly come to any other conclusion than that there was indeed an imminent danger to the empire, and I am aware of nothing having occurred since that time to make the situation less grave. Mr. McKenna's speech was delivered on the 16th of March, 1909, on the occasion of announcing the naval estimates, which were given as being in round numbers $175,000,000. His speech was the first official utterance following a certain unrest in the public mind as to a vastly increased naval programme on the part of Germany and following some expressions which suggested inadequate naval defence on the part of Great Britain. I quote one or two brief excerpts as bearing on this debate:

Our island position, the extent and dispersion of our empire; and the magnitude of our trade oblige us, as long as we are equal to the task, to maintain a navy adequate in strength to insure our shores from invasion, our empire from hostile attempts, and our trade from destruction in war.

In expressing his alarm at Germany's naval programme he added significantly:

We do not know, as we thought we did, the rate at which German construction is taking place.

Then, in relation to battleship construction, he further adds:

There will come a day when by an almost automatic process all ships of an earlier type than Dreadnoughts will be relegated to the scrap heap.

Mr. Balfour replied, couching his remarks in a manner, as admitted by the Prime Minister, entirely freed from party spirit and worthy of the occasion. He stated:

We are face to face with a situation so new, so dangerous that it is very difficult for us to realize all that it imports.

Mr. Asquith followed, and hoped that the government would be able to lay down twenty Dreadnoughts to Germany's seventeen, by 1912.

In a leading article next day the 'Times' referred to these speeches as containing 'utterances all serious and disquieting.'

These speeches were reported in the British press of March 17. On March 18, there appeared in the London 'Times' a letter which not only by its power and ability, but from the fact that it came from the pen of an anti-militarist. a man well known in literary and philosophic circles, drove home the lesson of the day before with extraordinary force to the minds of the people of Great Britain. I refer, of course, to the letter of Mr. Frederick Harrison. Mr. Harrison starts by saying that his views were formed long before the recent discussions and were formed as the result of a long and careful study of European politics, and he explains with extraordinary power why he considered the problem facing the country as vital and urgent. In a brilliant and searching analysis Mr. Harrison pointed out that the Pan-Germanic ideal and its aim at hegemony was the obvious result of the European situation and of the history of Germany since the rise of Bismarck in 1864. He said:

The danger of collision lies not in any hostile disposition of the German people, but in the manifest tendency of the two dominant factors in world-politics—the military ascendancy and resources of the German empire face to face with the British empire based on command of the sea.

And he utters in conclusion this pregnant warning:

If ever our empire or our dominion of the seas is challenged, we now see that it will be no desultory attack in distant waters, not on India, South Africa, nor Australia——

And he might have added Canada.

——but by direct plunge at the heart of the empire, on our arsenals, our ports and the capital.

Events followed in rapid succession. On the 22nd of March New Zealand, to her everlasting honour, cabled an offer to bear

the cost of building and arming a first-class battleship, and offered a second one if subsequent events showed it to be necessary. On the 25th of March that offer was accepted. On March 29th, the very day in which a memorable debate took place in this House, Mr. Balfour moved a vote of censure on the government for not making adequate preparations, and though the government could not do otherwise than take the position that it was making due preparations, yet Sir Edward Grey, a statesman who commands in an exceptional degree the confidence and respect of the people, only confirmed general feeling as to the imminence of danger. We must all agree with his words that if the extravagant military and naval expenditures of Europe went on at the rate at which it had recently increased, it would sooner or later submerge the civilization on which it was a satire, and that the hopes and aspirations of the best men in the leading countries are devoted to trying to find some means of checking it. But we must also assent to his deliberate statement that to give up competition would be to sink into a position of inferiority, and if so, he added:

> We should cease to count for anything in Europe; we should be fortunate if our liberty were left, and we did not become the conscript appendage of some stronger power.

In the closing words of his appeal to those on the ministerial benches not to oppose a generous naval programme, he admitted that:

> We may be entering on a stage more grave, more serious, requiring greater care, greater effort than anything we have yet known.

Mr. Speaker, it is singular that at this very time, on the very night, as a matter of fact, that these grave warnings were uttered by one of England's most responsible statesmen, the Prime Minister of this government should have so little realized the gravity of affairs that he could speak as follows:

> Let us not disguise the fact from ourselves that at present there is a passing wave in which we can trace anger, enthusiasm and fear, and which may be calculated by some to force us to depart from our policy, and to contribute at once to the British navy. Let us view the question as it is, let us not blink at it, let us realize that it is not the way in which in the past we have understood our duty. This question is not new; we are familiar with it, it is not of to-day or of yesterday. I will not say it is old as the hills, but it is as old as confederation itself and it comes to the front periodically.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—Mr. McCarthy.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had stated that there were two phases of this naval question—one, the question of the imminence or non-imminence of the danger to the naval supremacy of the empire, and the other, the particular question of the empire and Canada's part or lot therein; and just according as each member regarded the weight to be attached to these particular questions, so would his whole attitude be on the proposals of the government. I had also quoted the utterances of responsible old country statesmen which were calculated to make the world at large, and especially us in Canada, believe that there was a serious menace to British naval supremacy; and I had further stated that while nearly everybody was persuaded of this fact, while New Zealand had responded by presenting a battleship to Great Britain, the Prime Minister alone had remained practically unmoved. The right hon. gentleman did, it is true, acknowledge in a way that he has never done before, the obligations of this country to the empire and the necessity of upholding imperial supremacy, though even here his utterances were unnecessarily loaded with cautious warnings to preserve our autonomy. But it is apparent that he did not grasp then, nor has grasped since, the vital fact of immediate danger and the accompanying necessity and duty of immediate assistance. Even the official organ of the Prime Minister's party, the Toronto 'Globe,' has said on March 24, that German unfriendliness and aggression were apparent. 'War is deprecated,' said the 'Globe' in its editorial:

> But as a matter of fact war is in progress. The contest in shipbuilding is war. If the mother country were engaged in a deadly conflict Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the motherland. But we must remember that our aid is as much needed now as if a physical war instead of a shipbuilding war were on. It is Canada's duty from every point of view, from our affection for the land of our fathers, and for our own self interest to take prompt and practical action.

Everybody sees imminent danger except the Prime Minister. He for his part said: 'I may say that we are not to be carried

away, we are not to be stampeded from what has been the settled policy and deliberate course which we have laid down, by any hasty, feverish action, however spectacular such action may be.' Well, Mr. Speaker, if the prompt giving of a battleship in the hour of English peril by the small colony of New Zealand be feverish and spectacular, thank God for a patriotism so spectacular, and let us all pray that we may be infected with a fever so sane and uplifting. And here a word may be said in regard to the resolution passed by this House on March 29, last, and which has been so much discussed since. It has been truly said by the leader of the opposition that unanimous action on the part of this parliament was so much to be desired, that it was eminently desirable that no vote should be taken which might seem to indicate a division on a subject of so much moment. It was a worthy sentiment, worthy of the lofty stand always taken by the hon. gentleman, who leads his Majesty's loyal opposition. But, Sir, it must also be said that though concurring with this view there were many members of this House who had a strong desire to go much further than that resolution, to put matters in such shape that immediate practical help should be at once forthcoming. I believed then, as I believe now, that the day will come when Canada might well undertake to do some efficient work in constructing or having constructed in her own ports, from her own wealth of natural resources, some substantial vessels to swell the fleet which patrols the empire, but I also believed then as I do more firmly now, that immediate effective help to the empire to which we are so passionately attached could not come in that way. Much self-imposed restraint was necessary to avoid giving prompt expression to those views. But, while we did refrain from generous motives, it has remained for the government and for the government press to make political capital out of that generosity by the attempt to pin us down to the narrowest meaning of that resolution and to meanly intimate to the country that we are at one with the government in its policy.

I have endeavoured to show that strong reasons existed for believing that British naval supremacy was threatened a year ago. The reasons are no less strong at this day and hour. The German naval budget estimates for 1910 are 443,000,000 marks, the largest in the history of the country, and they have within the past two weeks decided to borrow money to carry out with iron resolution and at all costs the enormous programme mapped out. It is singular, too, that within the last few months Britain has again been warned in impressive terms of her danger. In the heat of a political contest the writings of Robert Blatchford have been lightly dismissed by those who had political reasons for so doing. But the message, graphic, stern, mercilessly logical in its marshalling of the facts, has gone home, and went home with additional force from the fact that again the sender of the message, Robert Blatchford, was not a jingo, not a panic monger, but a life-long anti-militarist. The Postmaster General has delivered some ex-cathedra utterances on the meaning of the late elections in Great Britain, and if he expressed himself half as freely in England as he has done in this House, one might have no difficulty in giving a local habitation and a name to the unknown, but semi-official authority quoted by the Manchester 'Guardian' as expounding Canadian views on behalf of the Liberal party in Great Britain. The Postmaster General saw fit the other day in his speech to make the gratuitous and puerile statement that the German war scare only existed in the imagination of party politicians. 'It was started,' he said, 'by the party press of Great Britain controlled by Lord Northcliffe, and was written up during the elections by the well known socialist, Mr. Blatchford, in the pay of a certain party in Great Britain.' Well, Sir, the minister, who seems to have taken such a keen interest in party politics in the old country, and whose 'peregrinations' were paid for by the whole people of Canada regardless of party, will acknowledge that any word spoken by Lord Cromer is to be accorded some weight. Lord Cromer should command the peculiar sympathy of my hon. friend, who I take it may be called a free trade anti-budget politician during his stay in England, as Lord Cromer, the great pro-consul, was one of the Lords who did not vote for the rejection of the budget, and who has always preached free trade doctrines. But Lord Cromer speaks with peculiar authority on all questions affecting the empire and in reference to the genuineness of Mr. Blatchford, of whom the Postmaster General has disposed so airily, he said, speaking at Sheffield on December 18:

> It would be difficult to find any two men who hold more discordant views on some important subjects than Mr. Blatchford and myself. But there is common ground on which we can meet. Mr. Blatchford is worth listening to on this subject.

It is rather amazing to hear a Canadian minister, who professes to have followed British affairs closely, impugn the bona fides of a man whose whole career and record, whether we agree with him or not, relieves him of any suspicion of insincerity of purpose. Let those who have carefully read Mr. Blatchford's utterances judge on this point. I quote one of the passages which closed one of the strongest of his articles:

This is not a party question. It is an imperial question. Let every commercial man in the empire understand that unreadiness for war means bankruptcy and panic and such suffering as this favoured people have never known. If I did not feel this strongly I would not say it. I am no longer young. I have had more than my share in unpopular causes. I would like to live a quiet life. I am reluctant to offend and oppose my own party (the Socialist) and my own friends. But I have never shrunk from a duty because it was unpleasant or unprofitable and I will not begin now. The empire is in danger. It cannot be saved by talk; it can only be saved by sacrifice and work!

Both the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General very laboriously endeavoured to show that no empire danger existed, precisely because they knew that their whole policy of to-day was and is a sham and a delusion in the face of actual danger to British naval supremacy. They are deliberately and purposely blinding their eyes for fear they shall see what every one else sees. The Postmaster General quotes the utterances of Mr. Asquith, Mr. McKenna and Sir Edward Grey on political platforms. No one knows better than the minister that in the heat of an election when the government are attacked for not apprehending a great danger, they will naturally assert that no danger exists. But we have in this case to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. We have to regard the sober, serious utterances which I have already quoted. As to the popular voice: The total popular vote on the Unionist side was 3,080,072; that for Liberals 2,847,303, and Liberal and Labour combined exceeded the Unionists by less than five per cent. Not only do the whole of the Unionist votes testify to the truth of the facts as to danger to the empire, but it is unquestionably true that thousands also of those who support the Liberal or Labour party for other reasons would assent and do assent to the pressing need of strengthening British and imperial naval defence. I cannot see that there is offence to the German people in our position. My right hon. friend was a great admirer of Cobden, the man of peace. In the face of a threatened danger from another country, not half so serious as that which exists at present, Mr .Cobden said in 1861:

I will vote a hundred million pounds rather than allow the French navy to be increased to a level with ours, because I say that any attempt of that sort, without legitimate grounds, should argue some sinister designs on this country.

But if grounds existed then for anxiety, how much greater are they to-day? But I may tell the Postmaster General that one of the most prominent Berlin papers has recently said that Mr. Balfour's warnings as to a menace from Germany, if unpleasant to the German people are certainly equalled in unpleasantness by the statements of the Postmaster General's friend, Mr. Lloyd George, who, to use the expression of the Berlin 'Tageblatt, 'holds us up to contempt as a race of eaters of black bread, horse and dog.' The Prime Minister and the Postmaster General have not only shown strong sympathy with the free trade ideas of the Liberal party in England, but have, during the debate, made very long appeals, in fact I am hardly overstating the case when I say that the greater part of their speeches has been such an appeal—to their French Canadian friends. The Postmaster General said:

Sir, who will believe that Britons, that the English people are scared by a so-called 'German terror.' Sir, I am of French descent but I know something of the history of England.

To these gentlemen of French descent let me commend the words of a French publicist, M. Judet, in an article in the 'Eclair' of January 16. He looks at the political situation in Great Britain with different eyes to those of the ministers here. Recognizing that a Unionist victory would mean a breaking of the free trade system, and consequently entail financial loss to France in her export trade, he yet adds that French sympathy must go to the Conservatives because they stand for a supreme navy. A strong Britain and an all-powerful British navy, he argues, are so absolutely essential to France, that Frenchmen must not grumble if through a tariff they are asked to pay for them, and concludes that the unconcealed preference of the Germans for the British Liberals is a good reason why French support and sympathy should be given to the other party. The right hon. the Prime Minister, much of whose speech was directed to his compatriots of French descent, would do well to bear these things in mind. The Postmaster General started out with the pious aspiration.

I hope I will be brief in the remarks which I intend to offer.

Like Carlyle, who preached the gospel of silence in forty volumes, so the minister has preached brevity in a speech of two hours and three-quarters. At one time it smacked singularly of a budget oration, with endless examples of the country's progress under Liberal rule, and was like a budget speech also in its extraordinary irrelevancies. However, he also dealt very exhaustively with the Quebec situation—wrestled mightily to convince his countrymen there that the government policy was sound and frankly stated that his speech was intended for circulation in Quebec. He, too, would do well to ponder what the French people, in an infinitely better position than he to judge of the trend of events, think and say of the conditions existing at the present time. Mr. Speaker, the sane, sober judgment of this country, of the other

over seas dominion, and of Great Britain is that a critical state of affairs exists—that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is threatened—and feeling this we have to ask ourselves what is our position?

The Prime Minister does not contend, cannot contend, that his proposals provide the slightest help on Canada's part if that crisis should become acute in two, three, four or five years. His statement as to the time when this Canadian navy was to be ready was of the loosest and vaguest character. He piously hopes that five years may see these vessels afloat, but admits frankly that he does not know whether an adequate shipbuilding plant could be laid down in a year, and, judging by other great works which the government has had a hand in, we are not encouraged to think that they can be turned out in twice the time the First Minister mentions. Meanwhile the shock of battle may come and Canada witness what transpires during the dread arbitrament of war, powerless to assist, seeing everything that we value jeopardized and endangered while we stand by with hands tied by the short-sighted and totally inadequate policy laid down by this government.

Much has been said about the British admiralty and its views. The Prime Minister states, to buttress up his own position, that owing to Canada's double seaboard a fleet unit was undesirable for the present. This was said in August at the conference. But on July 20, Mr. McKenna, First Lord, says definitely and emphatically—section 5 of the Admiralty Report:

> In the opinion of the admiralty a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts, in time of war.

That fleet unit must contain a battleship. But the Prime Minister says: No, we will not include the most effective part of the unit—a battleship. It is the old story, the play of Hamlet, with the part of Hamlet left out by desire!

The country will not forget, either, that upon the admiralty must not be saddled the responsibility of such an affair as this. The Prime Minister in his speech said: 'Two plans were proposed to us. One to have a fleet of seven ships, and another a fleet of eleven ships.' On page 26 of the Conference report are these significant words:

> It was represented on the part of the admiralty that it would be difficult to make any suggestions, or to formulate any plans, without knowing approximately the sum of money which Canada would expend. The Canadian representatives then suggested two plans.

One $2,000,000 a year, the other $3,000,000 a year. What sort of a position is the government trying to place the admiralty in? No British statesman, no British naval lord would dream of saying to Canada: 'You must do this, or that.' To their honour they wish, they earnestly desire that our assistance should be willing, the free expression of a free people. It is all very well for the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to say that when he was in Great Britain the Prince of Wales commended this and Lord Roberts commended that. Any of these distinguished gentlemen would commend anything that Canada was doing on behalf of the empire, be it little or great. We need not try to make political capital out of that. But the admiralty did plainly intimate that 'the maximum of power would be obtained if all parts of the empire contributed according to their needs and resources to the maintenance of the British navy.' They did indicate the necessity of the battleship. Sir, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is fond of quoting scripture. Let me remind him that the Lord loveth a cheerful giver. But, instead of giving cheerfully the government has laboriously struggled to see how little it could give. He has harped upon the policy laid down in 1902. The policy as interpreted by the government has been a laisser faire policy, a policy of masterly inactivity, a policy of words. He has been forced into doing something at last, and here again we have a striking manifestation of the vast difference between opportunism and statesmanship. If I were to cite a noble example of statesmanship I would cite the honoured name of Lincoln, who with firm convictions as to the integrity and wisdom of his own course yet waited till the policies which he was advocating had been sufficiently seized by the popular mind to warrant him carrying his great ideas into effect. How vast a gulf separates this from the opportunism of the right hon. gentleman who leads this government! To-day he and the Postmaster General and others of their followers are, with marvellous insolence arrogating to themselves credit for sending Canadian troops to South Africa.

> But man, proud man,
> Drest in a little brief authority,
> Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
> His glassy essence like an angry ape,
> Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
> As make the angels weep.

At that time it was, as at this time. Averse to move, loth to strengthen the imperial sentiment, or consolidate imperial action, this government moved only when inaction meant that they would have been swept from power and office by an indignant people, a people now derided by the Prime Minister and his colleague the Postmaster General as 'pharisees of imperial-

ism' and 'super-loyalists'; derided by gentlemen the measure of whose regard for Britain and British institutions is exhibited by ornate phrases, and by the determination plainly expressed by the limitations of this naval programme, that they will not stand at once by Britain's side in the hour of danger. It is true that, so far as the administrative power is concerned, the Conservative party is practically helpless at this time. The party led by the right hon. Prime Minister has in its hands the reins of power. We have the ardent desire, without the power to help Great Britain and the empire in this time of stress. But I would infinitely rather have the desire to help without the power than have the power without the desire.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister asks 'What would be the condition of Canada to-day and of the province of Quebec in particular if England were to lose the supremacy of the seas?' He asks and may well ask. But, in the face of possible, if not actual, danger we may also well ask: What is this government doing to aid in the maintenance of that supremacy? Nothing, absolutely nothing, as far as any help for many a long year goes. What is the proposed Canadian navy going to do for us when these gallant ships are finally turned off the stocks? Few of us in this House will have the hardihood to pose as naval experts. But, it does not require an expert to know that an unarmoured cruiser of the Bristol type is meant for scouting purposes and is built for speed and, as has been well put to elude pursuit. If this be their chief end and aim, to elude pursuit, the prospect is not encouraging. The Prime Minister and his colleague have expressed some pious sentiments in regard to their duty of defending British Columbia. It is pleasant to think that they are experiencing a solicitude about British Columbia's welfare. Hitherto, in some grave matters, they have shown a marked disregard of the best interests of the people of British Columbia. But, if, unfortunately, at some distant day, we should be at war with Japan the government is anxious to defend us. The Prime Minister says—and this is surely one of the humorous touches of this debate—'Circumstances may be such as to force us to do what Japan did—strike the enemy before the enemy strikes us.' I do not know whether the First Minister has 'mountains of information,' as to the difficulties ahead of him in such a task. If he knows anything of the Japanese navy, it must require a very large sleeve indeed to conceal all the laughter the right hon. gentleman is putting up it as he contemplates a Canadian Bristol cruiser built to elude pursuit, striking first one of the many armoured cruisers or battleships of our oriental friends. However, it is possible, as the leader of the opposition suggested that the New Zealand Dreadnought might come up in time to save us, though the process would not be without its humiliating side for a self-respecting Canadian.

Sir, in the face of the critical conditions now existing—in the face of impending danger, the proposed scheme of the government entirely fails to meet the case. The contribution of two battleships would not only be a far more effective aid to British naval supremacy, but would fit naturally into a broad scheme of naval defence of a permanent kind if the Canadian people pronounced themselves in favour of such a scheme. There would be no difficulty in associating Canada with the future of those two vessels. The admiralty would without doubt willingly man them with Canadian officers and men if, and when Canada can provide the men. It would stimulate Canadian interest and Canadian pride if the battleships were named on our suggestion. We would gladly see one of them named 'British Columbia', and the Prime Minister, if he likes, could name the other 'Quebec'. I can assure the government that in this whole matter the people of British Columbia will be keenly disappointed if nothing more substantial is done at this juncture than is at present proposed. Why should we in Canada, who have absolutely no experience in naval construction, to whom the path is so strange, hastily rush in where others have feared to tread? Let me point out that Germany herself and various nations have all first adopted the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition, viz.:—that of getting their first warships built in the great British yards where years of experience, and thousands of skilled workmen guarantee not only efficiency but expedition? Japan has been mentioned—Japan's first fighting vessel was a wooden frigate carrying 26 guns, ordered in Holland. This was barely fifty years ago. When Japan seriously entered on the task of creating a navy, her first step was to establish a naval college and barracks for training her men; and again in 1877 when she concluded to place ironclads on her waters, the first ship of this kind was designed by Sir Edward Reed and launched on the Thames in England.

In any event the people of this country have an absolute right to be consulted in a departure so grave and so radical as the initiation of a permanent policy of naval construction.

The Prime Minister says: 'Outside of this House it (his policy) has received the open commendation of the best and most experienced minds in the party'. We challenge the statement and ask him to put it to the test. The government knows just as clearly as everybody else knows that

they are absolutely unwarranted in committing the country to this scheme without the country being allowed to utter a word either of assent or dissent. But ministers are reaching out everywhere for excuses for not so consulting the people. The Postmaster General, in his desire to stifle the popular voice, hastily pleads that there is no need of a plebiscite when the loyalty, duty and chivalry of the Canadian people are in question. I do not know how the people of Quebec, for whom this speech was intended, will interpret these sentences, but in the west we should call it a flagrant example of side-stepping. Is there less loyalty, less chivalry, do we less perform our duty, if Canada, out of her riches and her affection, sends two giant battleships to reinforce the British fleet instead of withholding help for at least five, and probably for ten or fifteen years? Surely the minister does not intend this clap-trap for serious argument?

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to show that a critical juncture of affairs exists. Even the ministers indirectly have to acknowledge its existence. What then does the government propose to do to meet it? The Prime Minister, when the question of emergency was baldly put to him the other day remarked: 'We are getting pretty far from the question we have in hand just now'. But we have his answer in another place:

> For my part, he said, I do not see any cause of danger to Great Britain at the present time. Let me say further that if Great Britain were engaged in such a contest, a wave of enthusiasm to assist her would sweep over this country and all other British countries.

Yes, thank God, that is true. But under our proposals if Great Britain were engaged in a life and death struggle in three years, two Canadian battleships would be in the foremost line of battle. Under the government plan, there would be a wave of enthusiasm, but no battleships. Even the 'Bristols' would not be ready to sail on any kind of waves, even waves of enthusiasm. But one inspiring spectacle we should have at that dread time, for on March 29 last, the Prime Minister told us that if that time of storm and stress should come:

> I would stump the country and endeavour to impress upon my fellow countrymen, especially my compatriots of Quebec, my conviction that the salvation of England is the salvation of our own country.

He doesn't need to stump Canada on such a mission. Canada knows these things, and demands and insistently cries out that the government of Canada shall do its duty and do it now—Now!

Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks I urged that every member's attitude to this great question before the House must be determined by two things. One by the matter of imminence or non-imminence of danger to naval supremacy, and the other by the broad question of empire and Canada's part and lot therein. The first I have dealt with. The second I propose to deal with for a few minutes.

Those great words, patriotism, loyalty, duty, have been heard much of during this debate, and certainly if there ever was a question before the Canadian parliament which called for true loyalty and true patriotism in its discussion, this is one.

The Prime Minister says he is not an imperialist, not an anti-imperialist, but a Canadian. Sir, one does not like a personal note. But like thousands of my fellow-countrymen, I was born in England. More than a quarter of a century ago, out of all the world, I deliberately chose Canada as my country. For twenty-seven years, east and west, I have amid varying conditions, lived my life; like myself thousands of others have endeavoured faithfully to interpret the messages which our common country breathes in our ears from time to time; have loyally tried to translate those messages into practical work for the betterment and development of this great British Dominion beyond the seas. We are Canadians in every sense of the word; our patriotism is not less pure, our devotion to Canada not less sincere than those whose eyes first opened on Canadian scenes, and we speak with no less authority on these high matters which affect Canadian citizenship and Canadian destiny. Passionately as we are attached to Canada, proud as we are of the strengthening opulence of her life, assured as we are of her great future, we, Canadians too, have also a deep-rooted affection, not only for the motherland, but for all those over-sea sister states whose people are gloriously perpetuating in the twentieth century British institutions, and daily carrying into effect the noble ideals so long associated with British traditions and British liberty!

Feeling these things so deeply as we do we cannot help feeling that there is a tremendous, a grave, responsibility on us at this time. We ought not, we dare not, think only of ourselves. What we do, or do not do, may have a profound effect on others. South Africa, shortly to commence its formal career as a federated state within the empire, will anxiously watch to see the steps we take, and it is because so many of the arguments advanced to support the government policy, and because of the policy itself, that we urge the binding necessity on the government at the present time to move in a direction which makes for the solidarity of the empire, and not for its

future disintegration. The word autonomy has been strained to the breaking point. The Prime Minister has laboriously worked up the case of Canadian historical development and sees autonomy thrusting up its head on every page. There is an old saying that we get out of the Bible what we take into it. A lofty and noble message will be of noble and lofty import to one man. Another may read into the same words, and read out of them, simply an application to a local political condition. Similarly with history. It is one thing, as Whately said, to want to be on the side of truth, and another thing to want truth to be on our side. The Prime Minister appears to assume that we are even to this day in the position of having to wrest our autonomy from Great Britain, and it might be almost logically inferred from the whole tenor of his argument that the wresting process ought not to cease until we have achieved final autonomy in the shape of independence. The right hon. gentleman may comfort himself that in this view he was in line with an older and small school of English thought —now happily dead.

We are two peoples to all intents and purposes——

Wrote Cobden years ago,

—and it is a perilous delusion to both parties to attempt to keep up a sham connection and dependence which will snap asunder if it should ever be put to the strain of stern reality. I have felt an interest in this confederation scheme, because I thought it was only a step in the direction of an amicable separation. We have recognized their right——

—The right of the colonies

—to control their own fate, even to the point of asserting their own independence whenever they think fit, and which we know to be only a question of time.

Does the Prime Minister subscribe to these opinions? No one doubts that we can assert our independence. Great Britain, as we read things, gives us full liberty, but earnestly asks full co-operation in welding the empire together. No longer dependence, but inter-dependence. The South African war was the final answer to those who shared or yet share Cobden's views. We want not a separated country, not a fleet which in the hour of danger may or may not lift a hand, or fire a gun, whose vessels according to a significant hint may be flying a distinctive flag, but we want one King, one fleet, one flag. I was amazed at a statement of the Postmaster General when he argued out these things. In his speech, arguing for the government programme, he said:

I have here a list of independent countries and self-governing colonies whose population does not exceed 10,000,000 people, who have navies of their own.

Sir, a review of that list is significant, for not a single self-governing colony is to be found in all the eighteen cases cited. Leaving out China, which the minister stated was contemplating a naval programme, we have the seventeen countries quoted. Of these Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Portugal, Holland, and Greece are monarchies. Let us glance at the rest and see how this argument works out—an argument singularly unfortunate and even sinister: The Argentine Republic; Brazil, formerly a monarchy, but becoming a republic in 1889; Chili, which threw off the yoke of Spain and became independent in 1818; Colombia, which became a republic in 1819; Costa Rica, which took a similar course in 1829; Ecuador, a republic in 1830; Hayti, which asserted its independence in 1804, and whose unhappy and stained history we all know; Mexico, which became independent in 1857; Paraguay, which threw off its allegiance to Spain in 1811; Peru, which also did so in 1821, and San Domingo, which became independent in 1844. Where are the self-governing colonies here? My hon. friend accused the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) of not playing the game fairly. What about this? Let it also be remembered that in becoming independent these countries, as far as naval services go, have found the result to be vast and ever-increasing expense, weak and inefficient navies and in many cases universal service.

Does the minister imply that we should cast off our allegiance as these countries have theirs? The term is of different import to us. Ours is not a yoke under which we give grudging service to tyranny, but an allegiance and a loyalty willingly given, willingly received and to sunder which would mean not independence, but final absorption by the great country to the south, whose history and development we admire, but whose problems are not ours, and whose political destinies we do not wish to share.

The Prime Minister has paid a tribute of admiration to Lord Milner and has sheltered his policy behind the words of that great imperialist. Long passages were read from Lord Milner's addresses in this country, addresses with which most of us are thoroughly familiar. My right hon. friend remarks:

Lord Milner was here last fall, and you will pardon me, Sir, if I recall to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite what were the opinions of Lord Milner upon this question.

He then cites amongst others the following passages from Lord Milner's Toronto speech:

It is not a question of shifting burdens, but of developing fresh centres of strength. For this reason I have never been a great advocate of contributions from the self-governing states to the army and navy of the United

Kingdom, though as evidences of the solidarity of the empire such contributions are welcome and valuable pending the substitution of something better. But I am sure that the form which imperial co-operation in this field will ultimately take and ought to take, the form at once most consistent with the dignity of the individual states and most conducive to their collective strength and organic union, is the development of their several defensive resources in material and manhood.

Well, Sir, we too believe that regular and periodic contributions of money to Great Britain are not the most desirable way of performing our duty, and the leader of the opposition has said so very emphatically. We too believe that ultimately Canada should, and no doubt will, strengthen and develop her own defensive resources. But let me emphasize one thing. Lord Milner was not in Canada last fall. This very address was delivered in October, 1908, and it is necessary, therefore, to clearly bear in mind, in arguing from the passages that the Prime Minister quoted, that Lord Milner was emphatically dealing with the ultimate policy, and not with what was Canada's best course at the present time.

What did Lord Milner, whose authority the Prime Minister invoked, say, when speaking on this question at Stockport on December 20 last? These words he uttered, and those who call him to their aid and shelter themselves behind his name and prestige would do well to bear them in mind:

> The great position which this country occupied in the world—a position won for us by the enterprise, sacrifice, industry and courage of our forefathers, though still held is being more menaced every day. The undoubted supremacy which this country at one time possessed at sea, if it has not gone, is seriously challenged.

We cannot doubt what the attitude of Lord Milner would be in the present case, nor can we doubt that he passionately hopes for a strengthening and not the weakening of imperial ties. My right hon. friend quoted a passage also from Lord Milner's speech in Vancouver in 1908. Here again it applies to ultimate action in defence and as the Prime Minister left off just where the passage became most interesting, I will finish the paragraph:

> Without any loss of individuality, without any excessive strain on her resources it is within her power to enjoy all the benefits of that great position not only on this continent, but throughout the world, in which every self-governing community under the British Crown is equally entitled to participate. Canada would be greater, far greater, as a member, perhaps in time a leading member of that group of powerful though pacific nations, than she ever could be in isolation.

With that proposition we on this side of the House entirely agree, and it is because we agree to it that we cannot support a policy which so obtrudes a false idea of autonomy as to say that a navy having been built, not a gun shall be fired until the Governor in Council or this parliament says so. The fundamental difference between military and naval matters in this connection are too obvious to be pointed out. Every one knows that on its naval side the issue between Japan and Russia was decided in the first hour of attack. The position taken by the government is impossible and repugnant to the feelings of the whole country. The moment, in the face of war, that question is debated that moment we cease to belong to the empire in any real sense. We cannot be of the empire and yet not of it. To say as prominent Liberal organs have said that we may lend our ships to Great Britain—with emphasis on the may—is to admit the point is an arguable one, a distasteful and dangerous admission.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this expression of my own feelings on this great question. and also I believe the opinions of the vast body of my constituents, I can but again repeat my belief that the step proposed by the leader of the opposition is the wise, the patriotic, the right step and the people of Canada will so regard it.

We cannot lightly talk of war, or lightly consider the infinite miseries that follow it. Grant's words that 'war is hell' must remain true for ever. But there is another kind of war, a war which, to use the glowing words of Ruskin:

> In which the natural instincts of self-defence are sanctified by the nobleness of the institutions, and purity of the households, which they are appointed to defend. To such war as this all men are born; in such war as this any man may happily die; and forth from such war as this have arisen throughout the extent of past ages, all the highest sanctities and virtues of humanity.

We owe it to ourselves to help the coming of that day when every state in the empire shall be worthily represented in a council of imperial defence. Such a step would in itself be the surest step towards the securing of peace. We owe it to ourselves in Canada at this time and hour to see that we linger not behind others in the defence of the empire.

On this grave matter, of a permanent naval policy, fraught with far-reaching results, the government ought and should consult the people who are the final authority. We know not whither it will lead, or what consequences will follow: 'Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide'. If the Prime Minister will not refer the issue to those who placed this government in power, we can at least tell him what we feel to be the absolute truth: that Canada,

if it were given its rightful opportunity of expression, its choice between the government proposals and the patriotic plan of the leader of the opposition—would unhesitatingly choose the latter, and, out of its riches, and out of its strength, sustain a policy which makes for the speedy and effective strengthening of that navy which has guarded our liberties in the past, and which alone can guard them effectually in the future.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer). Mr. Speaker, I must say that my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell), for a gentleman who bestows so much contempt upon waves of enthusiasm, certainly to my mind gave undue importance at the beginning of his remarks to the exact chronological moment at which he and his followers in somewhat discordant tones, so far as I can remember, sang the National Anthem. I have been accustomed to hear Tories on both sides of the Atlantic claim a monopoly of loyalty and patriotism, and it would now seem as if they claimed a monopoly of the National Anthem. I am one of those, Sir, who do not believe that the main strength and enduring greatness of a people depend upon armaments. The world is full of decayed civilizations, but every one of these civilizations died first from within. The real strength of a people is in the strong arm, the healthy body, but far more than that in a healthier mind and good morals. And, I am bound to say that the people of Canada, following as they have followed, the advice of the right hon. the Prime Minister —which has been suitable for Canada up to this period of her history—the advice to keep out of the vortex of European militarism, have not lost but gained in the process. Does any one pretend that Canada has been weaker because she has followed that policy hitherto? No. With no desire to interfere with others and yet with a quiet determination that others shall not interfere with her, the strength of Canada has been as the strength of ten because her heart was pure. But, having said this much I am bound to admit that we live in a practical age and that the resolution of last March really narrows this discussion down to a very fine point indeed. It narrows it down to two definite lines of policy upon which we must decide. As the House, most unfortunately as I think, upon a question of foreign policy is to be forced to a division. Now, I think it would be regarded as a presumption on my part were I to make a long speech. I do not think that the House or the country is looking for long speeches from private members after the extremely exhaustive speech of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister on the second reading of the Bill and the equally exhaustive speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition on the first reading. I would like, however, to say a few words on the points which have been raised in the speeches of the two gentlemen who have spoken for the opposition to-day; and at the outset I wish to say that I am in perfect agreement with the main position taken by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and by the hon. member for Yale Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) as to what ought to determine, or largely determine, the attitude of members on this question. The question, is there any immediate peril to the empire? Is that peril imminent or non-imminent? as my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo put it, is a question upon the answer we give to which will depend largely the attitude of members who want to give a rational vote at the end of this discussion.

Now, both my hon. friends have based their case for a present imminent peril of the empire very largely upon what I may call authority. One of the authorities was quoted with very great surprise to me. I am surprised that my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo attached the importance he did to the writings of the quondam Socialist, Mr. Robert Blatchford. Why, Sir, if he were well acquainted with the former writings of that gentleman—perhaps he is, I do not know, but it does not seem to me as if he were—he would remember that Mr. Blatchford, when he was the editor of a paper called 'The Clarion,' eight or ten years ago, was writing in that paper the very stuff about a German invasion which he has been trying to frighten the British public with during the general election. If that be the kind of authority on whom my hon. friend bases his effort to prove that the German menace is imminent, and if that gentleman has been blowing his clarion off and on for the last eight or ten years, and we are still living free from a German attack, I am bound to say that my logical faculties are such that I cannot be worked into a state of panic over anything that emanates from the pen of Mr. Robert Blatchford. However, there were very much more eminent authorities quoted by my hon. friend from North Grey as well as by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo. A great deal was made by the hon. member for North Grey of the speeches delivered to our own delegates and the delegates from the rest of the empire on the occasion of the press conference in Great Britain last summer. But as I listened to the quotations from those speeches, so far as I could gather the object of the various statesmen speaking to those press delegates, they did not want to convey to them for a moment that there was any particular peril to Great Britain at the hands of Germany. I think they rather wanted to impress upon them a thought as old as Adam Smith, that the time had come when the whole burden of imperial defence could no longer be allowed

to rest on the mother country. Take the language that was used. The members of the press conference were asked to exercise a forethought extending over years, to look forward, and Mr. Balfour was careful to say to the delegates that there should be no panic.

A great deal was made by both of my hon. friends of the utterances of Sir Edward Grey. I quite agree with them that no British statesman could be quoted whose language ought to be listened to with greater respect or consideration than that of Sir Edward Grey. But I think that where my friends have made a mistake is that they have not seen the most recent utterances of that right hon. gentleman. Speaking when the election was almost over, at Hexham, in my native county, after seven seats fought there had gone Liberal, and contributing his quota to the eighth one going Liberal, he referred to his speech of last March, which my hon. friends have quoted, and referred to it in this language:

> There was not a word to take from anything from which they said in March last with regard to the navy, and not a word to be unsaid. Was there anything to be added? Yes, this, that during last year they gave orders for the ships which were necessary to be built to be put in hand in the course of this year in order to maintain our naval position. In March they said that it might require to be done; they were now in a position to say that they had done it.

Well, that is one member of the British Cabinet; and let me say at this point that I cannot confine myself in what I quote to utterances preceding the late general election. I was astonished at my hon. friend the leader of the opposition taking that attitude, because it surely created the inference that no men of front rank in British politics are quite sincere at election times. Well, I do not concede that. I think I can furnish evidence that some candidates in the recent campaign were sincere; and, while we may believe in the sincerity of Mr. Robert Blatchford, I do not think we need attach much importance to what he said. But when Mr. Lloyd-George, who was the leading figure in the recent contest, and who will continue to be a leading figure in political life in England for years to come, described this, like other British panics, as 'manufactured cries of national danger,' I think we should attach some importance to his language. Mr. Asquith, shortly after the speech on which my hon. friends base so much of their reasoning, went on to add that old ladies of both sexes might rest quietly in their beds, because the empire was perfectly secure. Now, I contend that such a description, applied to the scare mongers is sufficiently strong, and comes from a sufficiently high authority, for a country with our broad prairies and our clear air and our self-reliant people not to pay too much attention to these scare-mongers. Mr. Churchill, another prominent member of the British Cabinet—and these are men who know the real condition of the navy—has referred to the scare-mongers of last spring as 'March hares and April fools running about the country creating an unfounded panic.' But before this House had broken up in the month of May last, another prominent member of the British Cabinet was doing what many of the British people were doing at intervals during the most of last summer—interchanging ideas with their fellows of the same race among the great German people. The right Hon. John Burns was addressing a large number of German trades unionists who were visiting Great Britain, and he used this language:

> Your visit is timely. It coincides with the collapse of an attempt to foment mischief between the two great branches of the same race. I have seen a few scares in this country come and go, but I never saw one more hollow and less decent than the last. It has hardly lasted the traditional nine days. It was confined to a small section of people, and I may say, with few exceptions, to the least reputable of our journals, to the most unreliable of our precocious politicians, and to a few socialists who ought to have known better.

That was very strong language to have come right on the back of the scare on which we carried the resolution of last March and on which scare, I understand, the whole defence of the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is being based by the two speakers who have preceded me to-day. But we are not dependant on British authority in this matter. I hold in my hand the account of the Press Conference, by one of the ablest journalists in Canada, who was present at that conference, written in England in the shape of letters to his own newspaper while there. And what had he to say about the scare in the country last summer while the conference was going on? If the speeches quoted by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) had the significance which he attached to them, surely that significance would have found its way into the head of this journalist.

Mr. BRADBURY. Who was that journalist?

Mr. M. CLARK. Mr. John Dafoe, the editor of the Manitoba 'Free Press.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. M. CLARK. My hon. friends laugh at the name. I suppose that is because he belongs to a different political party than themselves. I described him as a great journalist, and if I want to justify

my description of him I could surely do it up to the hilt when I mention that there was scarcely a committee of the journalists for whatever purpose of that conference appointed by themselves on which Mr. John Dafoe was not placed, and let me say to my hon. friends that when we have the good opinion of our peers and fellows with whom we work we have the highest testimony that we are men of reputation and of worth. Mr. Dafoe said:

The panic, of course, has quite passed away, leaving behind it a fixed resolution in the minds of Englishmen, of all classes, that in a matter of such supreme importance to them as the supremacy of the seas, they will take no chances.

Might I offer the testimony of another journalist who has passed through the recent election. I think that, as Canadians, we cannot afford not to pay attention to the journalists who are over there. Something was said by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in criticism of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) for a remark he made about the last elections having settled the war scare, and the hon. member for Grey in regard to that, quoted Portsmouth as a place where the scare was evidently believed in. In Portsmouth and the other dockyard towns it is not so much belief in the scare as our old and well known friend, patronage, which affects an election. It is a cure for the scare that the people of Portsmouth and Davenport are interested in, because they get their living by building ships, and, of course, they listen to any one who goes there and promises an enlarged naval force. Mr. Joe Clark is the correspondent to whom I refer. I do not remember even the papers which he represented, but I read all his letters, and his forecasts of the campaign seem to me to indicate a journalist of an alert mind to whose word we should attach a good deal of importance. He said:

The navy scare will probably pass away. In fact it has been almost impossible to find anybody not on the stump afraid of Germany and one feels that such talk would not be used except in a country too strong to care whether a neighbouring nation took offence or not.

Mention was made of Lord Beresford's attitude. This same journalist quotes some words of Lord Beresford, and I am bound to believe he would only have done so on the best of authority. He states that Lord Beresford said after the contest, and I think these words indicate the exact importance he attached to the scare:

I do not wish to make a party thing of the navy, but you have got to get into parliament somehow.

Taking these views of the journalists who have been there and the leading members of the British cabinet, I am bound to say that I do not see there is much evidence that they believe in any imminent danger from Germany at all. I would like to quote the language of Mr. Balfour, the prominent statesman on the other side of politics. He was taken to task by Mr. Asquith for referring to an opinion among the statesmen and diplomatists of the lesser powers of Europe. Mr. Balfour said:

You will find among them absolute unanimity of opinion that a struggle sooner or later between this country and Germany is inevitable.

Yes, but Mr. Balfour was careful, with the sense of responsibility which naturally is felt by a man who might conceivably have had to go into office and hold diplomatic relationships with the great country of Germany, to immediately add:

I do not agree with them, that is their opinion.

So that every leading member of the government of England, at the present moment, has thrown doubt upon the motives and the reality of the scare of last spring, and Mr. Balfour, the leader of the opposition, agrees with them.

But, as I said, my friends have rested mainly upon authority in this matter. I, Sir, have other methods by which I judge of the importance of these panics into which the British people go from time to time. A little history is a splendid cure for a good deal of hysteria. I am old enough, I regret to say, to remember when the word 'jingo' first became a current word in British politics. In 1878 Lord Beaconsfield and the Marquis of Salisbury returned from the Berlin congress, and the Prime Minister made the famous speech in which he said: I bring you peace, and peace with honour. The London crowd went crazy and broke Mr. Gladstone's windows. Yes, but the London crowd was not then representative of British opinion, and in 15 or 16 months after that event, so far from the British people being carried away by that panic and entering or rather coming any nearer to war with Russia—it was Russia that the scaremongers were frightened of at that time—Mr. Gladstone won the country by a majority of 120, and that scare, for the moment, was forgotten, indeed it has been forgotten ever since because we have had no war. It is over half a century ago since the British people were similarly excited over the absurd rumour that the French people were building ships secretly in the harbours of Toulon and Cherbourg. There is no one to whom we ought to pay the attention that we do to the successful prophet, the man who sees the meaning of those things at the time. As I said, a little history is a splendid cure for a good deal of hysteria. Mr. Richard Cobden said at that time:

There is something very puerile in the recent attempts to frighten the country with stories about secret preparations in the French dockyards.

Yes, and how puerile it looks to us to-day, 50 years after the event, when we reflect that from that moment to this there has grown up between the great French and English nations the entente cordiale unbroken by a single warlike act during half a century.

It is absurd to have any fears of a war between Germany and England at the present time, owing to the relative strength of the two peoples and the two fleets. Why, I do not understand the make-up of the Jingo. It is beyond all possible doubt that the British seamen in the British navy at the present time number two and a fraction to one in the Germany navy. Britain is equally superior in the matter of ships. What is the attitude of hon. members towards the Englishman's fighting power anyway? The people who made the charge at Balaclava did not ask to be twice as strong as their opponents? I have never heard that Nelson and Wellington made it a sine qua non of their fighting that they should be two and a half times as strong as the enemy. I cannot understand the make-up of the Jingo. Have hon. members no belief in the might of England? Have they no knowledge of her history? I cannot for the life of me see why we should insist on Britain being two and a half times as strong as Germany, and, when we fear that it may be otherwise, to get into a state of hysterical excitement and do things that we shall be sorry for six months after when we have recovered from our unworthy panic. But I rest more on the good-will that prevails between the two peoples. And I am bound to say that, while I think a number of my fellow countrymen have been—to use the old American phrase—twisting the tail of the German lion, a trick that used to be played regularly in elections in the United States with regard to Great Britain herself, it redounds greatly to the credit of the German people that they have taken it all calmly and quietly. The trade relations between the two peoples make it the most unthinkable thing in the world that there could be war between them. Let me read what John Burns said on this subject upon the occasion to which I have referred:

> On the ground of race, religion, ideals and aims, Europe and the world would be the poorer if Germany and Britain were involved in a war. Germany was England's best customer and he was not a wise shopkeeper who advocated the blacking of the eyes of his best customer as a means of advertising his business. England sent Germany over £41,000,000 of goods and Germany sent England £57,000,000 a year, £12,000,000 of which was in food, whilst the British empire sent to Germany goods to the value of £90,000,000.

It is inconceivable to me that the two foremost nations of the world to-day are going to stop the whole beneficial service of commerce in the North Sea to fight it out like two school boys to see which is the stronger of the two.

Now, Sir, I think I have furnished sufficient ground for holding a different view from that of these two hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred as to the imminence of the German peril. But, we are face to face with the situation, peril or no peril, and there are two methods of handling it before the members of this House. Now, I must say that I was immensely disappointed when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) tabled his amendment. Having regard to the speeches which he had been delivering all summer and during the fall, I anticipated that he would allow this question of the foreign policy, this question of such immense importance, to pass the House without a division. We have heard, however, Sir, that the tail sometimes wags the dog. When three tails of extraordinary activity get wagging all at one time the result is likely to be serious. The result was the production of what I would call an omnibus resolution—an omnibus with compartments. Into one compartment was hustled the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) and those who agree with him, singing: 'We don't know where we are, but we're going to the country to find out'. Into the more roomy compartment of the omnibus were crowded the larger number of those who sit behind the leader of the opposition, singing, as befitted them, the old Jingo refrain:—

> We don't want to fight,
> But, by jingo, if we do,
> We've got the men, and we've got the ships,
> And we've got the money, too!

Until my hon. friend resumed his seat, I thought there would have been a compartment for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), but he struck on the business and switched off on a little conveyance of his own. The main omnibus was driven, I need not say, by the leader of the opposition with every apparent encouragement from his chief lieutenant, and the whole party raced off as fast as they could from implementing the resolution for which they were, equally with the other side, responsible last March.

What is it that the amendment proposes, Mr. Speaker? It proposes to carry out at once the policy of the opposition and propose to refer the policy of responsible government to the people. Well, that is a shifting of governmental respon-

sibility. But, if a referendum is good for the Liberal policy, which happens to be the policy of the majority of this House, surely it will be equally good for the policy of the minority, especially as there is no great panic, as I have tried to prove. Surely, the referendum policy would apply to the policy of providing Dreadnoughts as well as to the proposal to build a Canadian navy? There are one or two questions which I would like to ask about the giving of these Dreadnoughts. How often would hon. members propose this policy? Are these Dreadnoughts to be the finish, the final policy of Canada? Is that all they propose to do towards saving the empire in the midst of the terrible peril to which she is exposed in the pages of Mr. Robert Blatchford's writings? If not, and if there is to be gift of Dreadnoughts, when? I wish to push these questions upon the opposition. I judge that there will be plenty of members from that side following me, and I want them to explain to the House and country just how this thing is going to work out. How many Dreadnoughts are we going to give? Perhaps I could help to answer that question. These delegates of ours to the imperial conference saw a wonderful sight in the Solent last summer. The British fleet was there assembled, 144 battleships, covering eighteen miles of water. And the thing which bears upon the question I am putting to my hon. friends of the opposition is this—that only one of these battleships had been in existence twelve years before. You are going to give two towards one hundred and forty-four—not an almighty contribution, but probably sufficient There are a great many questions that the opposition have been directing to the government side of the House about the government policy that are equally applicable to their own. What is the empire going to do, we have been asked, during the time the ships are building? All I have to say is that if the empire, with 144 ships of her own on the Solent, depends absolutely for her salvation upon the two Dreadnoughts of the opposition, she will be in a worse place still. But the point I wish to urge upon my hon. friends is that this fleet was new within twelve years. You give your two Dreadnoughts, at a cost to Canada of about $25,000,000. Then, about time when the British fleet is rebuilt, you have to give two Dreadnoughts again. But if, long before that, Mr. Robert Blatchford and the yellow press of England agree to raise a scare, are you going to propose a policy of this kind every time such a scare is raised? There is a great deal to be said in support of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) when he said that the yellow press was at the back of this whole policy. I hold in my hand a telegram sent February 29, 1909, from the 'Standard' newspaper in England to the 'Evening Journal' of this city:

Build your navy. The rest must come. Build and your claim to a share in controlling imperial defence cannot be evaded, but build.

Now, I would like to know if, every time the English yellow press gets into this particular mood, and sends a telegram to the 'Evening Journal' of Ottawa, we are going to give another couple of 'Dreadnoughts'? Unless we are to withdraw from the empire altogether, you are not going to stop with the two, you will give another couple at least in eight or ten years when the present vessels of the British navy have become obsolete, and you have to replace them. But during that time you will not have taught a single Canadian to go to sea without being sea-sick, you will not have taught a single Canadian youth to walk the decks, you will have remained a nation of land lubbers—that is the practical outcome of the policy of the opposition. Contrast that with the plan of the government. The panic on one side, what we are concerned with is, not the giving of 'Dreadnoughts,' not a policy which is so ill thought out as that, but we are concerned with the orderly development of Canada as a portion of the empire.

Now what are the merits of the government plan? I want to state them in a couple of sentences. In the first place, the government plan is at least on an equality, for emergency purposes, with the opposition plan, because, if we are going to have a war with Germany next week, it is clear that any money we send to build 'Dreadnoughts' could not be used in that time. So that so far as emergency goes, the one plan is as good, or as poor, as the other. If emergency comes upon Britain quickly, we should at any rate be in quite as good a position as the opposition, or as we have been at any past period in British history. But I would say in criticism of the hon. leader of the opposition at this point that the very objection he made to the government plan is equally applicable to his own: it either goes too far, or not far enough. For my part, if the empire were really in danger, I do not believe Canadians would be content with giving a couple of 'Dreadnoughts.' The real asset which the empire has in Canada is in the knowledge of the fact that behind her, if the worst comes to the worst, she has all the material and moral resources of the people of Canada; and when that is made known to her it is better than giving a couple of 'Dreadnoughts.' So far as emergency goes, that is all the knowledge that Britain would want. I have some young fellows myself who can handle a rifle fairly well, and if the old land was really exposed to danger from a foreign foe, those young fellows, and others in the west, could not be restrained, and I think

I should have to put a sticking plaster on myself. 'Give a couple of Dreadnoughts.' I have heard of little Englanders in England, and I think I have discovered some little Canadians in Canada.

Not only is the government plan at least on an equality for emergency purposes with the opposition view, but it guarantees the autonomy of Canada. Now, disguise the contribution plan as you may, it gives away that autonomy, and if you repeat your contribution from time to time, it becomes equivalent to taxation. If you do not repeat it, then I think you would be little Canadians. Disguise it how you may, a cash contribution for 'Dreadnoughts' would amount to taxation without representation. Now, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, running away as he was from his resolution of last March—because it was his just as much as the Prime Minister's—he did what is very uncommon with him, but he did what people very often do when they are going to do a foolish thing, he rather lost his temper, and he charged the right hon. gentleman with great heat, with having talked two-thirds of the time he was on his feet, wide of the subject. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with that view. I think that the magnificent argument we had, the history we had of the rise of Canadian autonomy, and the need of preserving it, was absolutely pertinent to that point. What is the history of the colonies of the empire in that respect? From the time of Lord Durham's memorandum and the repeal of the navigation laws by Lord John Russell, the attitude of the old country has been under the aegis of British Liberalism; the policy of the old country has been to produce, not so much an empire, as an alliance of free nations, independent for a great many purposes, but connected for others. That is the history of autonomy, and I should think that our Tory friends would have had enough of the other policy when they reflect upon what happened to the United States of America. That good old Tory, Lord North, believed in running the colonies from Downing street, and he tried it with the American colonies, with the result that they are gone. Well might Lord Beaconsfield call the Tory party the stupid party, because they are talking the same imperialsm to-day, they are building the same kind of a Tower of Babel, that will end in the same confusion, and chaos, and failure that attended that memorable building.

Not only is the government plan on an equality for emergency purposes with the opposition plan, not only does it guarantee the autonomy of Canada, but as I have said, it takes its place naturally in the national development, and it keeps hold of the purse strings. Let me say, Sir, that this is a point of very great importance. My hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo said just now that the Lord loveth a cheerful giver. Well, it is as well that he quoted that text for the benefit of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, because I am sure it would never have any effect upon the Minister of Finance. 'The Lord loveth a cheerful giver' may be a very good maxim for people to carry out in their private enterprises, but I do not think it would be a good maxim for those responsible for taxing the country, and governing the people with the proceeds of their taxation. The Lord may love a cheerful giver, but I do not think the taxpayer has the same affection for him. I am bound to say that the resolution of last March could not leave this country where it had been, because we were bound after that resolution to do something. A great deal of the growth of this nation's responsibility in the empire is based upon the possibility of paying our own obligations as we go along, and retaining some of the benefit by giving fresh outlets to the enterprise of our people; and if we are ever to be a sea-faring people, teaching our young generation, those of them who want to go to sea, to learn to be sailors, would seem to be an essential part of a sound policy upon this question. I have endeavoured, as far as might be, to argue this question, free from partisanship.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. M. CLARK. Well, if a man be a partisan when he proves that the authorities of those who build up a panic are not quite what they expected they were themselves, then I have been a partisan. I have taken one side of the argument, but it happens to be the right side. I have, at least, been non-partisan in this that I have never hinted, nor would it be fitting to hint, at the want of loyalty on the part of a single member of the Conservative party. Be he French or English, I give him credit for as good citizenship as I possess myself, and I must say that it would redound greatly to the credit of the Conservative party if they would follow my example in that respect. I marvel at any member of the Conservative party trying to cast doubt upon the First Minister of the Crown of this great country. I marvel at it for this reason that for two generations Liberalism has been teaching that the peculiar glory of the British people has been that they are colonists and that they can take Frenchmen and, by giving them their freedom, make them good citizens of this great free empire. It is still the glory of British statesmen and of British Liberalism to believe in freedom as the cement of empire, witness the giving of freedom recently to South Africa. I marvel at this want of courtesy and want

of faith. However, I recollect that before I became a citizen of Canada I used to see that when the Prime Minister visited Britain, at least, his loyalty was believed in there by all classes of the people. I tell my hon. friends with all due deference to the talent which is on their benches, that it will be a long time before the same kind of a reception is given to any man outside of the right hon. gentleman himself in Great Britain.

Sir, if, after over 200 years of freedom from war in Great Britain, the smoke of battle were to be seen there again instead of the much more beneficent smoke of industrial enterprise which has prevailed for a couple of centuries, and if the land of this sacred island were to be stained again with human blood, from all I have seen of Canadians, I believe there would be aroused the cry from the whole Anglo-Saxon population of Canada: Hands off the cradle of our race, but I believe there would be mingled with that cry the equally patriotic and strong cry from every one of our French Canadian citizens: Hands off the mother of our liberties.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, at the outset I may say that I do not propose to treat this subject at any great length, but there are a few points to which I desire to direct attention. I listened somewhat attentively to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who has just taken his seat for the purpose of jotting down points that I might answer, but I regret to say that the paper is yet a comparative blank. Although he travelled over ancient, medieval and modern history, political economy and the abstract questions of government, nearly four-fifths of his speech, I thought, had very little to do with the question before the House. He did say before he sat down that the Canadian people were loyal. Well, I agree with him in that. I think there is no doubt about that. The Canadian people as a whole are loyal. There may be individual cases of disloyalty. There may be policies propounded for Canada that, if carried out, would lead to disloyalty, but I think the great heart of the Canadian people is loyal. The hon. member for Red Deer finished by saying that the government proposal or plan had two merits. What were they? One was that it was quite as good as that proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Well, that is an admission that there is some merit in the proposal contained in the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He did not claim that the government proposal was any better, but at least that it was as good. The other merit was that it preserved the autonomy of Canada. Does that imply that the amendment which was proposed would not preserve the autonomy of Canada? That is the only and natural inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks. There is no man in this House who will read the resolution calmly and dispassionately, or analyse and criticise it fairly, who will reach the conclusion that there is anything in it that would lead to a sacrifice of the autonomy that we enjoy at the present time. The hon. gentleman went over a lot of ground and what occurred to me as a fair summing up of his speech as a whole was what I heard once from a very young professor who was asked if he could give a clear and logical demonstration of chemistry. Well, he said, the shortest and best that I know of is about this. I will give you an example of it:

> You take an effervescent
> And add a deliquescent,
> There will be a precipitation
> That is a conglomeration
> That amounts to a demonstration.

His statement was just about as clear and just about as logical. The first observation made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when moving the second reading of the Bill, which attracted my attention, was the positive and emphatic statement, as he turned around to look at his friends, that the government intend to stand or fall by this policy. What did he intend that to be? It could not be addressed to members of the opposition because they are generally found opposing the government, but it was a very strong and vigorous threat addressed to his own friends. Why? Because forsooth there must be a very great diversity of opinion and strong opposition to the policy which the government has propounded. That is the only conclusion to reach from that observation. I am justified in reaching that conclusion as well, because farther on, in answer to the question I asked him: Do you mean to say that when England is at war, Canada is at war?—he said: Certainly he did. Then he went on to say that when he made that statement he shocked his friends in Quebec until they rent their garments and tore their hair. These remarks were addressed to his friends in Quebec, and it, therefore, would not seem that they were standing as a solid phalanx behind his back; they could not have been addressed to the opposition in this House because he does not stand or fall by the power of the opposition, for were they strong enough they would vote him out of power. Then his next observation was that there was no emergency between Germany and England. Surely to arrive at this conclusion he must have ignored the calm and deliberate statements made by Sir Edward Grey, by Mr. Reginald McKenna, by Mr. Asquith, by Lord Roberts, by Lord Char-

les Beresford, and every one of the public men of England who gave their views as to the necessity for a strong naval construction policy by Great Britain. True, the Postmaster General told us, when I questioned him across the floor, that he was ignorant of the statements made by these gentlemen last spring, but he had heard the matter discussed during the election. However that may be, surely the Prime Minister was aware of the statements of British statesmen that there was a grave crisis at present in the British empire. The right hon. gentleman told us that if there was any emergency the Liberals would be as ready to assist in the time of need as the Conservatives would be, but if all he has heard and seen will not convince him that a crisis is upon the empire, then it would be a waste of time for us to try to convince him. The right hon. gentleman told us there was no danger because the navy of England represented 2,000,000 tons displacement, whereas the German navy represented only 890,000 tons. That may be all very well when you apply it to each of the navies as a whole, but if you take from the British navy such ships as are not considered of any great value as a fighting force, and then compare the Dreadnoughts of the two countries, the difference will not be found to be nearly so great. If Germany should continue her activity in building Dreadnoughts for the next three or four years, and if England should make no more progress than she has made for some years past, then Germany would have a fighting force equal to that of England. And, if this great German navy is not intended against England, what does she want it for? No other naval power than England begins to compare with her. England is the only country that has a navy superior to that of Germany, and if Germany did not design her ships against England she would have no nation with which to claim rivalry on the seas. The right hon. gentleman told us that it was trifling with common sense to say that this policy now announced by the government was a new policy, and he added that it had been clearly before the people since 1902. Well, there were three distinct colonial conferences attended by representatives of Canada. At the first conference all that was done was to agree to have another conference in three years. The second conference was largely taken up with discussion as to the trade relations between the different portions of the empire, and although defence was mentioned there was nothing formulated except the assistance offered by the Australian colonies to the motherland. At the conference of 1902 there was a proposal made in regard to naval defence, and one of the authorities who made the statement before the conference said:

Mr. SPROULE.

Sir Wilfrid informed me that His Majesty's government of the Dominion of Canada are contemplating the establishment of a naval force in the waters of Canada but they were not able to make any offer of assistance analogous to those enumerated above.

That was all there was about it. We had an election in 1904, but the government of Canada did not propound their naval policy, and they did not ask the people to sanction it. So far as I am concerned I never heard it discussed on a Canadian platform. And, what has this government done up to the present time with regard to carrying out any naval policy? They have boasted that they have taken over the naval stations at Esquimalt and Halifax, and to that extent relieved the mother country of the expense of their maintenance, but what money has Canada expended to provide any ships to defend these naval bases? None at all. We are absolutely without any defence even so far as Canada is concerned. Of course, the Minister of Marine has told us that we have built some fishery protection cruisers and established certain aids to navigation, and built the Canadian Pacific railway to transport troops across the continent, and in that way we have given aid to imperial defence. But, I have no knowledge that we have done anything to relieve the mother country of the heavy burden of naval expenditure which she has been constantly bearing outside of what we have done at Halifax and Esquimalt. But whatever was proposed then, it was said that the other colonies were doing something. While the United Kingdom was spending 15s. 2d. per head for naval defence, Cape Colony was spending 1s. 10d. per head, Australia 1s. 0¾d. per head, Natal 10s. 9d., Newfoundland 6s. 7½d., and New Zealand 1s. 0¼d., the Dominion of Canada is marked 'nil'—not a farthing, either to help the empire or to help ourselves. What was done at the conference of 1907? Practically nothing. There were discussions as to what might be done, but there was no practical scheme evolved that was submitted for the approval of the Canadian people. Then we come down to the conference of 1909, which evolved the naval scheme which we have to-day. It was not until then that any proposition had been crystallized into concrete form that could either be understood or submitted to the Canadian people. And yet the right hon. the First Minister says that this is an old question, that the Canadian electors knew all about it, and had assented to it again and again. We had an election in 1904, but not a word was heard about it, and no policy was laid down by the government. We had another election in 1908, and again no policy of naval defence was submitted to the Canadian people. There-

fore I am justified in saying that this is a new policy that was never submitted to the Canadian people. That is one of the reasons why we say that before we commence an undertaking that is going to be financially so great and so far-reaching in its results, and that may change our relationship to the mother country, it ought to be submitted to the Canadian people, so that they may have an opportunity to express their views upon it. That is one of the features of our resolution.

I am opposed to this policy because it means a heavy initial expenditure and a constantly increasing expenditure in the years to come. The right hon. the First Minister told us that the vessels he outlined would probably cost to construct about $15,000,000, and afterwards about $4,000,000 per year to maintain. If we judge what the naval force of the country will cost by what the militia force has been costing us since it was reorganized, we must come to the conclusion that $4,000,000 a year will not be half the outlay the Canadian people will be obliged to make to maintain that force. Let us compare this initial expenditure with the expenditure we make in other lines. I take up the estimates submitted for our consideration, and I find that we are asked to vote for the coming year the following sums: Civil government, $4,587,000; arts, agriculture and statistics, $1,114,000, which includes practically everything we spend for the farmers of the whole country; for every dollar we spend in the interest of the great agricultural class, the farmers of the country, we propose to spend fifteen for naval purposes, this is what is proposed by this Bill; railways and canals, $899,000; public works for the whole country, $8,104,000; mail subsidies and steamship subventions, $1,860,000; naval service—I do not know where it is unless it is on the fishery protection boats—$855,000; ocean and river service, $1,025,000; lighthouse and coast service, $2,321,000; subsidies to provinces, $9.117,000; Indians, $1,368,000. Take any one of these important lines and put it alongside of the expenditure proposed by this Bill, and it is a mere trifle; and these are the lines along which we must have increasing expenditures in our growing country. I have said that to judge what this proposal means to us in the future we can only calculate what we do not know from what we do know. We know that our militia was organized a few years ago. We were told that it was going to be valuable, that while it would cost a little more money, it would be worth while to make the additional expenditure. We consented to it. What has been the result? In 1896, when the present government came into power, the militia of Canada cost $2,193,000. We organized it according to the new plan of the Minister of Militia. In 1906, ten years after, it cost $5.664,000. and in 1908 $6,526,000, or even three times as much as in 1896. Now then, if our expenditure on militia can be taken as our guide, the expenditures on our naval forces will run up in about the same proportion or very much higher. There is no doubt about that whatever, and therefore I say we have a right to look upon this project with a little suspicion, and to fear that it is something we do not want. Let me give a few items to show how the militia expenditure has run up and we will have the same thing in the naval forces. If we start it, I claim it is the commencement of militarism, which the Canadian people dread; from the history of European and continental countries they know what it means. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) knows what it means. He is prepared to assent to supporting the same principle here which I have heard him decry strongly in this House. Let us see what it has meant in the case of the militia of Canada. The permanent force of Canada was looked after in 1896 by the following staff, with the salaries stated:

Officer.	Salary.
1 major-general commanding..	$ 4,000
1 adjutant-general..	3,200
1 quartermaster-general..	3,200
1 inspector of artillery..	2,300
1 assistant adjutant-general..	1,800
1 A. D. C..	1,000
2 clerks of military stores..	800
Total, 8 officials at..	$16,300

Under the new organization that was made some two years ago we have the following staff:

Nowadays it is supposed to require to do the same work, the following officials:

Officer.	Salary.
1 chief of general staff..	$6,000
1 inspector-general..	6,000
1 master-general of ordnance..	4,000
1 quartermaster-general..	4,000
1 adjutant-general..	4,000
1 director-general of medical service..	3,400
1 director of clothing and equipment..	3,200
1 assistant director of operations.. ..	2,400
1 asst. adjutant-general for musketry..	3,200
1 intelligence staff officer..	2,165
1 director of transport and supplies..	3,200
1 director of artillery..	3,200
1 director of engineer services..	3,200
1 asst. adjutant-general..	2,800
1 asst. director intelligence..	2,400
1 staff officer to inspector-general.. ..	1,200
1 intelligence staff officer..	2,400
3 staff lieutenants..	3,660
1 director operations and staff duties..	3,200
1 medals board officer..	2,600
1 asst. to A.A.G.M..	2,000
1 rifle factory inspector..	2,800

The old staff cost $16,000, while this costs $73,425. In 1896 it took only eight officers, but now it takes 23 officers and in addition

to these there is an army of clerks attached to the department involving an expense of several thousand dollars each year in addition.

I have given these figures to show what the new undertaking will involve in a few years. Instead of being able to handle that militia force with $16,000, we now require $73,000. I believe to-day it is over $100,000 and is increasing every year. When I first spoke on this I said it was the commencement of militarism, and I repeat the same thing with regard to the present proposal of a naval force. It is the commencement of militarism that the Canadian people dread because of the expense involved in it and the little result that will accrue to the country. For that reason, I say, I am opposed to it because, I believe, it is radically wrong. I am opposed to it because it does not meet the present emergency. What did the people in England say was required to meet the present emergency? They said:

> If the problem of military and naval defence were considered merely as a problem of naval strategy——

And naval strategy is what gives them control of the high seas to-day, with a force standing at their back.

> —it would be found that the greatest output of strength for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and unity of command.

That is what would be the most valuable.

> In furtherance then of the simple strategical ideal the maximum of power would be gained if all parts of the empire contributed, according to their needs and resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

That is what would do the most good. If our desire is to do the most good to strengthen the British navy, surely we ought to have some regard to their expert knowledge, to their judgment and to their views, and they tell us that is what they desire; but we are told Canada will never consent to that. It is said that if we gave in that way it would be taxation without representation. Perhaps it would be and yet after all it might not be a bad thing, and we might be able to do that without any injustice to Canada and with great good to the British empire. But that is the judgment of the British people and I say I am opposed to this because it does not meet the present emergency. In no sense or in no way can it meet the present emergency. Now it is said that the emergency is on, we must either deal with it or do nothing, and that if it matures at the present rate it must come to a head within a few years. The Prime Minister himself said that these ships could not be built, we could not have a ship ready to go into commission before at least five years. But a navy to be of any value would take at least 15 years to build. What is to become of the emergency in the meantime? What assistance are we giving to the British fleet in the meantime? None whatever, and that emergency is on, that emergency must be met.

England said: If the colonies will not assist we are bound to do it ourselves. She accepted courteously and thankfully the offers made by New Zealand, Victoria and the Australian Commonwealth generally when they offered 'Dreadnoughts' and money—but Canada made no offer, Canada stood aloof from it. Therefore, I say, I am opposed to the proposal because it does not meet the present emergency. I have no doubt many in this House have noticed that for several years past a proposal has been made by the foremost minds of the world, that the different nations should have a conference and agree to a limitation of their naval and military forces, and their expenditures for the development of these forces. Almost every nation in the civilized world has offered to agree to it except Germany. While Germany has said she was willing to agree to it, she was never prepared to do it. In the meantime, while she was professing a desire to control her naval expenditure, she was still going on spending more and more each succeeding year.

She must have had some purpose. What was that purpose? England was ready to go into that conference, France proposed to go into it; even the United States was prepared to go into it—all civilized countries were prepared to enter the conference except Germany. But Germany was going on building her Dreadnoughts and preparing for her naval battle whenever it came. If, to-day, the colonies of the empire came to the assistance of England with a gift of money which she could use in accordance with the well-matured plans that her naval experts have evolved from generation to generation, her force would be increased to the greatest extent and in the quickest way, and England would be ready to cope with Germany. Germany then might regard it as useless to go on developing her naval forces as she has been doing. And, if she reached that conclusion, she might go into that conference and decide to limit her naval and military expenditure. If this were done, the emergency would be over. Giving once, we might not be called upon to give again. This would be a free gift, on the same lines as our sending men to take part in the South African war. It would not be taxation without representation; it would be a free and voluntary gift, and, as the emergency might not arise again for many years, we might save ourselves the millions upon millions which we must

spend to go on with a navy as proposed at the present time.

I am opposed to this policy, because it was not what the British naval authorities suggested would be of the most use to them. They said that a naval unit would be the best contribution outside of money. The fighting they said must be done by Dreadnoughts, while the smaller craft are good in their way they are practically of no value in the work for which the Dreadnought is needed. Therefore, we are not preparing to give what the naval experts of England said every colony should give that wished to help the empire in the best way. It is suggested that with Esquimalt and Halifax to care for, if we want to have a naval force of any value and to look after these ports, we must have a force on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic. But, because the government is not prepared to undertake that expenditure, it cannot provide a single unit, the only fighting force that Britain thought would be of great value. But a money contribution would meet the emergency. Therefore, I would favour a money contribution, which, as I have said, might be required only once in a generation.

And lastly, I am opposed to this policy because the Canadian people have not had an opportunity to express their views upon it. The government has never submitted their policy to the people either by referendum or at a general election. I hold that we should not commence such an undertaking without asking the judgment of the Canadian people upon it, and if the government is not prepared to evolve a policy and submit it to the Canadian people at the next general election, they are not the kind of statesmen as are to be found in every other portion of the British empire except Canada. For this would be in accordance with the principle of our form of constitutional government—the government propounds its policy crystallizes it into form and submits it to the people and asks for their approval.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) if he would propose to put off submitting the question until the next general election?

Mr. SPROULE. What I would propose to do is exactly what I have said. The government should give a contribution either in money or in vessels in order to meet the present emergency. We might not require to do that again for a long time. Then, they should evolve a policy and submit it to the Canadian people, either by calling a general election, or by making it an issue in the next general election, and let the people express their views upon it. When that is done, when the Canadian people endorse the policy, the administration will be justified in going on with it; if they do not endorse it, it will have to be abandoned for the future. For these reasons, I am opposed to this Bill and in favour of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition.

On motion of Sir Frederick Borden the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 10, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CUSTOMS AND FISHERIES PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) to amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act. He said: This Bill proposes to amend the Act so as to prescribe the method of proceeding where steps are taken to condemn a ship which has been seized and where such proceedings are taken, not in the Exchequer Court but in the Superior Court of a province. There is provision in the law as it stands that such proceedings may be taken either in the Exchequer Court or in the Superior Court of a province, but in some of the provinces no rules are prescribed for the taking of such proceedings in the provincial court and practical difficulty has resulted in endeavouring to get on. The proposal is to remove that difficulty by providing that, unless and until rules of procedure are prescribed by the provincial courts, the rules of procedure existing in the Exchequer Court shall be followed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

DOMINION LAND OFFICES REVENUE IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What was the aggregate revenue received in money and scrip by Dominion Land Offices in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, respectively, from the 1st July, 1905, to the 31st December, 1909?

2. Were any amounts additional to the foregoing collected at Winnipeg or Ottawa during the above period on account of the public lands and other natural resources comprised within the area of the said land offices? If so, what was the aggregate additional amount for each province?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. Province of Alberta, $1,531,275.67; province of Saskatchewan, $1,939,271.02.

2. Collected at Ottawa: province of Alberta, $2,181,672.92; province of Saskatchewan, $470,983.60. Total: province of Alberta, $3,712,948.59. Total: province of Saskatchewan, $2,410,254.62.

COMPENSATION TO ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN FOR PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. LAKE:

What is the aggregate amount of the compensation paid to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta respectively for public lands under section 20 of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts from the 1st July, 1905, to the 31st December, 1909, distinguishing between that paid under subsections 1 and 2 of the said section 20?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING:

Amount paid to the province of Alberta under subsection 1 of section 20 of chapter 3 of the Acts of 1905, 'The Alberta Act'	$ 1,687,500 00
Amount paid to the province of Alberta under subsection 2 of said section	421,875 00
	$ 2,109,375 00
Amount paid to the province of Saskatchewan under subsection 1 of section 20 of chapter 42 of the Acts of 1905, 'The Saskatchewan Act'	$1,687,500 00
Amount paid to the province of Saskatchewan under subsection 2 of said section ..	421,875 00
	$ 2,109,375 00

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—O'BRIEN, FOWLER & McDOUGALL CONTRACT.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Referring to the O'Brien, Fowler & McDougall contract on the National Transcontinental railway, mile 1,534·04 to 1,558·17 from Moncton—

At the date of the latest estimate, what quantities of solid rock, loose rock and common excavation, respectively, had been taken out?

2. What was the rate of payment, and what was the amount paid for each of the classes of material taken out down to date of this estimate?

3. What was the date of this estimate and by whom was it made?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

	Cu. yds.
1. Solid rock..	344,377
Loose rock..	331,802
Common excavation	129,057

As the classification has been found to be different from that originally estimated, it is impossible to give the quantity of each class of material yet to be taken out without having a special estimate for the purpose made in the field.

2.

		Amount paid.
Solid rock, per cu. yd..	$1 45	$499,346 93
Loose rock, per cu. yd..	0 55	182,491 10
Common excavation.. ..	0 25	32,264 25

Amounts actually paid are 10 per cent less than above, viz:

Solid rock..	$449,412 24
Loose rock..	164,241 99
Common excavation..	29,037 83

3. The date of this progress estimate is December 31, 1909, and it is in two parts, that for the easterly thirteen miles, being made by Howard Brunlees, assistant engineer, and approved by F. J. McIntosh, assistant district engineer, and S. R. Poulin, district engineer; the remaining westerly part made by J. A. Rogers, resident engineer, and approved by H. J. McKenzie, division engineer, and S. R. Poulin, district engineer.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ALLEGED USE OF STOLEN PASSES.

Mr. RHODES:

1. Has the government any knowledge of stolen passes said to have been used on the Intercolonial railway within the past three years? If so, was any investigation held, by whom, and what was the finding?

2. What measures have been taken to prevent a similar occurrence?

Mr. GRAHAM. On this question, perhaps I may be allowed to explain that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has asked for some documents in connection with the matter. There are practically no documents so far as I can ascertain, but I am having a statement made that will cover both this question and the motion of my hon. friend from North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. No correspondence?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

BOAT FOR HALIFAX HARBOUR QUARANTINE SERVICE.

Mr. CROSBY:

Does the contract for the construction of a boat for the quarantine service, Halifax harbour, cover the cost of bringing the boat out from England and delivering her in Halifax? If not, what will be the cost of bringing this vessel across from the place of construction to Halifax?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

LIGHTHOUSE AT SPENCER'S ISLAND, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. RHODES:

1. What was the total cost of the lighthouse at Spencer's island, Nova Scotia, and was it built by contract or day labour?

2. If by contract who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?

3. If by day labour, what amounts were paid for labour, teams and materials, respectively, and who were the persons receiving pay for same?

4. Does the government own the site? If so, how much land was bought and from whom?

5. If owned by the government, is it under lease, what quantity of land is leased, from whom, and on what terms?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Total cost $654.65; built by day labour.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Labour, $227.62.

B. McLellan	$ 62 00
M. Morris	43 75
G. Porter	43 75
J. Dunbar	23 62
S. McKeen	41 00
G. Morris	4 50
R. Lambert	4 50
G. Murphy	4 50
	$227 62

Teams, nothing charged.

Material, $398.03.

C. R. Hoben, lamp	$ 9 50
Longard Bros., rail	55 63
Magnus & Lourdes, ventilator	19 50
Holland & Kuhn, shades	3 30
Haley Bros., lumber	85 69
McAvity & Sons, hardware	130 85
Walsh Bros., glass	26 00
B. McLellan, lumber	58 78
	$389 25

4. The light house was placed on the beach and no site was purchased or leased.

5. Answered by No. 4.

POST OFFICE AT DIXON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

1. Was the post office at Dixon, Ont., removed about one year ago? If so, what were the reasons for its removal?

2. Has the Postmaster General received a petition requesting that it be left where it was formerly located? If so, how many signatures were on the petition, and what distance is it from the old site to the new one?

3. How many years was the post office in operation on the old site?

4. Was the old site convenient to a factory and school and the centre of a division?

5. Is the government in possession of affidavits to the effect that the petition asking for the removal of the post office was a false petition?

6. Will the Postmaster General, in view of the petition of April 20, 1908, and the affidavits of March 29, 1909, restore to the people their right of a post office centrally located?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. Yes. The post office became vacant by the resignation of the postmaster. In making a new appointment it became necessary to make a change in the location of the office.

2. Petitions for and against the change were received. A petition in favour of another location has some fifty-three signatures, but it was considered that this location was in too close proximity to the Northfield Station post office and would deprive the residents west of the present location of postal facilities. The distance of the present site from the former site is one-third of a mile.

3. The former postmaster had been in charge of the office from June, 1885, to August, 1907.

4. The department has no specific information on these points.

5. An affidavit to this effect was received from one person, a Mr. Simon Bartle. The change in location of the office had been carried out some time before.

6. The department decided, after careful consideration, that the public generally would be best served by having the office at its present location and that a large portion of the community to the west would be seriously inconvenienced if it were retained in its former location. It is not considered advisable, therefore, to make any further change in the site of the office.

BRIDGE OVER MUD LAKE.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR:

1. Was a survey or estimate made by any officer of the Public Works Department during the last year as to the cost of a bridge or crossing over Mud lake, in the township of Tay, county of Simcoe?

2. If such survey work was done, what was the cost of same, and what was the name of the official or officials who performed the work?

3. If an estimate was made of the probable cost of such work, what was the figure or cost estimated?

4. Is it intended to proceed with the work? If so, when?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. There was no survey or estimate made by any officer of the Public Works Department during the last year as to the cost of a bridge or crossing over Mud lake, county of Simcoe.

GOLD SPECIE IN HANDS OF GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Is there any statutory provision in the Audit Act or elsewhere to empower or direct the Auditor General, or any other person or persons, outside of the Receiver General's office or staff, to ascertain, at stated intervals and report to the House the actual amount of gold specie at such dates found to be in the hands or under the actual control of the Minister of Finance, or in the hands or control of the several assistant receivers general.

2. Does the government propose during the present session, by amendment of the Audit Act or otherwise, to make provision for hav-

ing the actual amount of the gold or other specie reserve ascertained at regular stated intervals by counting, weighing or otherwise, by the Auditor General and his staff, or other independent capable officials?

Mr. FIELDING. The long established practice of the government in this matter has been that the specie in the hands of the assistant receivers general is counted and checked by the inspectors from the Finance Department. The Auditor General is not specifically required to take part in this work. It is, however, a service that he may properly be required to perform under the provisions of subsection (j) of section 63 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. The Minister of Finance has informed the Auditor General that he desires him to participate in the examination and counting and that every facility will be afforded him and his officers for this purpose.

RAILWAY TO ELEVATOR AT PORT COLBORNE.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. What amount of money was expended in the construction of the railway to connect the Grand Trunk railway with the elevator at Port Colborne?
2. What was the object of constructing this railway?
3. When was it finished and what traffic has gone over it?
4. In what condition is this road at present, and is it to be repaired? If so, what is the estimated cost of repairs?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $34,000 was expended in constructing a siding to connect the Grand Trunk railway with the elevator at Port Colborne.
2. The object was to provide railway facilities to the government elevator at Port Colborne and all railways are allowed to connect with it.
3. It was finished in November, 1909, and the traffic over it to date amounts to 323,022 bushels of grain.
4. The road is in good condition at present, but requires about 200 cubic yards more ballast. The estimated cost of repairs will be about $400.

THE PARIS FLOODS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to communicate to the House a telegram which I have received from Sir Francis Bertie, the British Ambassador at Paris, with reference to the appropriation of $50,000 made by parliament to assist the sufferers from the French floods. The money was conveyed to His Excellency, Sir Francis Bertie, through our financial agents, and I have now received the following communication from him:

Mr. LENNOX.

Paris, February 10, 1910.

Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Your telegram of February 7, money handed to French Minister for Foreign Affairs; also requests that deep gratitude of government of Republic, who are much touched at this generous mark of sympathy, may be conveyed to Canadian parliament.

(Sd.) BERTIE.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 136) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal.—Mr. McColl.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to ask when we may expect a return to an order of the House of December 6, to which I made some reference in the House a few days ago; a return in respect of the officers of the government having residences in the House of Commons.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information has to be procured from several different sources. I made inquiry the day before yesterday regarding it, and I hope that by to-morrow, or next day, or on Monday next, the information will be furnished.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). In resuming the debate upon the motion for the second reading of the Bill to provide for a Canadian navy, I shall find it necessary to review, to some extent, a debate which took place in this House somewhat less than a year ago. In doing so I can hardly bring myself to believe that the opposition of to-day is composed of practically the same gentlemen who were in this House and took part, some of them at any rate, in that debate in March, 1909. The hon. leader of the opposition and his deputy, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), waxed eloquent in that important discussion; in fact the hon. member for North Toronto introduced a resolution, which was afterwards changed into the resolution which finally and unanimously passed this House. I did not observe that any one of the opposition dissented, not even my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk); he acquiesced, at any rate by his silence, in the terms of that resolution. It cannot be said

that the resolution was passed hastily. My hon. friend from North Toronto told us on that occasion that he wrote out his resolution before he left Toronto, at any rate, that he placed it in the hands of the clerk on the very day this House met. My hon. friend did not move the resolution for some time afterwards, but I do not question in any way his motives, I am simply pointing out the fact that there was no hurry, no undue haste, that my hon. friend took all the time that he required before bringing the important matter to the attention of the House. Without detaining the House I shall proceed to read that resolution. It is as follows:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted thereto:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

I may call attention to the fact that in this resolution there occurs the word 'speedy,' 'the speedy organizations of a Canadian naval service,' and that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was the man who suggested that some word of that kind should be introduced into the resolution. He has taken great credit, properly enough, for having done so in the speeches he has made in various portions of the Dominion and in the heart of the empire itself, in the city of London. Sir, can any one believe for a moment that the hon. gentlemen who lead the Conservative party to-day are the same gentlemen who moved, who acquiesced in, who took an active part in and boasted of the active part they had taken in the passing of that resolution, and who supported it in every sense for many months after the resolution was passed? But some change has come over the spirit of their dreams. It is difficult to understand what could have happened. We know that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) took his vacation in the summer in England. There is an old saying that when the cat is away the mice will play, and so it would appear that the mice possibly played during the visit of my hon. friend to England in the summer, and they seemed to have played to some purpose, because I shall now read, and I wish to contrast with the one I have just read, the resolution which the leader of the opposition moved here on February 3. It is as follows:

That all the words after the word 'that' be left out and the following substituted therefor:—

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty, and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

That no such proposals can safely be accepted unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

That the said proposals while necessitating heavy outlay for construction and maintenance will give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the leader of the opposition is apparently delighted at the reading of his resolution, much more so than he was at the reading of the resolution in the framing of which he was so proud to claim a part, and which was passed here in March, 1909. I propose to read shortly some of the arguments which were presented in 1909 in favour of the resolution then unanimously carried. I shall begin by reading an extract or two from the speech of the hon. the leader of the

opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Referring to the leader of the government, he said:

Now the right hon. gentleman has spoken of the relations of Canada to the empire and I for one am prepared to go as far as he, as far as any hon. gentleman in this House, in absolutely maintaining in this country of ours the full control of our own affairs, which we have enjoyed for many years in the past. I do not think there is any difference of opinion between the two political parties in Canada in that respect. It might be wise to refer for a moment to the circumstances that Great Britain by giving to Canada and the other great dependencies of the empire, absolutely full control of their own affairs, and absolute autonomy in respect of self-government, has, I believe, increased and strengthened the ties which bind these great dependencies to the empire as a whole.

Again he said:

I understand also that in Great Britain the King has, as a matter of formal law, of strict legal right, the power to impose his veto upon any statute of the United Kingdom; but I also understand that by means of that which Mr. Lowell, the new president of Harvard, has called custom superimposed upon law, and which Mr. Ansen, another great constitutional writer, has called law overgrown by custom, the parliament of Great Britain today, although it has legal power, has not the constitutional right to alter the British North America Act without the consent of the people of Canada. So we understand that we have in this country full powers of self-government, and that those powers of self-government depend, not upon the written but upon the unwritten law, that has so largely moulded British institutions and the relations of the great dependencies to the empire in the past.

And again:

It is of no use for us in Canada to speak of this country as a nation, and to shrink in any manner from the discharge of our national responsibilities. What are those responsibilities? Acknowledged in every civilized nation, recognized among all the civilized nations in the world, is the defence of their territories and the protection of their commerce.

And yet to-day the leader of the opposition goes back on his policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He goes back on his policy and he proposes to tax the people of this country some $25,000,000 to send Dreadnoughts he knows not where, and to place them utterly beyond and outside of the control of the taxpayers of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one more quotation from the hon. leader of the opposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it all.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not often that one has the extreme pleasure of being able to read quotations which are alike popular on both sides of the House and agreeable to all. My hon. friends opposite affect to enjoy these utterances of their leader, and I am sure my hon. friends on this side will be delighted to hear them, although we are sorry that the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. Let us hope that he may return some day to the sound opinions which he held in 1909. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) continued to say:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the naval defence of this country I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that.

And yet he no longer believes in it, because he now proposes to take $25,000,000 out of the pockets of the people and send it away where the people of Canada will have no control over it. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) said:

The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in every respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory. In Australia it, in the end, failed to meet with the approval of the people for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas, and if the operations of that squadron were so extended the Australians felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which they felt it should have. So that, the policy of Australia at the present time is the policy of the submarine and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would cooperate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy. It was pointed out in discussing this question that although the people of Australia provided a force of that kind they would provide a force which it would be very difficult if not impossible for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that when they were protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the empire.

Nine or ten months ago the hon. gentleman sympathized with Australia, which had found that to tax her people large sums of money for contribution or tribute for ships which would not be near the shores of Australia, but might be in the China seas, was no longer popular or proper. My hon. friend agreed with that view then; but to-day he wishes to tax the people of Canada $25,000,000 and to send it away out of sight of Canada where Canadians could have no possible interest in it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) further said:

I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as that is concerned. I am one with him in this respect also that I think that an expenditure of money designed for that purpose, as far as possible, ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own parliament and that by making an appropriation of that kind and attending to the defence of our own coasts, by co-operation and co-ordination with the imperial forces, we would be rendering a real service in the defence of the empire and we would be doing only our duty not only to Canada alone but to the empire as a whole.

It will be seen, therefore, that the hon. gentleman expressed himself as being in entire accord with the sentiments expressed by the Prime Minister, and so it will be instructive to see what were the sentiments of the Prime Minister with which the hon. the leader of the opposition was in absolute agreement as he said over and over again in his speech. Here is what the right hon. the Prime Minister said:

The empire of Britain has been founded less on war than on discovery and colonization, and wherever founded in any part of the world, whether by war or colonization or discovery, it has been maintained only by the free will and consent of the peoples who now acknowledge British supremacy. To-day the British empire is composed of a galaxy of young nations proud of their allegiance to the British Crown and proud also of their own independence. And though they may have a common aim, each has reserved to itself the duty and the right to develop its own resources and to attain its aim according to its own views, and by its own methods which may be best suited to the peculiar circumstances of each.

Now, it may be said that defence which is the duty of all nations is a matter as to which there should be a common aspiration. Yes, I agree in that, but at the same time the young daughter nations of England have insisted that even in the matter of defence they should preserve in its entirety local autonomy, and that each should approach this subject according to its own lights. Let us not disguise the fact from ourselves that at present there is a passing wave in which we can trace anger, enthusiasm and fear, and which may be calculated by some to force us to depart from our policy and to contribute at once to the British navy. Well, Sir, let us view this question as it is, let us not blink at it, let us realize that it is not the way in which in the past we have understood our duty.

And the hon. the leader of the opposition acquiesced in every word of the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister on this line of his argument. The right hon. the Prime Minister continued:

This question is not new; we are familiar with it, it is not of to-day or of yesterday. I will not say it is as old as the hills, but it is as old as confederation itself and it comes to the front periodically. It presented itself in a concrete form in the imperial conference of 1902 to those who were there assembled from all parts of the British empire conferring with the government of the mother country. The proposition was placed before us that all the self-governing dominions of the British empire should contribute to the army and to the navy. The Canadian ministers who were present attending that conference did not view that project with any favour. They received it with respect but they declined to accept it and they presented their views in another form and they stated what they were prepared to do so far as Canada is concerned. Their views on that occasion were stated in a paper which has often been quoted in this House, but which I think it is opportune that I should quote to-day.

A paper I will not quote from, as it is very familiar—the memorandum which was placed in the hands of the conference of 1902 by the Canadian ministers. These are the sentiments, Mr. Speaker, which the leader of the opposition approved of in March, 1909. If they meant anything, they meant that the only self-respecting means by which Canada could in any way add to the responsibilities of defence which she was already bearing, was by the organization of a Canadian navy, but on lines which would enable it, if the people of Canada so desired, to co-operate with the great imperial navy.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean to affirm that, from what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said as to his agreement with the Prime Minister, that binds the leader of the opposition to an agreement with the memorandum placed before the imperial conference of 1902?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The right hon. the leader of the government stated that that memorandum had been before the people of Canada from 1902 down to that moment, and that no one on either side of the House had ever dissented from its terms.

Mr. MONK. The resolution of March last undertook to carry out the plan of defence as defined by the imperial conference of 1907. That is what it said in very words.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend has not grasped the point which the hon. member for North Toronto was trying to make. The hon. member for North Toronto, as I understood him, asked me if I thought it was right to make the leader of the opposition responsible for that memorandum because it had been read by the Prime Minister, and because the leader of the opposition had approved of the Prime Minister's words in that regard; and I told my hon. friend from North Toronto, and I repeat it now, that that memorandum of 1902 has been before the people of this country for seven years, and has never been dissented from by any member of the opposition, nor by anybody in this country, so far as I know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not think it unfair if I

called his attention to another part of my speech to which he has made no allusion.

While I venture to think that a system of torpedo boats and submarines such as has been adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia would be perhaps the most effective way in which we could assist Great Britain in a stated policy of naval defence, yet I agree that the Canadian government ought to have the advice of the British admiralty and lend itself to such co-operation and co-ordination as will be best for the whole empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think the interruption was at all pertinent. The hon. gentleman was discussing the question of autonomy, and I did him the justice to read every word he said about it; and the beginning and end of his observations was that he approved of every word the right hon. leader of the government had said:

But, Mr. Speaker, there were other notable speeches made. The hon. member for North Toronto, during the vacation, after his leader had gone away, showed that he was still firm in the faith in a speech which he made at Halifax on the 25th of August, 1909. In that speech—and I quote from the Halifax 'Herald,' which he will not dispute—he said:

This is the greatest step forward we have ever made in Canada. We must be prepared to defend ourselves——

Not the British empire, but ourselves; it was Canada he was thinking about then. He forgot about it since.

—Canada has a mighty future before her as a maritime power.

He was thinking about the future of Canada then, and he uttered some fine words and some splendid periods in regard to it. But to-day he and his party have become so dwarfed by this narrow policy which they have adopted that he sees nothing but blue ruin, Germany and hostile fleets, and nothing will avert that but the people of Canada putting their hands deep down in their pockets and taking out $25,000,000 and sending it away never to be seen again.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Nothing small about that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The crisis had not arrived then; there was no emergency; everything was going on placidly and smoothly, and he could think of other things besides the danger of the German navy. Another remark of the hon. gentleman:

One effect of Canada's making a navy will be to give an impetus to steel shipbuilding in this country of ours, which will make immense employment and cause immense development in this country. One navy for the whole empire, though you may have several fleets, one flag, one history in the past, one grand mission.

The hon. leader of the opposition, at the Canada club banquet in London on Dominion day, said:

The establishment of a Canadian navy, upon which both parties were united, would serve a more practicable purpose than any such offer of Dreadnoughts.

And after he had returned and had heard of the capers which the mice had been performing in his absence, but still firm in the faith, he went to Halifax, where his deputy had been, and made a speech in October. He said:

There is not and never has been for the past forty years any constitutional or other objection to the establishment of a navy by Canada whenever its people think they should adopt that course. Nationhood involves certain responsibilities from which we cannot escape. One of these is the duty of defending our borders and of taking effective steps to protect our commerce and our trade routes.

That is forgotten. Nothing now but the policy of spending $25,000,000 for Dreadnoughts or ships to be sent to the other end of the world. Canadian commerce and trade routes and harbours are forgotten; under the overwhelming dread of the impending crisis. He said:

In this connection may we not hope that there should be given a stimulus and encouragement——

This is from the leader of the opposition. He was in his own constituency then:

—to the shipbuilding industry in Canada which has long been lacking. To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity in that regard.

That is what he said at Halifax. What did he say at Toronto? On November 1 or thereabouts, he said in that city:

Our actions should be inspired and characterized by neither hysteria nor indifference—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is it now being characterized by hysteria?

—but by a solemn and abiding sense of national responsibilities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Efforts no doubt were made of a very serious character to heal up the differences within the ranks of our friends opposite. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) stuck to his guns nobly all through the months of October, November and even December. But on the 12th of January, while I do not think he had thoroughly decided to make the new departure, he was evidently considering it. The pistol had been held to his head, and

in his speech of the 12th January, 1910, it was quite evident that he was considering what course he should pursue. Well, there was an attempt made to provide a compromise. A blanket resolution was offered, the one which I have read and of which my hon. friends opposite are so proud, but which was a complete backdown from everything they had said and done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

An hon. MEMBER. Take it back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid I cannot however much I might like to. But there was one hon. gentleman who could not be kept within the fold. No blanket that could be prepared by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), particularly my hon. friend from East Grey—no blanket resolution was big enough to include in it the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). So we had to have another resolution, regarding which I shall not trouble the House at any length, but content myself with pointing out that after the speech my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) made in this House in which he quarrelled with British diplomacy and everything British, in which he gave no credit to British institutions or the mother of parliament for any liberties we enjoy. After speaking for two hours in that vein my hon. friend thought he would square himself by moving a resolution, which began in the following words:

The House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown—

After my hon. friend had denounced everything British, he thought he could square himself perhaps with the friends of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule)——

Mr. SPROULE. Do you object?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not, nor does my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but I find that introduction most inconsistent with the speech I listened to. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition did not find it necessary to begin his resolution in that way, but the hon. member for Jacques Cartier did. It is quite evident that while this trouble was going on they thought that perhaps some of the artful dodger's methods, some of the peculiar methods of statesmanship which used to characterize the Conservative party in the good old days, might be brought to bear on this occasion, and one element of the country in the province of Quebec be harnessed up by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), while the friends of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would be kept straight and right by the course that hon. gentleman was pursuing.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) saw fit—but in this I do not think he was very serious—to cast some reflection upon the loyalty of the leader of the government by reading some extracts from speeches made by my right hon. friend many years ago, in which there were references to independence and freer trade with the United States. Well, the day has gone by in this country when the methods which were potential in former years in the Conservative party, when they could bring two extremely discordant elements together by playing on the prejudices of both—I say that the day has gone by when such methods could be of any avail, and the reason is the well known devotion, loyalty and unswerving patriotism of my right hon. friend the leader of the government. Sneers may be cast at our right hon. leader but they will be entirely innocuous. I say that when the name of every other man who sits in this House to-day is forgotten, the name of Wilfrid Laurier will stand upon the annals, not only of Canada but of the empire, as that of a man who gave his life service for the best interests of his country, and through whose efforts a reconciliation and a better understanding of the duties of, at any rate, his friends, has been made, and to-day it would be impossible to stir up strife such as was frequently stirred up in the past.

Mr. MEIGHEN. May I ask a question? Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Frederick Borden), while he is on the subject, say whether or not he is in accord with the sentiments concerning independence expressed by the Prime Minister in 1892?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am generally in accord with the views of my honoured leader, and I have absolute confidence in his leadership. Now, Mr. Speaker, viewing the condition of our friends opposite, the domestic infelicity in their political home—I do not wish to go into the internal economy of their establishment, but evidently there is trouble there—when I read the resolution of last session in which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend from North Toronto took such a conspicuous part, and contrasted it with the one which they have now placed before the House for its consideration—I could not but think—how applicable to the situation of these hon. gentlemen were a couple of verses in Lowell's works that I happened to read the other day: These verses are found in ' The Pious Editor's Creed ':

I du believe in bein' this
Or that, ez it may happen
One way or t'other hendiest is
To ketch the people nappin';
It ain't by princerples nor men
My preudunt course is steadied,—
I scent which pays the best, an' then
Go into it bald-headed.

In short, I firmly du believe
In humbug generally,
For it's a thing thet I perceive
To hev a solid vally;
This heth my faithful shepherd ben,
In pasture sweet heth led me,
An' this'll keep the people green
To feed ez they hev fed me.

The resolution of the leader of the opposition, I presume, may fairly be considered to embody the policy of the opposition of to-day. The first paragraph of that resolution reads as follows:

The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty, and, in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war, are ill-advised and dangerous.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that we have not followed the proposals of the admiralty, and he spent a good deal of time in endeavouring to enforce that proposition. I have not been able to discover in his remarks, which I have carefully read, anything in the shape of argument. A good deal was said about Australia, and we were told, and the country was given to understand—for, I suppose the speech was made largely for the country—that, while Australia and New Zealand had done everything that daughter-nations of the mother country ought to do and had followed obediently the direction of the admiralty, we Canadians had failed to do so. Well, now, take the case of Australia. One of the great difficulties which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition sees in our policy—or claims to see, for I do not understand how he can see it—is that we do not automatically place the control of our navy under the British admiralty. Is that the objection?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman desires to know what the point I made was, I can tell him in a few words. I say that the resolution of March, 1909, declared expressly and explicitly that any naval service to be established should be in accordance with the suggestions made by the admiralty in 1907, and I read—as the hon. gentleman will find at page 3061 of 'Hansard'—the words of Lord Tweedmouth, the First Lord of the Admiralty, in which he expressly declared that command must be reserved to the admiralty of all such forces.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And nobody objects to that. When any Canadian fleet or any Australian fleet is serving with the British navy, of course it will be under the command of the senior officer of the British navy. That is one thing. But it is quite another thing to say that, the Canadian fleet shall automatically serve whenever war is declared. The Canadian Bill reserves the right to the Governor in Council——

Mr. FOSTER. Who would have command in that case?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In that case, I suppose, the command would remain as it was.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is for that reason that I say it does not follow the suggestions of the admiralty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The admiralty has never suggested that the fleet of one of the Dominions shall pass automatically under the control of the admiralty. It remained for the super-loyal opposition in Canada to make the suggestion, for nobody else ever thought of such a thing. Let me prove that. But, first, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that he read from Lord Tweedmouth. I know he did, and it was not very much in point. If there was any point to it at all, we were directed to follow the lines laid down in the conference of 1907, which were that we should build the smallest class of cruisers, and not even as large ships as we are building now, no large cruiser or battleship was ever thought of. But Lord Tweedmouth said other things which my hon. friend did not read. I did not intend to read this, but I have it here. He said:

Gentlemen, what I have to say is that the admiralty and His Majesty's government are perfectly ready to meet these contributors to admiralty funds in a liberal and conciliatory manner.

Speaking of Australia and New Zealand:

We do not wish to insist that the contributions from the colonies should necessarily be in the form of money only. We are quite ready to enter into any arrangement with the colonies that may seem most suitable to them, and which may seem to bring advantage to the navy and advantage to the colonies themselves.

He was thinking of the colonies, something which the new fangled policy of the opposition does not think of:

I have here a short statement of what may be called the general principle on which the admiralty desires to meet the representatives of the self-governing dominions of the King beyond the seas.

Then he goes on:

In the opinion of the government, while the distribution of the fleet must be determined by strategical requirements of which the admiralty are the judge, it would be of great

assistance if the colonial governments would undertake to provide for local service in the imperial squadrons the smaller vessels that are useful for defence against possible raids, or for co-operation with a squadron, and also to equip and maintain docks and fitting establishments which can be used by His Majesty's ships. . . . I understand, that in Australia particularly, and in South Africa, it is desired to start some naval service of your own. Perhaps I might suggest that if the provision of the smaller craft which are necessarily incident to the work of a great fleet of modern battleships could be made locally, it would be a very great help to the general work of the navy.

What navy? The British navy. That provision should be made locally, and in time of stress and emergency in the quarter in which those ships are, they could be of immense assistance to the British navy.

You cannot take the small craft such as torpedo boats and submarines across the ocean, and for war ships to arrive in South Africa, or in Australia, or in New Zealand, or in Canada, and find ready to their hand well trained men in good vessels of this kind, would be an enormous advantage to them.

Are we not following the directions of the admiralty as proposed in 1907? It seems to me we are.

There is, I think, the further advantage in these small flotillas, that they will be an admirable means of coast defence——

We have coasts on both oceans which require defence. The British fleet has been withdrawn from Halifax and Esquimalt and we propose to take its place with small vessels which the British admiralty kept at those two places, by a navy of our own, and in that way to relieve the mother country of further responsibility for our own local defence.

—that you will be able by the use of them to avoid practically all danger from any sudden raid which might be made by a cruising squadron.

Is that not of some use? A word now about Australia. I do not care to make comparisons, but comparisons unfavourable to Canada have been made over and over again in this debate, comparisons and inferences which are entirely unfounded. Now I asked the other day from the Department of Marine and Fisheries some information as to what was understood in Australia with reference to bringing their ships automatically or otherwise under the control of the admiralty, and I find the following facts. In the proceedings of the imperial conference and the Imperial Parliamentary Sessional Papers, 19th August, 1909, paragraph 3 says, after stating that the commonwealth government have exclusive control in time of peace, and while on the Australian station:

Further, when placed by the Commonwealth government at the disposal of the admiralty in war time, the vessels should be under the control of the naval commander-in-chief——

Mark the words:

--when placed by the Commonwealth government.

Nothing automatical about that. I find in the Australia Defence Act, read first in September, 1908, cited as the Defence Act, 1906:

In time of war, the Governor General may——

The very words used in our own Act.

—subject to the provisions of this Act, place the defence force or any part thereof under the orders of the commander of any portion of the King's regular forces, or the King's regular naval forces, as the case may be.

But note in the interpretation clause of this Act what war means:

Any invasion or apprehended invasion, or attack or apprehended attack on the Commonwealth or any territory under the control of the Commonwealth, by any enemy or armed force.

That is the law of Australia, and if my hon. friend had looked up the law he would have saved himself a great deal of trouble.

Mr. COWAN. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether the Act he has read just now provides in any way for a navy, whether it is not merely an Act for a naval militia?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is the Defence Act of Australia, which includes both the military and the navy.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I asked if that Act from which he has quoted provides in any way for a navy. I know it provides for a naval militia, I know it provides for a military militia, and I know too, that it does not provide for a navy.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no doubt about it. Of course I do not want to speak too positively, but this is the information which I have, and which was prepared for me by the naval experts of the Marine and Fisheries office. Now what about an emergency?

In time of war or emergency, or upon a declaration by the senior naval officer representing the British government, that a condition of emergency exists, all the vessels of the naval force of the Commonwealth shall be placed by the Commonwealth government under the orders of Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

Paragraph 9, says:

It is, however, to be understood——

This is not the law, this is only a memorandum.

—It is, however, to be understood that if any of the coast defence vessels be desired in seas remote from Australia, the approval of the Commonwealth government shall first be obtained to their removal.

But I was not satisfied with all this and so having learned that Admiral Kingsmill had a code with the authorities in Australia, I asked the admiral to send this message:

February 5, 1910.

Captain in charge,
Sydney, Australia.

Please inform me by telegraph as soon as possible whether, in the event of war, vessels of Australian navy pass automatically without any action under control of admiralty.

(Sgd.) KINGSMILL.

The answer came on February 8 as follows:

Kingsmill, Ottawa.

With reference to your telegram, transfer control to the admiralty is not to be automatic but subject to approval of Commonwealth government on declaration of war.

Perhaps that may possibly satisfy my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this first paragraph of his resolution was quite unnecessary, and that the deductions suggested by it are absolutely unfounded.

What evidence is there that there was any difference of opinion between the gentlemen who were sent to the conference to represent Canada and the admiralty, or any representative of the admiralty participating in that conference. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, Canada boasts of independence, of autonomy of nationhood. Surely when she solemnly sends a deputation to the mother country on the invitation of the mother country to take part in a conference, she is not to go there with her ears and mouth closed. They wanted consultation and they had the opportunity of consultation; we wanted advice, they wanted to know what the conditions were, their statesmen, admirals, men anxious to do the thing which would be the best for Canada, and the best for the empire. But taking the lowest point of view and looking carefully at every word in this blue-book, there is not a single word there to indicate that there was any difference of opinion whatever between the members of the British government or the representatives of the admiralty, and the Hon. Mr. Brodeur and myself. What did Mr. Asquith, the premier of England, say in the statement which he read to the House of Commons? On August 26 he said:

The conference, which has just concluded its labours, was convened under the terms of resolution 1 of the conference of 1907. In the invitation sent by His Majesty's government at the end of April to the governments of the dominions, it was stated that the object of the conference would be to discuss the general question of naval and military defence of the empire, with special reference to recent proposals from New Zealand and Australia, and to the resolution passed on the 29th March, by the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada. It was further stated that the conference would be of a purely consultative character and that it would be held in private. It follows that all resolutions come to and proposals approved by the conference which has now been held, must be taken, so far as the delegates of the dominions are concerned, to be ad referendum, and of no binding force unless and until submitted to their various parliaments.

Mr. FOSTER. It speaks there of certain resolutions come to, and proposals accepted and to be referred to parliament. Were not certain resolutions accepted, and if so why have they not been brought down to parliament?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, there was no resolution at all. It was found at the second meeting of the conference in reference to naval matters that an agreement was impossible as to a line of policy in which all of the dominions could agree. New Zealand, as will appear from the papers, declared her unwillingness to agree to a policy of building up a navy of her own. She was determined to adhere to the plan of an annual contribution. So soon as that fact was ascertained, it was agreed that each one of the dominions should meet with the First Lord of the Admiralty and his advisers, to arrange each by itself the policy it would follow, and that is what was done, and every resolution and every decision that was reached is recorded in this Canadian blue-book.

To resume the reading of Mr. Asquith's official statement:

I should add in special reference to the delegates from South Africa that they did not feel themselves in a position, in regard to either naval or military defence, to submit or to approve positive proposals until the union of South Africa was an accomplished fact.

With this preface I will briefly summarize the main conclusions of the conference in regard, first to military, and next to naval defence.

I shall read the conclusions as to military defence, because I think they throw a distinct light upon the general policy of defence, which has been adopted by the mother country and by the colonies.

Military defence. After the main conference at the foreign office, a military conference took place at the war office, and resulted in an agreement on the fundamental principles set out in papers which had been prepared by the general staff for consideration by the delegates.

The substance of these papers (which will

be included among the papers to be published) was a recommendation that, without impairing the complete control of the government of each Dominion over the military forces raised with it,——

That is the underlying principle of everything that has been done with reference to both military and naval defence:

—these forces should be standardized, the formation of units, the arrangements for transport, the patterns of weapons, being as far as possible assimilated to those which have recently been worked out for the British army. Thus, while the Dominion troops would in each case be raised for the defence of the Dominion concerned, it would be made readily practicable in case of need for that Dominion to mobilize and use them for the defence of the empire as a whole.

If they saw fit to do it, and not unless they saw fit; the force should be so arranged and so organized that it could be done, not that it must be done:

The military conference then entrusted to a sub-conference consisting of military experts at headquarters and from the various dominions, and presided over by Sir W. Nicholson, acting for the first time in the capacity of chief of the imperial general staff, the duty of working out the detailed application of those principles.

I may point out here that the creation early this year of an imperial general staff, thus brought into active working, is a result of the discussions and resolutions of the conference of 1907. Complete agreement was reached by members of the sub-conference, and their conclusions were finally approved by the main conference and by the committee of imperial defence, which sat for the purpose under the presidency of the Prime Minister. The result is a plan for so organizing the forces of the Crown wherever they are, that, while preserving the complete autonomy of each Dominion, should the Dominions desire to assist in the defence of the empire in a real emergency,——

In a real emergency, not in a fancied one.

—in a real emergency, their forces could be rapidly combined into one homogeneous imperial army.

Naval Defence.

Naval defence was discussed at meetings of the conference held at the Foreign Office on the 3rd, 5th, and 6th August. The admiralty memorandum which had been circulated to the Dominion representatives formed the basis of the preliminary conference.

The alternative methods which might be adopted by the Dominion governments, in cooperating in imperial naval defence were discussed. New Zealand preferred to adhere to her present policy of contribution; Canada and Australia preferred to lay the foundation of fleets of their own.

To lay the foundation of fleets of their own, mark that:

It was recognized that in building up a fleet a number of conditions should be conformed to. The fleet must be of a certain size, in order to offer a permanent career to the officers and men engaged in the service. The personnel should be trained and disciplined under regulations similar to those established in the Royal Navy,——

And that is the intention with reference to the Canadian fleet, as the Bill itself will show:

—in order to allow of both interchange and union between the British and the Dominion services; and with the same object, the standard of vessels and armaments should be uniform.

A remodelling of the squadrons maintained in far eastern waters was considered on the basis of establishing a Pacific fleet, to consist of three units in the East Indies, Australia and China seas, each comprising, with some variations, a large armoured cruiser of the new 'Indomitable' type, three second-class cruisers of the 'Bristol' type, six destroyers of the 'River' class, and three submarine of 'C' class.

The generous offer, first of New Zealand and then of the Commonwealth government, to contribute to imperial naval defence by the gift each of a battleship was accepted with the substitution of cruisers of the new 'Indomitable' type for battleships—these two ships to be maintained, one on the China and one on the Australian station.

Now, in the debate on the resolution which was passed here in March, 1909, there was not a suggestion from any of these gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, there was.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, Sir; it was not suggested that we should at that moment do anything more than we did, and there is nothing in the resolution except to take the power, at any time in the future, to give if we saw fit. But there was not a word spoken to indicate that it was in the mind of any of my hon. friends opposite that it was our duty at that time to give one dollar towards a Dreadnought for the British navy.

Separate meetings took place at the admiralty with the representatives of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and general statements were agreed to in each case for further consideration by their respective governments.

We had no power to settle anything. We followed, so far as we could, what we thought were the instructions contained in the resolution unanimously passed by this House. That is what we did. We stated frankly to the conference that we had no power whatever to go beyond the policy laid down there.

As regards Australia, the suggested arrangement is that with some temporary assistance from imperial funds the Commonwealth government should provide and maintain the Australian unit of the Pacific fleet.

The contribution of the New Zealand gov-

ernment would be applied towards the maintenance of the China unit, of which some of the smaller vessels would have New Zealand waters as their headquarters. The New Zealand armoured cruiser would be stationad in China waters.

As regards Canada, it was considered that her double sea-board rendered the provision of a fleet unit of the same kind unsuitable for the present.

Is there any indication in that statement that there was any difference of opinion? There was none.

It was proposed, according to the amount of money that might be available, that Canada should make a start with cruisers of the 'Bristol' class and destroyers of an improved river class—a part to be stationed on the Atlantic sea-board and a part on the Pacific.

That is the course that is to be followed:

In accordance with an arrangement already made, the Canadian government would undertake the maintenance of the dockyards at Halifax and Esquimalt, and it was a part of the arrangement proposed with the Australian representatives that the Commonwealth government should eventually undertake the maintenance of the dockyard at Sydney.

Canada immediately, Australia eventually. Canada immediately took charge of the two dockyards and assumed all expense in connection therewith; Australia would eventually undertake the maintenance of the dockyard at Sydney.

Papers containing all the material documents will be laid before parliament in due course, and, it is hoped, before the conclusion of the session.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps at this point it is just as well to refer a little more in detail to some of the hostile criticisms which have been levelled against—by imputation at any rate—the representatives of Canada, or, perhaps more correctly speaking, against the government. The accusation which has been over and over again made that little New Zealand, and I suppose big Australia, have done very much more than great Canada. Well, if our hon. friends would take some trouble, some reasonable pains, to look into the facts before being so anxious to bring accusations against the government, they would find, I think, that such is not the case. What is Australia doing? She is to give a Dreadnought, but that Dreadnought becomes a part of her fleet unit. She is not sending $10,000,000 or $25,000,000, as the case may be, away never to see it again or to get any direct benefit from it, as the resolution of the opposition proposed that we should do. It was a condition that the Dreadnought to be built for Australia, with Australian money, should be at the head of Australia's fleet unit. But what more? While Canada immediately takes charge of two dockyards and maintains them, Australia will 'eventually' undertake the maintenance of one. 'Eventually' is a very indefinite word, implying a rather long way off. It is, however, in accordance with the opposition's naval policy. According to the terms of their resolution, we shall eventually have a navy in Canada, but it is a long way off. Now, Australia is to have a fleet unit, and she is taking back the ship she gave, to be a part of that unit. She is to have three unarmoured cruisers; we are to have five, or rather four protected and one unarmoured, in the Canadian navy. Australia is to have six destroyers, and Canada is to have the same; and Australia is to have three submarines, which are not in the Canadian unit. But does Australia find the money to do all this? Not at all. The British government contributes £250,000 a year, out of the hard earnings of the people of Great Britain, towards the maintenance of her fleet unit. Canada does not get, or ask, anything of that kind.

But New Zealand, 'little New Zealand,' gives a Dreadnought. What does she get? She gets an agreement that it shall be made a portion of a fleet unit, a large part of which shall remain in New Zealand waters, and that the flagship of the China unit shall be the Dreadnought which she contributes. The whole arrangement is to be found in a letter from Sir Joseph Ward to Mr. McKenna. I will not read the whole of it, but here is a part of it:

I however consider it is desirable that a portion of the China-Pacific unit should remain in New Zealand waters, and I would suggest that two of the new 'Bristol' cruisers, together with three destroyers and two submarines, should be detached from the China station in time of peace and stationed in New Zealand waters; that these vessels should come under the flag of the admiral of the China unit; that the flagship should make periodical visists to New Zealand waters; and that there should be an interchange in the service of the cruisers between New Zealand and China, under conditions to be laid down.

The ships should be manned, as far as possible, by New Zealand officers and men, and in order that New Zealanders might be attracted to serve in the fleet, local rates should be paid to those New Zealanders who enter, in the same manner as under the present Australian and New Zealand agreement, such local rates being treated as deferred pay.

The termination of the agreement with Australia has of necessity brought up the position of New Zealand under that joint agreement. I therefore suggest that on completion of the China unit, the present agreement with New Zealand should cease, that its contribution of £100,000 per annum should continue, and be used to pay the difference in the rates of pay to New Zealanders above what would be paid under the ordinary British rate. If the contribution for the advanced rate of pay did not amount to £100,000 per annum, any balance to be at the disposal of the admiralty.

The whole of this fleet unit to be taken in hand and completed before the end of 1912, and I should be glad if the squadron as a whole would then visit New Zealand on the

way to China leaving the New Zealand detachment there under its senior officer.

I have nothing to say against the arrangements which were made with Australia and New Zealand; but Canada did not ask, did not want, and would not accept, any terms of that kind; and I think our hon. friends opposite should put a stop to the reflections which they are casting upon those who attended the conference and upon the government, in this matter.

Before leaving the question of control in time of war, I would like to add one or two words. In the Militia Act, as the hon. leader of the opposition pointed out, there is a clause similar to the one to be found in the Naval Act. His Majesty has power, in the event of Canadian troops being engaged with imperial troops, to place a British officer over the whole force. But the situation is entirely different in the case of the militia. Under the Militia Act there is no power to call out the militia for any other purpose than the defence of Canada; that is absolutely specified. But the hon. leader of the opposition, as I understand, objects to the calling of parliament as being equivalent to delay. Well, it must be very clear, in the case of the navy, as is the case with the militia, that the Governor General in Council, in time of emergency, would not wait until parliament had been called before taking action. That is not necessary; that is not intended. Action would be taken, if it were found necessary in the emergency to do so. The militia would be called out, and would be sent to do its duty, whatever it might be. But under the terms of the Act it would be necessary to call parliament, and then should parliament, in its wisdom, see fit to disapprove of what the government had taken the responsibility of doing, the government would be removed from office. So it would be in the case of a navy. Clause 18 or 19 does not mean that no action can be taken until parliament can be called—15 days hence. On the contrary, such action as the Governor in Council might think it their duty to take would be taken at once, but parliament would be called to approve or disapprove. That is responsible government, the principles of which I am beginning to think my hon. friends opposite do not entirely comprehend. It seems to me that no proper exception can be taken to that part of the Bill.

The second part of the resolution objects to want of unity or organization and action. But if my hon. friend had taken the trouble to examine the Bill, he would have found in it provisions for this unity of organization. The intention is to follow precisely the lines followed now in the case of our militia. Organization would take place on the lines of the organization of the British navy and nothing else. Take sections 45, 46, 47 and 48, I shall not read all these clauses, but just as full provision is made for the organization of the navy as exists in the Militia Act for the organization of the militia. My hon. friend says that, so far as he can see, the provision with regard to service is for three years. That only shows how carelessly he has read the Bill. There is nothing of the kind. There is a provision for the navy itself, or what is called the permanent force, and there is a provision for a reserve, and also a provision for a volunteer service. In the case of a volunteer service, which may not be organized for years, it is provided that the length of service shall be three years, but the term in the permanent force is to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and no doubt it will be fixed on the lines of the permanent service in the British navy. My hon. friend will see provision for that in section 10—engagement of officers and seamen. So that all this storm and fury about the lack of provision for organization on proper lines, is absolutely without foundation. But, of course, my hon. friend had to oppose this Bill. The edict had gone forth, the pistol was at his head, something had to be done, and he worked out ingeniously this resolution without the slightest ground or semblance or reason for it. I have here some quotations from the speech of the hon. gentleman, but I do not know that I need detain the House by giving them at length. He has the further objection, he says, that there is absolutely no unity of organization provided for. But I have shown that we have provided for it. Then he went on to say that the men, are to be engaged for three years. I have shown, however, that in that he was entirely mistaken. They are to be engaged the same number of years as the men in the British navy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no provision to that effect.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is left to the Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Left entirely open?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But the navy is to be organized on the lines of the British service, and common sense, if there were no other motive, would naturally cause the government to provide the same number of years. The British navy has had the experience of hundreds of years, and it contains the best organized fleet of any navy in the world to-day

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And no government of any British dominion would be so foolish as to organize its fleet upon any other lines. With regard to the third resolution, we are told that there is heavy outlay and no results:

Such proposals, while necessitating heavy outlay for protection and maintenance, would give no immediate or effective aid to the empire and no adequate or satisfactory results to Canada.

And in order to get results to Canada, my hon. friend proposes that we should vote $25,000,000 of money and hand that money over to the British admiralty. Well, it does not seem to me that such a policy would bring about results of any great consequence to Canada. Canada can afford to do it if she likes, but what the hon. gentlemen wanted, as I have proved by quotations from their speeches ten short months ago, was speedy action towards the organization of a navy. But it takes something besides ships to make a navy. The most important is the personnel, and we have none of that to-day in Canada. Men and officers are required to make a navy. The machine, as compared with the man, is a small matter, and can always be got. But educated seamen are the work of years. My hon. friend has reminded us of that, and he proposes to get over the difficulty by putting off the day and marking time. In fact, the policy of the Conservative party seems to be: Two 'Dreadnoughts' and mark time.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in March last objected very strongly to any contribution. This is what he said:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid. It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with a population constantly increasing, we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

And yet, to-day, ten months later, the hon. gentleman wishes to put it off indefinitely and to get rid of all this responsibility by giving $25,000,000 to hire somebody else to do that which he admitted ten months ago was the first duty of this country.

And, going on, he says:

The second policy to which I would refer is the assuming by ourselves of the defence of our own ports and coasts, in constant and free co-operation with the imperial forces of the mother country. Let us see what are the objections to and what may be urged in support of that second policy. It has its advocates and its opponents. In the first place we begin with no plant, no expert skill, no trained cadets, no trained sailors. In those respects, Canada is a blank sheet. Whatever may be necessary has to be collected and assembled and developed with such expedition and in such abundance as circumstances will allow. Under that system our first vessels would be British built, British equipped, British manned, British officered from stoker to captain. There is no other way in which we could proceed.

I hope we have found a better way

We are absolutely bare of the skill, the experience, the training and the machinery necessary to put one single war vessel on a proper footing; but—and it is but the beginning of a circle—the first Canadian owned vessel, built and equipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coasts would become the nucleus and the training ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors, and Canadian officers, and by and by perhaps, of a Canadian admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be taken in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the tracing of it and follow it fairly and faithfully, the time must come when we get a complete circle and have an imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the empire, in which Canada has some of her body, her bones, her blood, and her mental power.

Those were splendid words; that was a splendid policy. My hon. friend had taken days and weeks to think that out and it does him credit. But what shall be said of him now that, within ten months, he absolutely turns his back upon that splendidly-outlined policy?

I will not detain the House much longer, but I would like to say a word as to what is proposed. Very much which my hon. friend disclosed as his vision of what should be the Canadian navy will be undertaken. The first thing is to secure the personnel. It will be the duty of the department which presides over this work to at once secure ships sufficiently large for the purposes of training ships. Arrangements have been made, I understand, which will shortly result in one ship being brought to some point on the Atlantic coast and another on the Pacific coast, and then the training of the men and the officers on the lines laid down by the British admiralty will shortly be begun. I have here some notes which have been prepared by Admiral Kingsmill, from which I might read a few words, describing the uses and the character of the different vessels. I might begin by saying that the unit or parts of units which were agreed to by Canada are composed of, four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers—eleven vessels in all.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the hon. gentleman call that a fleet unit?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. He might as well call a section of infantry a company.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know the hon. member (Mr. J. A. Currie) is a great authority on naval matters. I would point out that the Bristol is a cruiser of the very latest pattern, a vessel of somewhere about 5,000 tons and now being constructed for the first time—that is, the new pattern for the British navy; in fact, so new is it that the full description is not yet at hand. The Canadian Bristols will be built precisely on the lines laid down by the admiralty. The Boadicea is another vessel of latest type, which will be the parent ship of the destroyers which are also of the latest type, river type.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the river type as the latest type of destroyers?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand that it is.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. If the minister (Sir Frederick Borden) will merely look at the annual and other publications, he will see that the river type is spoken of as the type of 1906. There is a more recent type.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Of course, I bow to my hon. friend's (Mr. J. A. Currie) superior knowledge. I am giving the best information I have. The uses of these ships have been mentioned incidentally in the observations I have made—mainly the protection of harbours and coasts and of lines of commerce also. But, in the early stages, before the ships are completed, there will be, as I have said, two training ships, and it is proposed to substitute for the Boadicea, a ship of somewhat older type a ship of larger tonnage and which will accommodate more men, probably all the men that can be secured at first for the purpose of training, the object being that the two ships, one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic, shall be ready, at the time the other ships are completed, with a portion of the personnel, of men at any rate, necessary to man those ships.

Mr. MONK. These two ships that are going to be acquired, in the first instance, to be placed on each ocean, are training ships, simply, are they not? They are not to be ships of the Boadicea type, but merely training ships.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the ship which is to be placed on the Pacific is not one of the eleven, it is a ship called the 'Rainbow.'

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Is that a battleship?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I think not; she is a small cruiser.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not a fighting ship at all?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes; but she will be used in connection with others for the purpose of training.

Mr. BOYCE. Has the 'Rainbow' yet been purchased by the government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Negotiations are now proceeding with reference to it. The ship which will be used on the Atlantic is known as the 'Niobe,' of the 'Spartian' type, a ship of some 11,000 tons, which is offered at a low price, and which, if purchased, can be substituted to advantage for the 'Boadicea,' because, as pointed out by Admiral Kingsmill, she will be extremely useful as a training ship.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Have these steamers been ordered to the scrap heap by the British government?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, it is difficult to see the particular cleverness of that observation; I dare say my hon. friend is proud of it. We are trying to discuss a serious subject seriously.

Mr. FOSTER. We are also interested in getting some information about these things.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, if hon. gentlemen will wait and not interrupt, possibly they will get some; though I admit at this stage it may be difficult to give such definite information as one would like. But I am doing the best I can. This project of a navy is not an old one, and whatever is done should be proceeded with carefully. As I say, we will have on the Atlantic and on the Pacific two ships within a very short time, to be used at first for the purposes of training ships. I was about to say that a considerable proportion of the men who will be required for the 'Bristols,' and the destroyers, when they are ready some years hence, will be in training.

Mr. BOYCE. How long will that be?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Prime Minister said that if the ships were built in Canada it would probably take one year for the contractors to get ready; and in four years thereafter, all the ships would be completed.

Mr. BOYCE. Will they be manned, and so forth, in four years?

Mr. EDWARDS. How many of these vessels do you propose to put on the Pacific coast?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be two 'Bristols' on the Pacific coast, two of the eleven ships, and two 'Bristols' on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BARNARD. These two ships that are to be stationed on the Pacific, are they to be used when a strike occurs, as mentioned by the Prime Minister the other day?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, really, if the hon. gentleman thinks that is quite consonant with his dignity as a member of parliament, I must say I do not.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the tonnage of the 'Rainbow'?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 3,600 tons. Now I will read a few extracts from what Admiral Kingsmill has said:

Taking into consideration the matter of training, the importance of commencing at once, also the fact that building the vessels in Canada would necessitate a training ship for some time, I laid before Mr. Brodeur a memorandum as to the advisability of obtaining, if possible, a larger ship.

I have already stated that the 'Niobe' was suggested, and negotiations are now proceeding with reference to the purchase of that ship. That ship has been recommended strongly by the admiralty.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the age of the vessel?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. What is her gun power?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 16 guns.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of guns?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 16 6-inch guns. She is a ship of 11,500 tons. Her speed is about 20 knots.

Mr. FOSTER. What is she to cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $1,075,000. Now as to the Bristol cruisers:

They would fill an important duty in warding off attacks against commerce or against the coasts of Canada of any enemy's raiding cruisers, and would also act as commerce destroyers. Their first duty is to seek out and destroy the enemy's destroyers. It is most imperative for a battle fleet cruising to know, when night comes on, that the ground they have to go over has been cleared of the enemy's destroyers. . . . In the event of a British fleet coming over, these cruisers would have gleaned information of the movements of an enemy's fleet, and so act as an advanced screen after which they could join up with the British fleet.

Mr. HUGHES. How many knots an hour can these ships make?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Bristol 25 knots and the destroyers 27 knots.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not given the gun power of the Bristol.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These vessels are of the newest type and the details of their gun power are not published; it is not considered desirable to publish them. I think it will be evident from what I have said that the ships which have been selected for us by the British admiralty are ships of the latest type, and that the arrangement which has been made with reference to the fleet unit adopted for Canada is of a kind which takes cognizance of the geographical position of this country, and the fact that we have two large oceans separated by a distance of some 4,000 miles, the idea being, and it is the only ideal that would be considered by the people of Canada, that we should begin at one and the same time the development of our navy on the Pacific and on the Atlantic. I may say that it did not appeal to Mr. Brodeur and myself as being desirable or at all in accordance with the views or with the ambitions of the people of the whole of Canada that we should place one unit upon one of the oceans; we held it was much better to begin more gradually, to begin to develop the personnel, which as I have said, is the very foundation of a navy, and to do it upon both of the great coasts of Canada, and later on it will be open to whatever government is in power in Canada to take such course as it may see fit as to the future development of the Canadian navy.

Mr. BOYCE. How would the minister provide for an emergency in the meantime?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are quite satisfied with the provision which is now made for an emergency.

Mr. BOYCE. I ask my hon. friend how long this naval service would take to equip and make effective?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I quoted what the Prime Minister said.

Mr. BOYCE. Has the minister any proposal to make in regard to providing for an emergency in the meantime?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Our friends of the opposition are doing that.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I have to ask my hon. friend if the proposals of the opposition are satisfactory to him?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not aware that the members of this side of the House have treated any of the opposition

speakers, particularly leading members of the opposition, in this way. I can stand any amount of heckling or nonsense, but I did not come here for that purpose to-day, and I think perhaps I might be allowed to get through with my statement and allow somebody else to follow.

Mr. BOYCE. I must beg the hon. minister's pardon; I had no desire whatever to embarrass him in his speech. I asked him a question and had it not been for his answer nothing further would have been said.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the question he put as to an emergency is not a proper question to interject.

Mr. BOYCE. I can understand that if the minister did not want to answer it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Now with regard to the cost, I have two statements here which I shall not read in detail, but I think it is perhaps desirable that a few words should be given on this point. I have here a paper prepared by Admiral Kingsmill from which it appears that the cost, exclusive of construction, would be for the first four years as follows: For the first year, $1,250,000; for the second year, $1,247,000; for the third year, $1,704,000; for the fourth year, $2,250,000. Admiral Kingsmill said this estimate is only approximate and that it will probably be found rather an over-estimate than an under-estimate. It does not allow for any of the ships proposed in the government programme being completed in the four years. Should any of them be completed and commissioned within this period, account would have to be taken of their upkeep.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand these sums do not include anything for the upkeep of the proposed new vessels.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I have also a statement of the estimated annual cost of maintenance, when the ships are completed, commissioned and fitted out. This estimate, including $100,000 for contingencies, is $3,680,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that take into account interest and depreciation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend has referred to the memorandum of Admiral Kingsmill. Would it be convenient, if it is too long to read, for my hon. friend to hand it in to 'Hansard' so that we could get the entire memorandum?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will see whether that can be done.

Mr. MONK. As my hon. friend has quoted from it I suppose it is right to have it put on 'Hansard'.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What happened was that Admiral Kingsmill gave me data and I took them down, so it was perhaps scarcely correct to say it was Admiral Kingsmill's memorandum but I think I can hand it in; I shall endeavour to do so.

Mr. MONK. It seems to be a memorandum connected with this matter, and as it is probably lengthy we can claim that it should be laid on the table of the House. I think it would be a convenient way for the minister to hand it in to 'Hansard', otherwise I would insist on my right to see the memorandum itself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no objection to the hon. gentleman seeing it. It is chiefly notes which I have made.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend lay it on the table?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I will see.

Mr. MONK. I think that document is necessary for our information, my hon. friend has referred to it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no objection, but I would not like to hand it in immediately until I have looked it over.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend must really excuse me. This is a question of order and I would like my hon. friend to let me know before he has finished his remarks if he intends to give us communication of that memorandum.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The memorandum which I hold in my hand from which I gave a few extracts is a memorandum prepared by the Admiral and which I intend to place on the pages of 'Hansard'. I have given the annual expenditure for the first four years, the estimated cost of maintenance after the ships are in hand and completed.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention—because it is important—to the estimated cost given by the Prime Minister on authority, when he moved the second reading of the Bill. He makes the annual cost, after the construction is done, and the work going on, at four

and a quarter million dollars. There is a large disparity between the two.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These figures which I gave were in the blue-book; I gave no other figures than those in the blue-book.

Mr. FOSTER. It is impossible that the up-keep should be in the blue-book, because there is no blue-book data for that kind of a unit.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought the House would desire more details than had been given, and with the best intention and in the best spirit I got what information I could. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) can understand how difficult it is to get down to very exact figures in a matter of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. I know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am doing the best I can to give the estimate, and I am placing this memorandum on 'Hansard' so that hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of examining it.

APPROXIMATE EXPENDITURE ON NAVAL SERVICE DURING THE FIRST FOUR YEARS.

—	First Year.	Second Year.	Third Year.	Fourth Year.	Total.
	$	$	$	$	$
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' —					
Cost of nucleus crew and training personnel	267,000	272,000	277,000	282,000	1,098,000
Victualling and medicines	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000	240,000
Clothing gratuity	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	60,000
Upkeep of 'Niobe'	140,000	145,000	150,000	150,000	585,000
" 'Rainbow'	110,000	110,000	115,000	115,000	450,000
Recruits—					
(a) Pay, victualling and medicines	51,000	200,000	370,000	550,000	1,171,000
Clothing	30,000	43,000	56,000	70,000	199,000
Recruiting expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
Dockyard Canstruction					100,000
Upkeep of naval college	35,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	275,000
" barracks		50,000	60,000	75,000	185,000
(b) " dockyards	210,000	270,000	300,000	350,000	1,130,000
Headquarter staff	60,000	70,000	75,000	80,000	285,000
Reserve stores	50,000			100,000	150,000
Ordnance stores	100,000			200,000	300,000
Contingencies	120,000	130,000	144,000	155,000	549,000
Total	1,250,000	1,447,000	1,704,000	2,284,000	6,685,000

This estimate is only approximate, but it will probably be found that it is rather an over-estimate than an under-estimate.

It does not allow for any of the ships proposed in government programme being completed within this four years; should any of them be completed and commissioned within this period account would have to be taken of their upkeep, &c.

(a) Annual increase due to the increased numbers entered annually.

(b) As the ships near completion the dockyards must expand.

Other increases due to expansion of the service.

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST OF MAINTENANCE.

No. of Ships.	No. of Officers and Men.	Pay, Allowances, Victualling, &c.	Upkeep.	Total.
		$	$	$
Halifax—				
2 'Bristols'	40 officers 742 men	443,000	265,000	708,000
*1 'Boadicea'	17 officers 261 men	226,000	150,000	376,000
6 Destroyers	30 officers 546 men	335,000	428,000	763,000
†Dockyard		100,000	100,000	200,000
Barracks, staff, &c			75,000	75,000
Recruits		200,000		200,000
College			80,000	80,000
Esquimalt—				
2 'Bristols'	40 officers 742 men	443,000	265,000	708,000
1 'Rainbow'	16 officers 163 men	115,000	115,000	230,000
†Dockyard		90,000	70,000	160,000
Headquarter Staff		80,000		80,000
Contingencies				100,000
Total		2,032,000	1,548,000	3,680,000

*Although the name 'Boadicea' is inserted, the cost of maintenance of 'Niobe' is actually shown, which is higher than upkeep of 'Boadicea.' This is done on the presumption that 'Niobe' will replace the 'Boadicea' as parent ship for destroyers.

†Based on admiralty estimate.

ESTIMATED COST OF CONSTRUCTION.

Ship.	Brief description of Character and Armament of Ship.	Cost of construction based on British-building prices.
		$
Bristol	Protected cruiser, 4,800 tons, length 430	1,885,000
"	Beam 47, draught 16, horse-power 22,000	1,885,000
"	Speed 25 knots, turbines	1,885,000
"	Armament not yet decided	1,885,000
*'Boadicea'	Unarmoured cruiser, 3,300 tons, length 385 Beam 41, draught 13·6, horse-power 18,000 Speed 25, armament 6·4-in., 3 torpedo tubes	1,750,000
Destroyer		400,000
"	Improved River Class, 935 tons, length 280	400,000
"	Beam 26, draught 9, horse-power 15,500	400,000
"	Speed 27 knots, armament 2·4-in	400,000
"	2 torpedo tubes	400,000
"		400,000

11 ships costing	$ 11,690,000
*Less difference in 'Niobe'	675,000
	$ 11,015,000
Building for naval college	150,000
Furnishing same and workshops	50,000
Two houses, captain of college and director of studies	15,000
Barracks, including drill shed	200,000
Battery for heavy and light guns	20,000
Arming same	110,000
Alterations of Admiralty House for officers of barracks	70,000
Dockyards	100,000
Total construction works	$ 715,000
Total cost of construction of ships and buildings	$ 11,730,000

Now, with regard to the cost of construction. The cost of construction is at British prices. Of course the prices I have been giving for victualling and up-keep and all that are at Canadian rates, but the estimate of construction is at British rates, and that should be understood. I am not in a position to say how much more the ships will cost if built in Canada, but they certainly will cost more. I think, from a Canadian standpoint—as had been pointed out by so many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House—it would be very desirable, if possible, that they should be constructed in Canada, if the excess of price involved is not too great. That can only be ascertained by asking for tenders, which of course will be done. It appears that the ships would cost $11,015,000, substituting the 'Niobe' for the 'Boadicea,' which appears in this memorandum as costing $1,750,000. The 'Niobe' is to be a training ship, and is to be procured very shortly, and she will cost $1,075,000. The difference of $675,000 between the cost of the 'Boadicea' and 'Niobe' will reduce the estimate, which is $11,690,000 to $11,015,000. Then there are estimates for the construction of a naval college, furnishing the same, workshops, two houses, barracks, &c.—I need not read the items, amounting to $715,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Canadian figures?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. The $715,000 would be Canadian figures. It is for the construction of buildings to spread over several years. The total cost of construction, therefore, would be of ships and buildings, $11,730,000, about $11,000,000 of which is estimated at British prices.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to say a single word as to the annual cost. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to the inauguration of what he called the era of militarism, and he thought that this expenditure would be sure to run up from year to year as our military expenditure had, and he believed that eventually the tax would be very high. Now, the military expenditure of Canada amounts to about 80 cents per head of the present population, and I take it that when construction is completed, the naval expenditure combined with the expenditure on militia would not amount to more than $1.25 per head of the present population of Canada, and I believe that the annual increase of population will keep the figure at about that per capita rate. It does not seem to me that for a country like Canada, rich and prosperous and rapidly becoming great, an expenditure of $1.25 per head for its total cost for defence would be a very high rate. I, therefore, think my hon. friend from East Grey may possess his soul in patience and need not worry over the expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a fact that since the militia was reorganized the expenditure has increased to $6,500,000 per annum, when it was formerly only $2,500,000? That being so, may we not reasonably expect a somewhat proportionate increase in the naval expenditure?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think so. The hon. gentleman stated the other night, and he stated correctly, that the expenditure on militia had increased, but he did not state that a very large part of that increased expenditure was due to taking over the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt and to increasing the permanent force of 800 or 900 men up to practically 3,000. That accounts for a large part of the increase in the militia expenditure, and I am sure the hon. gentleman does not object to our relieving the British taxpayer to that extent.

Mr. SPROULE. What I did object to, was that while in 1896 the officers and those who controlled the force cost the country $16,000, the men who do the same work to-day cost us $73,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not going to be turned aside now to deal with that question, because I have stated over and over again the reasons for that, and I have laid on the table of the House a memorandum from Major General Sir Percy Lake explaining fully every dollar of the increase.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister object to my endeavouring to get a clear understanding as to that matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think I might be allowed to finish my remarks. I have never known a similar case of interruption in my parliamentary experience of thirty-six years. When a minister is attempting to make a statement upon an important subject, whether his statement is acceptable or not, it is usually listened to. With regard to the per capita charge I shall say no more. The hon. gentleman, in the fourth part of his resolution, says:

> That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditure of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

This is rather an astounding proposition, Mr. Speaker, after what took place ten months ago. Parliament was then fresh from the people. The hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) scarcely waited until the ink was dry upon the returns of the elections before he took up the question of considering and bringing before parliament our duty in the matter of providing for naval defence. It was seriously considered, and a certain line of policy was unanimously agreed to. At that time the question that there was any duty devolving upon us to go to the country on

this subject was never raised by anybody. I will venture to say that no such misconstruction of responsible government was ever heard of in the British parliament or ever before suggested in this parliament. The people sent us here for the purpose of dealing with all important public questions. Is it to be said that every time an important question comes up, we shall go back to the people, particularly after parliament has unanimously agreed to a certain line of policy? Who would think of putting forward such a monstrous proposition as that? I think the hon. gentleman surely cannot be serious. I am reminded that the hon. gentlemen themselves suggested the addition to the resolution of March last, of the words to the effect that we should not wait, but get to work on a navy at once; and I have read extracts from the hon. gentlemen's speeches to prove that they were the most enthusiastic advocates of the immediate construction and organization of a navy. Yet we are told to-day that we should go back to the people. But I do not observe that the hon. gentleman thinks it at all necessary to go to the people for their approval of the proposal to tax them to the extent of $25,000,000 to buy two Dreadnoughts. Why, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that the Militia Act of Canada for the last fifty years, and I dare say ever since Canada has had responsible government, has made provision—and it is there to-day—for the organization of a militia navy. So this is no new policy. It is there authorized by the people; and it has always been perfectly understood that Canada had there the authority at any moment she felt financially able to undertake the additional responsibility of naval defence.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish simply to add to what I have said with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that I observe he is opposed to military expenditure or defence expenditure of all kinds. As I understand him he is against militarism, and seems to think that any expenditure of the kind is to be classed under that head I can understand therefore why my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should support this resolution. The other evening he said that he favoured our expending $25,000,000 on Dreadnoughts, and doing nothing else, because possibly that would be all the expenditure necessary. In his view, that would be a happy way of escaping from all future expenditure because perhaps another call would not be made on us for at least a generation or twenty years. Therefore it was from motives of economy that my hon. friend supports the resolution of the leader of the opposition. The gift of $25,000,000 might be a cheap way of getting out of our obligations because we might never have to put up any more, and in any case there would not likely be another call for the next twenty years.

The last part of the resolution of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition reads as follows:—

That in the meantime——

That is before the creation of a navy was submitted to the consideration of the people——

—that in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposition of the imperial authorities, as a free and loyal contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend such sum at such time and for such purposes on naval defence as, in their judgment, may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus insure its peace and security.

So that it is not necessarily Dreadnoughts which the hon. gentleman advocates—it is anything on which the British government may choose to expend money for the British navy. My hon. friend and his supporters based this resolution upon the idea that a crisis or an emergency exists. Otherwise there is no ground or excuse for putting such a proposal before this House. Because there is an emergency, the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall hand over $25,000,000 as a present to the British admiralty to buy two Dreadnoughts or anything else they might see fit in the way of naval defence. But when did this crisis or emergency arise? I have pointed out that in the mind of the hon. gentleman and of his lieutenant, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) there was no crisis or emergency in March last. I have read the speech of the leader of the opposition delivered in London in July last, from which it would appear that, in his opinion, there was no crisis then. Was it because my hon. friend had been looking at that magnificent array of battleships in the Thames which he spoke about so eloquently here a few weeks ago, that his mind was then kept in the due equipose which it enjoyed in March last? Was it on that account that he did not see any crisis then although he was in London, the very heart of the empire, where it might be supposed to be found if it existed anywhere. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman then said he was for a Canadian navy and against a contribution of Dread-

noughts. Was it in August? Certainly not. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told us, as late as August last in Halifax, that the proper policy was the building of a Canadian navy. There was no indication then of any impending danger. Neither was it in October, because in Toronto both these hon. gentlemen assured the people that they were still strong in the belief that a Canadian navy was the proper thing. It was certainly not in November, because we had the same assurances then. Nor was it in December because in the city of Montreal I had the honour of listening to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, making a strong and effective speech in favour of the adoption of a Canadian policy and the creation of a Canadian navy. When then did it come and whence did it come? As I have said, it showed its first symptoms on the 12th of January last when my hon. friend indicated that there were in his mind some germs which indicated a coming attack of blue funk—shall I say?—or the dread of some impending crisis. We have in England in the navy what has been known a long time as the blue sea school, and I have observed during the recent elections there that somebody has said that another school has taken its rise in England, and that is the blue funk school. The threat of German invasion was used, as we know, during the recent elections in England.

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has seen fit to launch his policy. That policy is, to give the admiralty of the mother country a sum of money sufficient to buy two Dreadnoughts. Now, what does that policy involve? It certainly involves delay in the matter of proceeding with the real work of beginning, constructing and organizing a Canadian navy to co-operate, when required, with the British navy. But more than that is involved. As I have pointed out, it involves a heavy expenditure without any direct benefit whatever to Canada in the way of building up a navy. We are a people of seven and a half millions. Years ago we undertook the defence of this country on land. Everybody agreed ten months ago that the time had arrived when we should undertake that defence upon the waters adjacent to our country. But this proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite means a begging of the question, it means expending $25,000,000 without contributing in any way whatever—as to personnel, as to shipbuilding, as to docks or anything else which is important—to building up a navy or educating the people of Canada towards co-operation with the mother country in our own defence.

Now, I ask your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments while I read some authorities upon this question of whether or not there is an emergency. It seems to me to be a very important question. For, if there is not an emergency, then my hon. friend's resolution is not to the point. And I think I can show without very great difficulty that there is no emergency. This is a serious question and one which we should approach seriously. We should make the effort by every means in our power to inform ourselves with reference to this question. I propose first to read briefly from a statement of Sir William White, who is ex-constructor of the British navy, a man who might be presumed to have very considerable knowledge as to the power of the British navy itself and as to the strength and character of the other navies of the world. Sir William White said:

> German activity in warship building attracts most attention for the moment and there is a tendency to treat existing conditions as if they were unprecedented. Every one familiar with the events of the last half century (since the iron-clad area began), knows that this is not true. That period has been marked by a succession of struggles for supremacy in sea power, and more critical situations have occurred in the past than that which now exists. From 1857 to 1870 France was a formidable competitor; indeed, for the first ten years of that period, her war fleet was stronger, relatively to the British navy, than any single power has been since. The combined strength of French and Russian fleets furnished the standard of strength adopted by British governments from 1887 onwards; and the great programmes of ship-building embodied in the Naval Defence Act of 1889, the Spencer programme of 1893, and the Goschen programme which followed, were frankly based on that consideration. There were times when the relative strength of the royal navy and of the allied fleets of France and Russia gave more reason for anxiety than any present or immediately prospective condition would justify.

Then, I propose to read a passage or two from the London 'Times'. For many weeks past, at any rate during the election in England, the London 'Times' has been publishing articles calculated as far as possible to alarm the people of England and to make them believe that the British government of to-day had not done and was not doing all that it ought to do and that there was a certain amount of peril in the preparations being made by Germany. I have here an article by a very able writer, written upon the occasion of the sixty-ninth birthday of Lord Fisher, who has recently passed out of the navy, and who, as everybody knows, was the first sea lord, for five years. I quote from the 'Times' of January 28, last.

Mr. FOSTER. Not an editorial?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is not an editorial. But it is written by a

well known writer who is constantly writing military and defence articles for the 'Times':

The most striking, though, in our judgment, by no means the most important, achievement of Lord Fisher has been the introduction of the Dreadnought type of warship. Not much need be said upon this subject. It is full of technicalities little fitted for popular discussion, and it positively bristles with controversy. There are those who hold that the introduction of the Dreadnought type in 1905 was premature, that it was too hastily adopted—as is held to be shown by the large modifications introduced into the succeeding vessels of the same type both in this country and abroad—and that it has involved this country in a vast increase of naval expenditure which might have been postponed, if not avoided altogether. It would carry us too far into the kind of controversy which we desire to avoid on the present occasion to discuss these criticisms. The broad facts are indisputable—first, that all the great naval powers have now adopted the Dreadnought type with no greater modifications than time and experience have suggested to ourselves as well as to others; secondly, that the introduction of the type effected a marked pause in the development of the constructive programme of other powers; and, thirdly, that the duration of this pause gave this country a lead in the construction of Dreadnoughts which we still retain and can lose only by our own craven default.

And again from the same article:

Any one who takes the trouble may, by consulting the navy list and other official documents accessible to all the world, institute for himself a comparison between the strength of the naval forces actually in commission in home waters at the end of 1904 and at the beginning of 1910. These dates cover the whole period of Lord Fisher's tenure of office. The figures are as follows. A similar examination of intervening periods would show that the development has been continuous throughout:—

	1904.	1910.
Battleships..	16	44
First-class cruisers..	13	37
Smaller cruisers and gun boats..	30	58
Destroyers..	24	12
Torpedo boats..	16	88
Submarines..		50

Here we must make an end, though we have by no means exhausted the tale of reforms effected by the admiralty in nearly all departments of naval administration during Lord Fisher's tenure of office.

That is the position which England occupies to-day in comparison with the position which she occupied in 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the author?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The article is not signed, but I fancy it is written by Mr. Amery. We may accept it, I think, coming from the 'Times' as a reliable authority, and this is a table which the 'Times' would not publish if it had not verified the figures.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was not the person who wrote that article a Mr. Amery and who advocated those views, defeated at the last election?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot tell what views he advocated; but I know the London 'Times' did all it could to excite public opinion in England to the view that all was not being done that ought to be done for the navy, and that there was some danger from Germany. Now I propose to read some other authorities, and I intend to begin with the Prime Minister of England. On the 10th of November at the Lord Mayor's banquet, Mr. Asquith said:

When I addressed your predecessors in this place last year the internation sky here and in Europe was somewhat clouded and there were signs in the horizon which might well have seemed to foretell a spell of stormy weather. I am happy to be able to speak to you to-night without any lurking apprehensions which it was then not wholly possible to lay aside.

My hon. friends ought to have introduced their resolution last March and got ahead of this trouble which the Prime Minister says existed about that time but fortunately had disappeared. He goes on:

If I speak for one moment of Germany, it is to say again that I know of nothing which need stand in the way of a full and friendly understanding which it is, I believe, a cherished object of the wisest statesmanship and of the best moral and social forces in both countries to promote.

That was at the Lord Mayor's banquet. And again on the 21st of December, Mr. Asquith said:

Let me say once for all that the navy is able to maintain not only now, but in future years, our supremacy at sea, and to guarantee the integrity of our shores, the protection of our commerce, and the inviolability of our empire. I do not believe that ever since the close of the great war nearly a century ago the navy and the army have been better organized than they are to-day.

And again Mr. Asquith, on the 19th of January:

Let me say once for all, and I speak with full deliberation and after careful and prolonged inquiry, that the navy of to-day is able to maintain, not only this year, but in the years that lie before us, our supremacy at sea, and, should the necessity arise, which God forbid, to guarantee the integrity of our shores, the protection of our commerce, and the inviolability of our empire.

Mr. McKenna, the Frst Lord of the Admiralty, has expressed himself recently as follows:

It is said that we are being left behind in comparison with Germany. At this moment Great Britain has got 7 Dreadnoughts in commission; Germany has got 2. When Germany has 4 in commission, Great Britain will have

10. When Germany has 5 in commission, Great Britain will have 12. When Germany has 9 in commission, Great Britain will have 14. When Germany had 11 in commission, Great Britain would have 16. When Germany had 13 in commission, Great Britain would have 20.

That carries us up to March 31, 1912.

Up to the present no programme in other countries has gone beyond that period. Next year will see its own programme, and I have no doubt that the figures will be equally satisfactory, and equally giving absolute security to this country with regard to subsequent years.

Sir Edward Grey, as late as January 11, said:

As far as relations between the British and the German governments were concerned there never had been less reason to talk about the prospects of war than there were at the present time.

It is the Secretary for Foreign Affairs in England who says that:

At no time have we found a greater disposition on the part of the German government to handle these questions which arise between us in a friendly spirit than we have found during the last year. It may be that in time there will be some agreement of a perfectly voluntary nature, but if any such is arrived at, it cannot be the result of pressure on either side. It must be simply the result of an equal amount of free will on either side.

Then I have here an extract from a leading German newspaper:

If we had not taken to ourselves a good measure of Shakespeare's world of humour, who knows whether we should not long since have sent a diplomatic hint to Downing Street asking politely that the German 'bogey' might be omitted in these domestic party conflicts; but on our side of the channel we have long perceived the aim of this English election manœuvre, and only thank the leaders of the present British government for the honourable endeavour to place all the Conservative and Unionist allegations as to Germany's nefarious designs in their proper light, and to expose them as a dubious election dodge not quite worthy of gentlemen.

Next I have here the Edinburgh 'Review' containing an article from which I would like to read. It is an article reviewing several German works and entitled 'Anglo-German Relations.' The fact that it is published in the Edinburgh 'Review' is, I think, a sufficient guarantee for its respectability. The writer says:

Nothing therefore so cut and dried as a convention between two nations is required, since we have no actual dispute to settle. What is chiefly needed to induce better relations are—more insistence on the interests and glorious memories that we have in common, and a fuller comprehension of each other's history, of our good as well as bad qualities, and even the real grievances each has against the other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Above all we should avoid thinking that each nation is plotting against the other. There are, no doubt, people in England anxious to destroy Germany's fleet and smash her commerce, just as there are people in Germany who would like to do the same to England. But in every country there are generally to be found people of the same extreme views. Every Russian has certainly not yet given up the dream once cherished of annexing the Indian empire, and there are plenty of American citizens still anxious to twist the Lion's tail. In the same way there are still Canadians——

Not many now, I hope.

—who feel no loyalty to the British empire, and a few back-country Boers who would hoist the republican flag to-morrow if they could. But it is undignified for a great people to take all such vapourings or such sullen discontents as the expression of another country's deliberate ambition, or to treat the theories of Pan-Germanism or Pan-Slavism or of British imperialism in their most blatant forms as constant menaces to one's own security. Moreover, it is well not to take every extreme expression of national ideals too seriously, even when uttered by a Bismarck. No doubt every considerable nation thinks or has thought that it would be better for the world if its own influence were supreme, and theoretically would be prepared to secure this supremacy. It is a natural and very pardonable instinct. But its existence by no means implies that such a belief would at any given moment necessarily manifest itself in action, even if such action might conceivably be successful. Our extreme jingoes themselves would not be such fools as to paint the map of the whole world red, even if they could; much less the average Englishman.

We have heard, and I think it is well to go as far as we can to the bottom of this scare question. I wish to quote from an extremely able article from which the leader of the opposition quoted in his speech on January 12 last. It appears in the last Navy League Annual, edited by Alan H. Burgoyne, and is written by a distinguished German, Graf Ernst Von Reventlow. It is entitled 'the Naval Policy of Germany and her Relations with England.' The writer says:

I now return to the main question—the object which is pursued in the German shipbuilding programme, viz., the protection of commerce the colonies and oversea interests; this, of course, includes the protection of our own coasts. The words in the preamble of the Navy Bill: '.....that even the greatest sea-power must hesitate to attack us unless she is prepared to jeojardize her international position,'——

Words which the leader of the opposition quoted for a different object:

—do not in any way assert that our fleet requires to be equal or superior to the British fleet. If we desire fully to comprehend the sense of this sentence, we must consider it

from two points of view, viz., in the event of war, and, secondly, as a means for the avoidance of war.

And then again:

The relation between our fleet programme and warfare itself we might in broad lines describe in the following words: it is sufficient for us Germans if England recognizes that she cannot in the long run carry out a blockade of the German coasts. This object of ours is thus also purely a defensive one. At the same time, however, there appears at first sight to be an irreconcilable duality of conception and view, for England regards it as her defensive right to push forward her line of defence as far as the coasts of the opponent. It was recently even stated in an English paper that in the future European war the line of defence of British interests would have to be pushed forward as far as the valley of the Meuse. We Germans, on the other hand, cannot accept that view, and on our part consider it to be a defensive action to make preparations in order to make it impossible in a future war for the line of defence of an enemy to be brought up to our coasts. I am of opinion that the uneasiness and apprehension of prominent British politicians and experts is precisely based on this idea. None of these prominent and experienced men will ever have believed in the nonsense about invasion, excepting, perhaps, a few fanatics. It is, after all, only a right of politicians if in England the spectre of invasion is made use of for purposes of agitation and in order to influence public opinion in favour of the navy; it becomes a wrong only where it produces greater harm than good. At all events, in England the fear of invasion has proved an effective means of agitation in favour of the navy, and, strangely enough, many people in Germany think that even admirals and statesmen seriously believe in this spectre, whereas it is probably only the blockade question that occupies them. It is well known that the prevention of a blockade, or the harassing of a blockading is not the work of small ships; the defending party must have at its back a strong fleet of battleships. An example of this on a small scale was furnished at the time by Port Arthur, where the Russian torpedo boats never approached the enemy's fleet, as they themselves were not backed by a fleet of battleships.

I wish now to read a very short quotation indeed from a speech made by the German ambassador in London only a few days ago on the occasion of the Emperor's birthday. As reported in the 'Times' of the 29th of January, Count Wolff Metternich said:

We are building our fleet in accordance with the programme which has been known for ten years, and which has been fixed by Act of parliament. In spite of the commercial reasons which impel us to wander far abroad, the pivot of our existence is in the Fatherland, which the army is called upon in the first place to protect. It is, therefore, neither necessary for us, nor have we any pretentions to be or to become the strongest on the sea. The ocean is free and according to the conceptions of all civilized nations, belongs to no single power alone. We do not wish to rule the seas, but we desire to occupy a position commanding respect commensurate with our commercial and colonial interests. But neither our fleet nor our army threatens any one so long as we are not threatened ourselves. And since we have no intention of competing for supremacy on the sea, is it reasonable to suppose that we seek to become involved in a naval quarrel, while we know that we are much stronger on land?

If we stop for a moment to reason, it seems to me that we should admit that Germany, with its great interests, its rapidly expanding trade, its vast commerce, is doing nothing but what any great power should do, looking to the necessity of defending her lines of commerce and her great and vast development. That is what Germany should do as a matter of duty, and it is what Germany has an absolute right to do. In view of these authorities, which I respectfully take leave to consider are superior to any in this House at least, in view of the reasons set forth by them, in view of the statements of the Prime Minister of England, of the First Lord of the Admiralty in England, of the British Foreign Minister: that there is no danger, and that the British navy was never stronger or better able to compete with the navies of the world than it is to-day, it seems to me we should accept these assurances in preference to the scare resolution of my hon. friends opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a single word in conclusion. Nobody on this side of the House doubts; we have affirmed it over and over again, and we believe that British naval supremacy is in the first degree essential not only for the maintenance of the British empire, but for the maintenance of peace and for the best interests of the world at large. I have spent some time, which I hope has not been lost, in endeavouring to establish that British naval supremacy is not in danger at the present moment, nor for many years to come. Now, Sir, we wish to assist in every way in our power the mother country, upon whom unquestionably the strain of maintaining her position, which is essential to our existence as well as to hers, has become very, very great. It is for us to consider how we can best do this. Is it by the means suggested in the resolution of the hon. gentlemen opposite, spending $25,000,000 now and receding from the proper policy and effort which we should make to build up a line of defence upon the sea which will be of some use immediately, but which will be of greater and greater use as the years go on when perhaps it will be more needed than it is now or during the next ten years? The suggestions made by the statesmen of the mother country, and her admirals and generals for years past all tend to show that the true way of as-

sisting the mother country in the matter of defence is by making each one of the great nations which form part of the British empire strong within itself. That is the line which has been followed in this country, to some extent at any rate so far as our land forces are concerned. It has been in contemplation to organize gradually a naval force, and we believe the time has come now. We are 7,500,000 people with an annual revenue of $100,000,000, and we should be prepared, we should be anxious to relieve the mother country from the responsibility of defending our coasts and our harbours. Let us then take this moderate step which we have proposed, of carrying out lines of local defence, a policy which is no new policy here, and which after years of experience of the other methods has been returned to and is now being followed by the great sister dominion of Australia. And so, my suggestion would be, and I think it will meet with favour among the great majority of the people of this country: that we should take up seriously the question of local defence of the sea, that we should follow it on the lines of local autonomy so ably pointed out by the right hon. the leader of the government in March last and so cordially approved then by the leader of the opposition. It seems to me that autonomy cannot be best utilized by the course which hon. gentlemen opposite now suggest. Autonomy does not consist simply in possessing the power to govern ourselves; it consists in utilizing that power and these rights and these privileges to develop ourselves in everything which goes to make up nationhood. It is no use to boast that we are autonomous if we do what the hon. gentleman from North Toronto so deprecated, and spoke of in such contemptuous manner a few short months ago: if we go and hire somebody to do the thing which, as free and independent and autonomus British subjects we should do ourselves. That, Sir, would mean, not autonomy; it would mean atrophy in the worst sense of the word.

Now, we hear in these days a great deal about imperialism. I have not been in the habit of boasting very much about it, although I may have as good right to do so as any man in this House, or any man in Canada. I have made some sacrifices, and I have endeavoured to do some work for the empire, and in the cause of imperial defence. But, Mr. Speaker, my notion of the way to build up the empire, my idea of true imperialism is for each one of the great dominions that make up the galaxy of nations constituting this great empire, to enter upon the task of developing itself to the utmost. Let each one of these dominions make itself strong by improving its trade connections and its trade routes, and by developing the great natural resources within its limits, and, not forgetting at the same time its duty in reference to defence. In that way we will make ourselves strong. I go so far as to say that I believe in Canada first; I believe that idea should stand out prominently in every mind in this country; I believe that all our children should be taught that it is their first duty to make their own country strong. If that course is followed, in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, and in the Dominion of South Africa—which is one of the greatest triumphs of British diplomacy and British institutions—if we cultivate a better acquaintance with each other and with the mother country; if we close up the ranks in friendly rivalry, in commerce and in the arts of peace, not forgetting to make all reasonable provision for emergencies, along the line of co-operation with the great centre and heart of the empire, our watchword shall be 'local autonomy with imperial unit'; for imperial unity, mark my words, depends absolutely and entirely upon local autonomy.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I am sure my hon. friend will not take it amiss of me if I do not commence and continue in a seriatim reply to his somewhat long and, I am afraid I shall have to say, not very illuminating address. All that I have been able to pick out that I think needs answer I will try not to miss as I carry along my remarks in a more connected way than I could do if I followed seriatim my hon. friend, for I have a little to say about the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman who moved the second reading of this Bill, who Lincolnized himself, according to the sane and judicious judgment pronounced upon the matter by the member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke), and whose speech, no doubt, is to be the pièce de resistance in this Dominion generally, in the province of Quebec especially, during the campaign which is now opening, and which may continue for a greater or less length of time. I thought, as I looked at my right hon. friend and listened to him, that his speech was, after all, an apology addressed to different wings of sentiment or opinion in this country, as to which of the two were the stronger he himself was in doubt. It had to me the semblance of a speech made by a man who feared on the one hand that he was offering too much, and on the other hand that he was offering too little, and expected animadversion on both sides. It seemed to me the halting step of a man who had not based his policy on deep and long abiding conviction, but who trod the shifty ways of compromise, and consequently, instead of drawing upon the founts of strong and deep feeling and sentiment, had to seek the flimsy consolations of a rhetoric often glittering, and as deceptive in many points as it was glit-

tering. Consequently my right hon. friend involved himself in contradiction, and descended to devices of argument which would do credit to the everyday hustings man, but which certainly to my mind does little credit to a statesman of twenty-five or thirty years' standing. If that appears to be a somewhat strong word, let me point out what I mean. Here was a man of long experience, putting, as he said himself, the capstone on to the many stories of the policy which he and his party had advanced in the Dominion of Canada. The final, the crowning stone was to be laid. Whatever he may try to persuade others, he himself knew quite well that he was standing in an epochal period in this House of Commons and this Dominion of Canada. He was proposing a policy which was absolutely new to the people of Canada, say what he may to try to convince others that it was old and well known. To-day, Mr. Speaker, there is no subject of importance which is less understood and which has been less thought out and less canvassed in this wide Dominion of intelligent electors than this very question, which, launched by the Prime Minister some few weeks ago, is to be decided in the space of as few weeks to succeed. One would have expected, when a Prime Minister, under these circumstances, stood before a House of Commons and before a people like the Canadian people of seven and a half millions, he would in statesmanlike way have gone directly to his subject, have pointed out the necessity of his policy, have noted its strong points, and, as he laid before his fellow members of the House of Commons and his fellow electors of the Dominion of Canada and asked for these wide powers and this departure, would have given to them solid and well based reasons why they should support that policy. Did he do it? There was no shifty device that the shiftiest of politicians could have recourse to, that my right hon. friend did not have recourse to. It is an old and well known design and usage of the man who occupies a weak position, to endeavour to put up bogies and suppositions and men of straw, and fight old battles that have been fought half centuries ago, in order to distract the attention of people from the real weaknesses developed in his plan.

My right hon. friend did that to perfection. In the first place instead of advocating his own policy, he, the premier of this Dominion, he, the statesman, on the subject of national and imperial defence, on which there should be no party division, on which all men should be approached in the most non-partisan manner—forgot his duty in that respect and launched at once, hot under the collar, into a tirade against members on this side for lack of consistency and of unity. Consistency—great Heaven! If there be any man in this wide Dominion who has the right to talk about political consistency, it is certainly not my right hon. friend. What difference did it make, as to the strength and soundness of his policy, whether A, B, or C, on this side had different opinions with reference to the policy that ought to be pursued? Did that add intrinsically to the strength of the right hon. gentleman's case? No, but he brought it up, as the wily politician, in order to produce an effect in favour of himself or at least to the disadvantage of the party opposed to him. Let me say to my right hon. friend, when he talks about unity and diversity of opinion, that I would rather have diversity and difference of opinion coupled with manhood and individual independence than uniformity of opinion coupled with servility and loss of independence. One thing let me tell my right hon. friend and that is that upon one point there is no division on this side of the House, and that point is a complete and unanimous disagreement with the policy proposed by the right hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That, I think, will be quite well understood and agreed to. There are ways in which uniformity can be brought about. This afternoon when the First Lord of the Admiralty or the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) was making his most important speech, and when I looked over the multiplicity of vacant seats on the other side of the House, I could only draw one of two inferences. Either there was a total lack of heart in the matter on the part of the supporters of my right hon. friend or else there was a very deep disagreement among them with reference to his plans and policies. One or the other must be true. But there are ways of producing uniformity, and my right hon. friend knows them quite well. He has the caucus; he has the thumb-screw; he has the rack; and he has the composing room. If the composing room does not make uniformity, the thumb-screw is applied. If neither be effective, the rack is used and the man is stretched. 140 men at the back of my right hon. friend, once independent men; many of them educated men; sturdy men coming up from their individual constituencies where they stand for much, trooping into caucus have, I should think, some differences of opinion, but when they come out of caucus, there is none. Look into the register, if you please, examine it, tote up the results of your examination, and in ten long years, how many of the 140 men—take all the iniquitous measures proposed, all the rights denied, all the investigations refused, during those ten long years—how

many of these 140 or 150 men have been down in the register for a single protest at any single time? The composing room or the thumb-screw or the rack has done the business. Although the dogs may troop into the caucus yelping as loudly as they please, silent back to the kennels they go, and they are mum and bay not by a single sound. There is the composing room—some one is recalcitrant is taken in. 'I understand you would like a judgeship; sometimes there are judgeships; I think you are a likely looking man.' This takes place in the composing room, and the recalcitrant comes out perfectly in accord with the most objectionable proposition. To another: 'You are looking for a commissionership, well you are a very likely man; there are commissionerships occasionally and wise caution may bring its reward.' The composing room does its work, and so the pressure goes on throughout the whole list. But I find I have made one mistake. I said that not one man had registered as an independent; not one had registered a single protest. I was wrong, there was one, Frank Oliver, a sturdy independent from the wild and woolly west. Oliver was quickly placed in office and ever since has uttered no protest. Richardson was another, also from the wild and woolly west. He spoke out his opinions, and he was cast into the outer darkness, where he has ever since remained. Lavergne was another who had a mind of his own on some things and ventured to express it. He was stripped, as naked as when he came from his mother's womb, from all patronage, and is to-day in the dark shadows of opposition. Bourassa had a mind of his own.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall have to appeal to you, Mr. Speaker. These gentlemen, usually silent, are learning to bay now. Bourassa had a mind of his own and spoke it. Bourassa is outlawed, and to-day every one of the minions of my right hon. friend has a commission to hunt him as they might hunt partridge, on the mountain side.

So I say that my right hon. friend was unwise in raising the question of division or otherwise.

Well, Sir, he brought out another favourite bogey of his. He knows quite well that there is, or has been, fostered a feeling of dislike and suspicion of what they call the imperialists in certain parts of this country. And so he next attacked the imperialists: they were shortsighted, they were wrongly led, they were Pharisees, who broadened their phylacteries and worshipped in the temple thanking God they were not like other men. What quarrel has he with the imperialist? Does he himself know? He thanked God that he was not an imperialist; and yet, being afraid that he had for once taken too solid and uncompromising a ground, he immediately thanked God that he was not an anti-imperialist. Who is the imperialist, and what does he profess? The imperialist is a man who, while doing all his duty to his own country, always remembers that his country is part of an empire into which it was born and in which he desires it to remain for ever. The imperialist is not the shortsighted creature that my right hon. friend would have us believe. He is a man who loves his country, gives up not one whit of its proper responsibility and proper obligations and proper autonomy, but at the same time does not go down to the market places of Boston and New York to declare that he is in favour of independence for this country of ours. But my right hon. friend was wise in his generation; he lifted this bogey in order to influence votes in the province of Quebec, and wherever else it might be possible, against the resolution introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) and so to bring men to his own side in regard to the policy of naval organization. That was his purpose and that alone.

The right hon. gentleman went on to argue that this policy which he has launched and which is embodied in his Bill has been before the country for at least eight or ten years, and that consequently there is no reason to give the people time to consider it and make up their minds with regard to it. What policy has been before the country for eight or ten years? The policy, says the right hon. gentleman, embodied in the memorandum which was presented to the delegates of the imperial conferences of 1902 and which is embodied in the report of the conference. That memorandum was the embodiment of no active policy, but was merely an expression of opinion and the negation of certain things—and that is all it was. I have it here in my right hon. friend's speech of last year. At a certain time in the conference of 1902—towards the end of it—my right hon. friend and his colleagues had this memorandum prepared, and it was read and embalmed in the records of the conference:

> At present Canadian expenditures for defence services are confined to the military side.

That was the first item.

> The Canadian government are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well.

That was the second.

> On the seacoast of Canada there is a large number of men admirably qualified to form a naval reserve, and it is hoped that, at an early day a system may be devised which will lead to the training of these men and to

the making of their services available for defence in time of need.

In conclusion, the ministers repeat that, while the Canadian government are obliged to dissent from the measures proposed, they fully appreciate the obligation of the dominion to make expenditures for the purpose of defence in proportion to the increased population and wealth of the country. They are willing that these expenditures shall be so directed as to relieve the taxpayer of the mother country from some of the burdens which he now bears; and they have the strongest desire to carry out their defence schemes in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of experienced imperial officers so far as this is consistent with the principle of local self-government, which has proved so great a factor in the promotion of imperial unity.

And this is dignified as a policy. It is simply an expression, partly of facts, partly of abstract opinions and partly of hopes and aspirations which have never been framed in any policy. That is the policy, and it is on all fours with the measure produced before this House and country and which the Prime Minister says is therefore justified because it has been for eight or ten years before the country. I deny that it has been before the country. It is embalmed in the English blue-book which was presented to parliament here in 1902. But I would like my right hon. friend to point out to me any discussions which took place upon that memorandum in this House, or any policy that was founded upon it for the consideration of parliament or any discussion that has taken place upon it in this country. I make the assertion that there is not one person in a hundred thousand in the Dominion of Canada that ever saw that memorandum or that knew or knows anything about it. And yet, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a democrat of democrats, thinks that this is sufficient reason for saying that his plan of building an independent Canadian navy has been before this country since 1902, and that no time need be taken to consult the opinions of the electors upon it.

But he goes on then to charge us with broken faith, and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) has repeated the same argument. Let us see on what this charge of broken faith really rests. In 1909, I introduced a resolution which it might be just as well to read now:

> That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

This resolution related to matters absolutely inside of Canada's own borders; it has not the slightest thing to do with the duties of this country with reference to sharing the burden of defence of the empire at large. That and that alone was in my mind when I drew the resolution, and that and that alone was the burden of my discourse in support of the resolution. As to the question I said:

> It is therefore not one which has arisen out of the later events and circumstances which are in the minds of all present.

It related to the duty which I thought was incumbent upon Canada. Having seaports on the Pacific and seaports on the Atlantic at the present time, entirely at the mercy of the smallest armed gunboat of a hostile power, I thought that was an unworthy position, an unsafe position, and that what Canada ought to do was to assume her own proper work, and make some provision, some adequate provision, for the defence of her seaports and her exposed harbours and coasts. That is all that I argued for. In the last part of my address on that occasion, and in the light of the events which had afterwards occurred, that is after my resolution was put on the order paper, I alluded to the question of emergency, and to the duty of Canada in that respect towards the empire as a whole, and I challenged my right hon. friend to stand up as a Canadian and to lead this Canadian parliament in making a contribution of Dreadnoughts, or of what was equivalent to it, at a time of crisis, and to meet the emergency; and that being so, I for one, and I thought every member on this side of the House, would stand in support of him if he undertook to carry out such a policy as that. Now, my right hon. friend and others may misrepresent that position as much as they please. I have carefully read that speech, I have carefully gone over those arguments; my position is absolutely tenable, and absolutely consistent with the position I take to-day.

Now, when it came towards the close the larger question intervened, and my right hon. friend moved an amendment which practically cut out my motion. That afterwards was amended and in the end the resolution was passed, which I will read. Now, Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that the motion which was ultimately passed was carried upon absolutely different data and conditions than the motion which I introduced, that it introduced broader and wider issues than I pretended to discuss in my resolution, and that it affirmed and conveyed the opinions of the members of both sides of the House as to our duty,

not only to Canada herself, but to the empire at large, and that was a very different thing. Now, Sir, what are the terms of that resolution which finally passed?

That this House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada as they increase in numbers and wealth to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

By national defence I understand the defence of Canada. That, then, covers the gist of my resolution, the part of it that relates to Canada and Canada alone. It goes on to say.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada was concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

We agree to that. By implication, if not stronger, that means that the question of emergency remains absolutely open and free to be dealt with at any time this House thinks it ought to provide for it. That the policy of regular and stated contributions is not the best, is what is in the body of that resolution and upon which the two sides of this House agree. There is no difference of opinion between the two sides of the House, on the whole, upon that. Upon both sides we do not believe that regular and stated contributions continued from year to year, is the best method and the best means, and I elaborated that in my address. I said: You may give this year your contributions, and next year your contributions, and the year after your contributions, and after ten or twelve years of giving contributions you have founded nothing that has taken root. I gave the reasons why I did'nt like that. But there is an express reservation there—who will deny it?—that if an emergency should arise we are free to meet it with a contribution adequate to the purpose, and we do not break faith with the resolution when we do it. Let my right hon. friend deny that. The Minister of Militia and Defence has argued for that to-day, my right hon. friend has argued for it. And he did declare, with all apparent good faith and sincerity, that if a time of emergency did arise in future he would meet it as an emergency by stumping the province of Quebec and other parts of this country. Therefore, there is no breaking faith with reference to that; my right hon. friend himself will not say so, it is undeniable, there is no repudiation of faith. Equally with reference to the first clause, that of national defence, there is no repudiation or change on my part and the part of others. Regular contributions as a policy I do not believe in; emergency contributions I do, and that resolution affirms the right of this parliament to make emergency contributions to the defence of the empire when necessity arises.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy——

That is one condition.

—along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference——

That is a second condition. But there is another:

—and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

You cannot leave out a single one of those conditions, you cannot leave out one and ignore another. Now, Mr. Speaker, who has broken faith with reference to that part of the resolution? My right hon. friend who sits there, and his party, and I will show that before I get through with my remarks.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required——

There are emergent contributions of many kinds and forms with which to meet the need when it arises.

—to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

Sir, I say that in the light of that they cannot accuse my hon. friend here or myself, or any member on this side of the House who thinks with us, of breaking faith. We have taken the ground and will maintain it, that the proposals of my hon. friend do not square with those resolutions. The resolutions themselves are abstract, and to the test of these resolutions must come the proposals of my hon. friend. Are we to take any proposals that he makes simply because if we do not take them we might feel that we would be accused of breaking faith? The faith-keeping is the fidelity of the proposal to the principle which is laid down in the resolution and, as I shall show this House and my right hon. friend, he has negatived the spirit and intent of those resolutions and is himself the faith-breaker.

Then my right hon. friend had a tilt with sundry windmills. He knows the story of the old knight and his doughty squire, filled full of the spirit of battle if not of conquest, bound for adventure, if not for human gore, who went around tilting at windmills. My right hon. friend tilted be-

fore this audience and the wider audience of Canada, and he did it to perfection. What were the windmills with which he tilted? He tilted, Sir, against the windmill which he took as an enemy to responsible government, and he drove his spear through all the wings of the mill. He then went to the next windmill which represented in his mind's eye a sturdy opponent of Canadian autonomy, and he pierced the wings of that mill. He proceeded until he met another enemy, conjured up, on the shape of centralization of power in Downing street, and he tilted against that, and then, filled with a lust for still further battle, he found another windmill which was taxation without representation, and he glutted his desire for warfare until he had demolished that one. There are some few things about which my right hon. friend ought to be careful; they are the statements that he makes. At page 3040 he makes these statements. Mr. Speaker, are they true?

But now we are told that in matters of naval defence we are to abdicate the principles of responsible government.

Who told him so? Did the British government tell him so? Did my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) insinuate that? Did any man anywhere in this House make a statement of that kind? And yet, Sir, to the men who read that speech, and it is his design that hundreds of thousands of people shall read it, he represents that somebody in power and authority has made it a sine qua non that the principles of responsible government shall be abdicated in the matter of naval defence.

We are told that we can have responsible government in anything else, we can make our own game laws, we can administer our own affairs and even have control of our land forces, but on matters of naval defence we should have no power of our own.

Who made that statement? The British government, the British admiralty, any person in a responsible position in this House or in the country? My hon. friend knows that when he made that statement it was a complete fiction of imagination. But he went further; he did exactly the same with reference to autonomy, he did exactly the same with reference to centralization, and he did exactly the same with reference to taxation without representation. He trotted out the old ghosts of Baldwin and Lafontaine, overworked already by my right hon. friend. Will he ever give them a rest? He trotted them out and went over the whole course of the history of responsible government and the acquirement of English liberties. Then he raised the idea that there were some men somewhere responsible for wishing to smother and destroy all those things. Autonomy, he said, is ours. That is true. Responsible government is ours. That is true. But both the autonomy and the responsible government have their orbits and apply in these orbits and in these orbits alone. When responsible government was granted to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or Ontario and Quebec, it was granted by the Crown, but it did not give either of those provinces under the exercise of responsible government any claim to exercise for themselves the prerogatives of the Crown which were not included in the grant of responsible government. Autonomy, said my right hon. friend, was given to us, and when it was given to us, no bounds were set to it, and to-day it is free to inclose the whole world. Fine as a figure of speech, but utterly fallacious as a statement of principle or of law. Autonomy for your province and for our Dominion is autonomy with an orbit of its own, complete therein and legitimately opposing any that would gainsay or cross it within its own orbit; but the very moment that it goes further, it is no longer autonomy; it becomes something very different. it may become separation, independence, rebellion even. So, when my right hon. friend talks about centralization, there are some things in which it is sensible to centralize, and if there is any one thing on which competent opinion declares that it is sensible and economical and only safe to have centralization, it is the matter of defence of the empire. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) knows that, because from the time that these conferences commenced until to-day that has been the one steady principle held in view, enunciated over and over again. What folly it is to try to persuade any thinking people that the battle of responsible government, that the battle of autonomy, that the battle of centralization in the authority of Downing street has to be fought over again to-day and is involved in this question which is before the House. These are only bogies that have been raised by my right hon. friend to prejudice his opponents and if possible draw support to himself.

Then, Sir, he went a little further; he quoted naval experts, he quoted Sir Charles Tupper. Since when has Sir Charles Tupper held such sway and power with my right hon. friend and his colleagues that to-day they swear by his wisdom and by his opinion? I am quite willing that Sir Charles Tupper should look at this abortion for imperial assistance and even for local defence as it has been brought down, and I am very certain that Sir Charles Tupper would not put his imprimatur upon it. Who else has been called in witness to-night by the Minister of Militia, as previously by the First

Minister? Sir William White. But, Sir William White, I believe, expressed an opnion with reference to Esquimalt and Halifax that my hon. friend (Sir Frederick Borden) repudiated and paid no countenance to. Sir William White may be a good expert in his way, but there are others. Lord Charles Beresford is quoted, and the right hon. gentleman said that no better authority than Sir Charles Beresford could be found. But if you take Lord Charles Beresford's advice on one point because he is a good authority, how can you refuse to take his advice upon another point? He is the same Lord Charles Beresford. And, Lord Charles Beresford does not tell the quiet and pleasing tale that was told us to-night by the Minister of Militia. Sir Charles Beresford announced it as his opinion, and he is ready to maintain it: That the British navy is not to-day where it ought to be, and that many tens of millions of pounds must be spent just as soon as it possibly can in order that the British navy may take its rightful position. And, on the matter of control, where is Lord Charles Beresford? In London, on June 29, 1909, Lord Charles Beresford said:

> The vessels should be under the administration and control of the Dominions, but in case of war ready to join the imperial fleet.

There is no better authority than Lord Charles Beresford, says the right hon. gentleman, and that is what Lord Charles Beresford said, and he said further:

> Remember the best defence is the defence that can be used as an attack. Your defence should be one that can instantly be turned into attack. There is one point, I think, you should insist on: when it comes to war you must act under the great strategic bureau which will be at the admiralty.

Now, I apply that to my right hon. friend in two ways—you are talking about making an adequate defence of Canada. But, the vessels that you propose some time to have completed, complete them all and put three of them on one coast and the rest on the other coast of this Dominion, and you have absolutely no force with which you would dare to attack, and consequently you have not an adequate force to defend. Lord Charles Beresford's authority is as good on one point as on the other. But, leaving these quotations of authority, the resolution of 1909 and the speech of my right hon. friend do not affirm that it was necessary to go to Lord Charles Beresford, and to Lord Milner, and to Sir William White, to find out what is best to be done. That resolution and the whole spirit of last year's talk on the resolution, sent this government direct to the admiralty of Great Britain. They were your experts, and they were your specialists. It was their opinion that you were to take, and the very fact that my right hon. friend and the Minister of Militia have quoted these men to support their case is because they cannot get the support of the admiralty. My hon. friend (Sir Frederick Borden) to-night said that the British fleet was the greatest fleet of history. It is. He said it has in it the best personnel that the historian has ever recorded. It has. It has the best experience, and the best matured regulations of any fleet that ever existed in the world. There in that repository is to be found the expert knowledge of long experience, and I tell my right hon. friend there is where you were sent to get your instructions, and there is where you were sent for opinions on what you should do. You went there, you got their opinions, you told them flatly to their face: We know more about it than you do, or, if we don't know more about it than you do we are not going to do as you tell us we ought to do. That assertion cannot be denied, as I shall show. All this quoting from these individual scattered experts does not amount, Sir, to the mist of a summer morning. What you were told to do, what you pledged yourself to this parliament to do, what was the faith and pledge of that resolution that was passed by this House: That you should go to the admiralty, that you should find out what the admiralty thought was best and that you should conform your plans to that. Is there any doubt about that? There is one expression of my right hon. friend that I got from him after the resolution was passed, and I will read it. In answer to a question of mine as to the conference and what they proposed to do, the right hon. gentleman said:

> I quite realize that Canada has reached a period in its history when as a nation and as a part of the British empire we should acknowledge the fact squarely and prepare as far as we can for our own defence, and that we should make all adequate preparation to that effect. I am not prepared to say to what extent we should go, I do not think it would be wise for us to take isolated action.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution forbade that, really.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not prepared to say that we should go in and construct our navy apart from the imperial navy. It would be very unwise that we should take any isolated action without conference with the admiralty so that our action——

Mark this, Mr. Speaker:

> —so that our action should be in accordance with the plan laid down and approved by the admiralty.

I deny that the right hon. gentleman has that plan or can produce it. You have an abortion of a plan which your own narrow and petty ideas of patronage and geography with no eye fixed upon the great imperial issue, led you to adopt instead of that which you were instructed to adopt

by the resolution of this House. Let me go a little bit further; a word or two more with reference to the admiralty proposals, because it is very important. Now, I ask my right hon. friend what he meant by this passage in his speech of February 3? He said:

Well, we thought, it prudent, for reasons I shall explain in a moment, to commence moderately. Two plans were proposed to us. One was to have a fleet of seven ships and another a fleet of eleven ships. The seven ships were to be composed of three Bristols and four destroyers; the eleven were to be composed of four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers. For the reason that we have to protect our coasts on the Pacific and the Atlantic and consequently to divide our fleet, we thought it better to have eleven rather than seven ships. In this we acted on the advice of the admiralty.

Now, I ask my right hon. friend, as a fair man, to put that statement before any man any where in Canada, and ask him to give you the meaning he takes out of it. What meaning can he take out of it but one? The British admiralty, out of the fountain of its experience and knowledge, proposed two plans to us. One was to have eleven ships, and the other was to have seven. We took the one involving the eleven, and there it is in black and white; in this we acted on the advice of the admiralty. Now, is that true? It is absolutely diametrically opposed to the truth in every way. Why should the Prime Minister endeavour to give that version to the people at large? He surely is bound, when he treats this House and this country to a premier's statement, to see that it is accurate. This is absolutely inaccurate. What the admiralty put before you—and I call my friend to witness, in this memorandum—was this: What is best, from a strategical point of view, is to have all give money contributions or ship contributions, and put them entirely under our control; we recognize, however, that the dominions may not be favourable to that—in some cases they are not. What is the next view of the admiralty? That if any dominion proposes to go upon the line of constructing a navy for itself, the least it can have is the unit, and the unit we declare to be certain vessels and certain classes of vessels. Did you take the unit? You refused it. They made a proposition anterior to that, which tested the good faith of Canada, and proved it not to be what they had thought. The admiralty had worked out an admirable scheme. A few years ago they drew their war vessels from every part of the ocean and massed them around Britain's home and Britain's heart for their protection. But they had to keep certain vessels on the far-off seas to show the flag and to be prepared for small emergencies. The Pacific ocean has been revolutionized in the last ten years. On the Pacific ocean Britain's fleet is not numerous; it is weak; and facing fleets are daily growing stronger. Britain, in conjunction with Australia and New Zealand, and, as she fondly hoped, with Canada, made this proposition first—and I bring the recollection of my right hon. friend to it. She said: join with Australia and New Zealand and the British government, and let us build four units, fifty-three vessels, and place them, with their four Dreadnought leaders, in the Pacific ocean. If you do that, you will confer an absolute favour upon the British empire. You will put in those unprotected seas a strong fleet that will be amply able to hold those waters against all comers, until, if it were necessary in a great emergency, British aid should come from other quarters to help you in your conflict. What a splendid idea! Australia with its unit; New Zealand and Britain combined with their unit; India and China and Britain with their unit; Canada with its unit; sailing the broad waters of the Pacific for the defence of the Canadian shore, and the shore of New Zealand's little island and of the great continent island of Australia—one fleet of four participants, strong with their Dreadnoughts and strong with their equipment for effective naval warfare. There, said the British government and admiralty, is what will suit us best and what will do the empire most good. You refused it. If your eye had been single to the defence of the British empire, whose supremacy you say is absolutely necessary for the peace and security and permanence of this country and its interests, that was a proposition which you could have taken, and in taking which the people of Canada would have stood by you to a man. Then, when you refused that, the admiralty said: The least you can do is to build the unit. Did you do it? No, sir. You flatly told them: We cannot do any such thing. Then you went to them in private or individual conference, and you said: We cannot accept your proposition as to a Pacific unit; we cannot act on your advice as to a unit such as it has been defined; what can you advise us to do for £400,000 a year? What can you advise us to do for £600,000 a year? Just tell us what advice brimming over from your fountains of knowledge you can give to us to help shape up some little makeshift of our own. Was it proposed to you, as the Prime Minister said? The very opposite: it was proposed by you, as the only step you would take towards helping in the defence of the empire; and in the long last. when your own proposals, reduced to a minimum, were accepted, as they would have accepted the offer of a single coaling station from Canada, if she felt she could not give any more,—when that was agreed

to, what do you do with it? You so arrange it, that it is not now, nor ever can be, in the shape in which you propose it, of any earthly advantage in the arbitrement of the fate of the British empire. You do still less. You get an expensive toy, which, in the course of twenty years, when your vessels are ready for the scrap-heap, will have totalled up in cost from $90,000,000 to $100,000,000 against this Dominion. And not a single arm of that fleet on the Pacific or the Atlantic will ever dare face a contest on the seas with a war vessel of any other nation armed and ready for action.

I wish now to come to a more important matter, but before doing so, I want to jog the memory of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. I want to compliment him, I want to tell my young friend that he shows up splendidly as compared with the right hon. gentleman, his leader, and the Minister of Militia and Defence. What did my right hon. friend the Postmaster General say? He said that the Munroe doctrine was a myth, and worse, it was an unpatriotic myth. He declared that Canada could not rely on it in the case of any invasion, that it was simply a delusion and distortion of facts to say that any obligation rested on the United States in virtue of the Munroe doctrine, and that the man who advocated it for Canada was unpatriotic as well as foolish. Well, Sir, I have two of those unpatriotic men in my eye now. The right hon. gentleman who leads this government, when in the city of Boston, in the home of men at that time not very well disposed to this Dominion or the British empire, told them that he subscribed to the Munroe doctrine; and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), who first apologized for the independence sentiments of his leader——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. And then, when asked whether he would stand by them or not, swallowed it all and said: Yes, whatever may be the opinion of my leader, I have such confidence in him, that I will back them all—I commend specially the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to the tender mercies of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), for in the city of Ottawa, discussing the Munroe doctrine, on the heels of a lecture delivered by Professor Leacock, the Minister of Militia and Defence, (Sir Frederick Borden) said:

Behind that doctrine were the guns and warships of the United States and the whole power of 80,000,000 souls.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

Surely that doctrine, if it meant anything, meant that Canada was safe from foreign aggression. It meant that neither Germany nor Russia, nor any foreign power would for one moment, whether England were strong or weak, be permitted by the United States to place a hostile foot in this country.

Does my hon. friend still hold to that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am very much of that opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a division, here is a scandal spread out before everybody. Two members of the King's cabinet, showing that delightful solidarity that is inherent in constitutional government by cabinets, have on the greatest question that possibly could be raised, the defence of their own country, opinions diametrically opposed to each other, and not satisfied with fighting like blazes about it in the cabinet, they bring their differences into the House of Commons. There is something to be settled among hon. gentlemen opposite.

Leaving that however, I wish to go, for a few moments, to what I think is a more important part of the question and to ask you to do what I think we have failed in our duty in doing in this House, and what I hope we shall not hereafter fail in doing. I endeavoured the other day to give a bird's eye view of these imperial conferences, and did it in a brief and I am afraid, not very effective way. What I mean to say is this, that we have failed in our duty on both sides of this House in not making a subject of thorough examination and discussion in this House of the attitude of Canada and other parts of the empire towards the empire itself. I am as certain as one can be of anything, that had this been done, had the position of Canada from conference to conference, been fully exposed and debated, there would be far different opinion in this country to-day in matters of imperial concern than that which exists. There are two striking sentences by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. If he asks me when I began to be a little dubious as to whether he meant to carry out the spirit of the resolution of the 29th of March, it was when, after that debate was over, I sat down and read consecutively his statements and then read the references to which he drew attention, and I came to the conclusion that it was not so sure that the resolution meant what it said after all. Here is what my right hon. friend said:

We are not to be stampeded from what has been the settled policy and deliberate course we have laid down.

That was on the 29th of March, 1909. Again he said:

Well to us it is an open question and we see no reason in anything that has taken place recently to depart from the policy we laid down in 1902.

Sir, if I had taken in the purport of that statement before that resolution was passed, I would have asked the right hon. gentleman to give his interpretation of the resolution in the light of that statement. What was this policy laid down in 1902? It was a policy of absolutely no aid to the empire, under any consideration or circumstance. That was the policy laid down in that obscure memorandum which never met the gaze or challenged the consideration of the people of this country. Might I recall that conference of 1902, that grand historical occasion in which there was the first virtual parliament of the Dominions and the empire called together for counsel and advice. It was summoned by Mr. Chamberlain, at that time, secretary for the colonies. Every British colony, every part of the British Dominions was there represented. Serious men, statesmen, patriots and magnates from all parts of the empire—before these, Mr. Chamberlain came with his plea.

And what was his plea? The burden of the defence of the empire; the community of interest of all parts of the empire; the growth and development of the over-seas dominions; the advisability of sharing in some way the increasing burdens of defence;—that was the pronouncement of the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. The paper of Sir John Forrest, Minister of Defence for Australia, was then read, and it was a great paper in every acceptation of the term. Lord Selborne's pronouncement from the admiralty was read, and it was a great and notable pronouncement. A memorable discussion on these followed. Then, sub-conferences took place. Then, agreements were made. And then Lord Selborne came to the assembled conference and intimated to that conference what had been done. Mind you, Mr. Chamberlain had made no beggar's plea; he had uttered no dictatorial word. He was neither an autocrat nor a suppliant; he simply placed the issue before the assembled magnates and asked for their consultation and advice. It was all done, and the advices came; and Lord Selborne's report showed what they were. Cape Colony, with five to one and more blacks than whites within her borders, and all the expense and worry that that entailed, raised her contribution from £30,000 a year to £50,000 a year. Australia raised her contribution from £106,000 to £200,000 a year. Little Natal raised her contribution from £12,000 to £35,000. Newfoundland, whose contribution had been £3,000, supplemented it by an additional £1,800. New Zealand, which had hitherto given £20,000, raised it to £40,000. And then Lord Selborne read out the report with reference to Canada. Listen to it:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier informs me that his government was contemplating the establishment of a local naval force in the waters of Canada, but they were not able to make any offer of analogous assistance to those enumerated above.

Is there any Canadian who has the heart of a man who relishes prosperous, favoured Canada in 1902, under that plea of the burden of empire, doing nothing then and 'contemplating' the thing which my right hon. friend never intended to carry out? For, eight years have passed since that time and never the first step was taken to carry out what was contemplated. But there was a sense of shame —I think it must have been a sense of shame—in the delegates from Canada, for they tried to cover themselves up with that memorandum which I read a little while ago, full of pious nothings and formulation of facts which had long since transpired, but with not one word of sympathy, one iota of help—a bare, blank denial; they would do nothing to help the empire; they might, maybe, do something to help Canada, and they might take imperial officers to help them in the doing of it. And, in that memorandum, they said; it is not the expense involved that we object to, but autonomy; we are afraid we shall lose our autonomy. Not the expense, oh, no—Canada is rich—but this rag baby of autonomy. It is a rag baby. Autonomy was born and grew to manhood and has been a man in this country for forty or fifty years. This is but a make-believe—a rag baby. The man Autonomy, once an infant, has grown to stature, strength and power, and there is none who will menace his existence. For this Autonomy I have respect. But for the presentment of it, long after the struggle has gone and the battle absolutely won and ended, to be trotted out in the face of an empire! This is but child's fancy, playing dolls. Had not Australia autonomous ideas—responsible government—manhood? Does not the Australian love his own country? Not a man from Australia raised the cry of autonomy. We have developed a militia, the memorandum went on; we have sent contingents to South Africa. Sent contingents to South Africa! My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows exactly what took place. He knows that he set out with the idea that no Canadians should go to South Africa, just as he sets out now with the idea that this fleet should not go to war. And yet he sat there and excused Canada from doing anything towards lightening the burdens of the empire by saying that we had sent contingents to South Africa. Yes,—and when they did go, when their going was forced upon my right hon. friend, they found Australians there ahead of them, they found New Zealanders there ahead of them; the men from Natal and Cape Colony were mustered into the ranks and were fighting before the Canadians embarked, even sikhs from India, men from

every quarter of the British world were there before the Canadian was there. And not one of these dominions piped up the cry, 'Autonomy,' and said: 'We cannot do anything now because we helped in the South African war.' And the memorandum goes on, 'We are prepared to consider the naval side of defence as well.' What defence? The defence of Canada and nothing else. Good material on our sea coasts, says the memorandum; hope that at an early day some system may be devised by which they can be utilized. That was eight years ago, and until this resolution came up not a thought of doing anything. More hazy and indefinite than Halley's comet to-night is the prospective and contemplated naval militia, which my right hon. friend in 1902 promised in a way to the assembly of magnates from all parts of the empire. And last, but not least, we will carry out a scheme for our own defence in co-operation with your advice and with what help you can give us. That was the spectacle in 1902. It is not refreshing to a Canadian. Then, after that, my right hon. friend rose in this House. There was some talk about the matter. And what did he say?

It is no use whatever at this stage of proceedings, on the floor of this Canadian parliament, to try to deceive ourselves as to what is intended by this subject of imperial defence. If it be intended simply to discuss what part of Canada is prepared to take in her own defence, what share of the burden must fall upon us as being responsible for the safety of the land in which we were born and to which we owe our allegiance, in which all our hopes and affections are centered, certainly we are always prepared to discuss that question.

But there is a second school abroad in England and in Canada, a school represented, perhaps, on the floor of this parliament, which wants to bring Canada into the vortex of militarism, which is now the blight and curse of Europe.

There is my right hon. friend's declaration that he would discuss Canada's defence, but he will not lift one finger for imperial defence. That is the ground he took in 1902.

We come now to 1907. There is another assembly, more imposing and more largely representative than the one of 1902. Of course, the Prime Minister did not want to go to that, as we all know. He took exception to the name Council, which meant nothing to quarrel over. The time came, and the time passed, or was rapidly passing, and it was rumoured that the Prime Minister was not going. We had to bring pressure upon the Prime Minister from this side of the House to go; we had to promise him that we would bring up no contested subjects while he was away, and we urged him to go. He was loath to go, he did not want to go; no one would have been better pleased than the Prime Minister if he could have got out of it. But general opinion was too strong, and he went. The first thing that came up was the establishment of a secretariat; that was meant to be the working arm of the conference, which would give it permanence and give it power. The right hon gentleman was opposed to that. After long discussion, he assented to it, on condition that it should be joined with the Colonial Office. I am not going to quarrel with him about that, it is not worth quarrelling about. He did not like frequent conferences, he thought once in six years was quite enough. Ultimately he was overborne, and it was agreed it should meet once every four years. Lord Tweedmouth was then Lord of the Admirality, and here is in brief what Lord Tweedmouth said to the assembled representatives of the empire in effect:

We ask you to take some leading part in making the national defence of the empire more complete. We thank you and recognize the free unstinted help already given.

What significance that must have had in the ears of my right hon. friend.

One reservation we make, and one only, that we hold the command of the naval forces for the defence of the empire for which we are responsible. Unity in action, unity of command. We want you to give us all the assistance you can. But we do not come to you as beggars. Whether you help or not, we are still bound to protect the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability.

No dictation, no whining, no supplication; a square presentment of the facts to the representatives assembled. Please consult with us. Can you help? If so, to what extent will you help? Advise with us, and let us know your minds. Was ever a scene more dramatic? The old mother speaking to her assembled sons, those whom she had borne in pain and nurtured with care, and welcomed to the old home again, and told them in no beggar's tones just the difficulties of the old homestead, and the troubles, and trials and burdens. There was the mute appeal of the weary titan whose every muscle was corded, and whose every bone was set to the strain, under the mighty and constantly increasing burden of the defence of the empire. That mute appeal, looking into the faces of the sons returned. There were forty millions of British taxpayers responding to the appeal of the old mother, to the mute appeal of the weary Titan, paying their hard earned taxes year after year in increasing quantity to keep the homestead intact, and to keep the empire free from the marauder. What is the response? Australia comes to the front and says: Yes, we are giving now £200,000 a year; that we will continue, and we will

do more. We will look after our dockyards and our coaling stations; we will go further, and make provision for the defence of our coasts. New Zealand comes forward and says: Yes, £40,000 a year we give now, we will make it £100,000. That is the loyal little islands with less than 900,000 of a population. Now comes Canada. The Prime Minister sits silent. Mr. Brodeur speaks for Canada. Will you listen to the tale? Not a word of recognition of responsibilities from beginning to end, no single expression of sympathy, and seemingly no sense of shame. My Lords and gentlemen, I have excuses to make. I am busily engaged, and at a great cost, in protecting our fisheries. I have now another duty put upon me, that of watching the Yankees along the great lakes. They have got an armed fleet there, they have spent $15,000,000 on it. By day I hear them drilling, by night I hear the splash of paddles and the evolutions of their screws, as they glide over the water of the great lakes. My lords and gentleman, I am puzzled and strained to the utmost to protect Canada from these Yankee marauders. Navies of their own they have there; one of Canada's first duties, he says, is protection of our interests on the great lakes. We have had invasions from the United States, so we have to look after ourselves and see to our protection. How pitiful! But how false, absolutely false. Not a man, not a gun, not a gunboat did Mr. Brodeur or this country ever put upon those lakes, nor any adjunct of them, for the sake of counteracting the naval armament of the United States. My right hon. friend knew that, and he sat there and heard that falsehood retailed to the empire. Then he goes on:

To a certain extent we have formed a naval militia.

To what extent has he formed a naval militia? 'To a certain extent we have formed a naval militia'; also I am building wireless telegraph lines, I am carrying on hydrographic surveys, and I have naturally to build lighthouses. I do not charge British traders any lighthouse dues when they come up the St. Lawrence. Then we are taking over Esquimalt and Halifax, and he ends up as he began—not a word of sympathy or recognition of responsibility.

I do not think for a moment it will be necessary for me to discuss the question further.

Not one sympathetic word, not one shade of an expression of a desire to help. Lord Tweedmouth follows. Listen to what he says. Referring to Canada he said:

We hope to have their help, but still they are quite right to look after their own interests, in the full security that so far as the British government can be of use to them in their defence in time of need, they may depend in any circumstances on our giving that aid with the greatest joy and without any sort of drawback whatever.

Later, Mr. Brodeur speaks again. He actually took that as a compliment, and in making his second speech before the assembled congress, he says:

Lord Elgin and gentlemen, I have nothing to say except to thank heartily Lord Tweedmouth for having been good enough to recognize what Canada has been doing in regard to its defence.

He took it seriously; he did not see the polite way in which Lord Tweedmouth had let him down to save his face as far as he could, before the assembled representatives of the empire. Then Mr. Brodeur went on and spoke about contributions. He said:

There was a discussion in previous years to the effect that we should contribute something directly to the British navy. I may say with regard to that, there is only one mind in Canada on that question.

The mind being that nobody was in favour of a contribution. Then he went on to speak about his going to get another cruiser for a protection fleet and he ended up by saying:

We are very glad to see that Lord Tweedmouth has recognized that in this matter it should be left almost entirely to the colonies. I may say, in conclusion, that we will be very glad to work in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and under the advice of an imperial officer, so far as it is consistent with self-government.

That, Sir, is all that Canada did in that conference, under the plea of the motherland and the empire. Every other colony came to the front. Canada made an exhibition of herself in the person of her delegates at that conference. But there was something else and I do not wonder that there was something else. Besides the delegates from Canada there were delegates from every other part of the British empire sitting there, watching this whole thing, taking it all in, and one can easily imagine their feelings and their feelings at last found voice. Dr. Smartt seemingly had had about enough of that kind of thing, and so he said to himself: Well, I will see whether or not there is any sand in this man and at the latter part of the conference he moved this resolution:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of

money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

Could anything be broader, could anything give greater freedom, could anything get further away from trenching on responsible government and the autonomy of the Dominions? One would have thought that such a resolution would have been acclaimed by everybody. It was acclaimed by everybody but one. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in our country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter.

It was not a uniform policy, it gave to each of the Dominions the right to make a contribution in any way it liked, all it called for was to do something.

The disproportion is too great between the mother country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the mother country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

Dr. SMARTT. But the public works to which you refer are of a reproductive character which are vital to the interests of your Dominion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some of our railways have never paid a cent of interest or expenses.

Dr. SMARTT. Still, it is developing and opening up the country to an enormous extent. All the colonies are building developing railways of a character which may not be revenue producing for years. I thought the wording of this resolution would have specially met your views, because towards the up-keep of the navy it may take the form either of a grant of money or the establishment of a local defence force or other services. I understand Canada suggested strongly the other day that some of their other services were in the nature of local defence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have said all I have to say on the subject.

Dr. SMARTT. I should like very much to hear the opinions of the representatives of the other portions of the empire.

Mr. DEAKIN. I have no hesitation in entering into the discussion if desired; but if we are not going to pass the resolution, is it worth while?

Mr. FOSTER.

Dr. SMARTT. I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation, that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It can be passed if there is a majority. For my part I must vote against it.

Sir JOSEPH WARD. To do any good we would require to be unanimous about it.

Dr. SMARTT. Yes, I suppose so.

Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL. It is not much good to have a resolution at all if we cannot be unanimous.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we had better not proceed any further just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We, of the different dominions beyond the seas, have tried to be unanimous up to the present time. I am sorry to say this is a question upon which we could not be unanimous. Therefore, Dr. Smartt can move it if he chooses or withdraw it, but if he presses it I should have to vote against it.

Dr. SMARTT. I am absolutely in the hands of the conference. I do not want to press a resolution that is not likely to meet with the general approval of practically everybody on the conference, especially a resolution of this particular character. We might, perhaps, let it stand over until the next sitting. Between this and Tuesday I may be able to modify it in some way to meet Sir Wilfrid's view.

And Dr. Smart withdrew it. Are we proud of Canada as thus exhibited?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Are hon. gentlemen opposite proud of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. They are?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sure.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't believe it—at least they were not until after they had gone through the composing room.

Mr. CONMEE. We have heard that before.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, Sir, what I have said about these two conferences brings me down to this: That the policy of 1902, the settled policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier is: That not one man, not one dollar, not one ship of Canada shall go towards imperial defence, and that whatever is done must be done in Canada and for Canada alone And not only the right hon. gentleman but the men upon whom he relies for support say the same thing. The statesman from the Yukon declared:

Even though Great Britain should lose her navy and be in such a position that the New Zealander can stand on London bridge and view the remains of this old Dreadnought grounded on the Thames, I do not be-

lieve that Canada would be in the slightest danger from foreign aggression.

The member for Nicolet, Mr. Turcotte, put the case thus:

I am in favour of having a sufficient fleet for protecting our fisheries and for nothing more.

Mr. Earnest Roy of Dorchester said about the same thing and then he added:

The Monroe doctrine imposes upon the United States the obligation of protecting us against the attacks of conquering spirits either from the east or from the west.

I hand him over to the tender mercies of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux). The composing room may bring him in all right or it may take the thumb screw or the rack. Mr. Beauparlant agrees largely with the others and he says:

I would agree to a Canadian fleet but only for the purposes of the creation of a navy to remain under our own exclusive control and for us alone.

And, Mr. Ecrement, I forget his constituency, who so eloquently moved the reply to the address, gave his version of what it meant, saying that:

He had the assurance that that was the meaning, that this was to be a fleet 'Canadienne dans sa construction, son utilisation et sa direction.'

Which means: It must be built in Canada——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. That it must be under the control of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And that it must do nothing outside of Canada——I notice the 'hear, hears' stop just there. And Mr. Brodeur who spoke afterwards made precisely the same statement if not in exactly the same words. He said: What we were to do we would do for Canada; Britain and her supremacy was safe, and we could go along very well developing our country and making progress ourselves.

Now I come to the conference of 1909 and I am not on exactly the same ground there. I have only what I can read between the lines as to the conference of 1909 and what is expressed in the documents that have come to us, and my knowledge of the preceding conferences. This conference of 1909 was an important one. It met on July 28, Mr. Asquith was in the chair, Mr. Asquith announced the purpose for which the conference was called:

The grave condition; the response of New Zealand and Australia, which has filled their hearts with gratitude.

And he asked:

What can be done to complete and perfect the system we have at present. We wish your advice and co-operation.

—thus re-echoeing almost exactly what Lord Tweedmouth and Mr. Chamberlain at the preceding conferences had said; and so they were invited to a discussion and a discussion took place, and reading between the lines it must have resulted in something like this. Australia after hearing the presentment said: Yes, we will give a Dreadnought, or, if there is any way under the advice of the admiralty that is better we will do what the admiralty think best. The admiralty thought a unit was best and Australia accepted the unit then and there. Sir Joseph Ward for New Zealand, said: Yes, we have been giving £100,000 a year; I have with the consent of my government promised one Dreadnought and two if they are necessary, and New Zealand would implement that; or, if the admiralty think that some combination is better then we will advise and act together. Natal, Cape Colony, renewed their old subscriptions and the South African Commonwealth takes them over and becomes responsible for them so that they are continued. And Great Britain says: To help in the fleet of the Pacific so necessary and so vital, we will join in with New Zealand and we will put our hands in the treasury for India and for China and we will together make three fleet units with three Dreadnoughts as their leaders and 39 vessels which shall watch over, protect, and defend, the south western Pacific ocean, and in time of war when the emergency comes will find their way to a decisive point and throw their guns and their force into that deciding contest. What does Canada say? We had two representatives there. We do not know exactly what they did say but reading through the lines I think they said something like this, after Mr. McKenna had declared the admiralty memorandum, after he had explained the wisdom and the advice of the greatest naval board in the world, after he had declared that no navy apart from the British navy which was not able to form a part of it and work with it in unison was of use; after he had said that if any dominion wished to have a navy it must have a unit for the training, the personnel, and the effective work both at home and abroad; after Australia and New Zealand and all the others had given their assent and their adhesion, after Canada was asked to supply the fourth unit on the Pacific, and Canada refused in the person of the Minister of Militia and Defence and of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after he had told them that the next best thing was to make a unit if you

are going to have a fleet of your own and will not join with your sister colonies. Canada refused the unit, and then went to the conference and asked this pitiful question: 'Can't you rig up something for us on £400,000 a year? Can't you rig up something for us on £600,000 a year?' And I can almost hear the voice of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia as he stood before that conference and told them that Canada proposed to go it alone; told them of what he had done with the militia, how long he had been at it, and what a force he had made of it; told them that Sir Wilfrid had sent over by him a resolution, and that they might keep it if they wanted it as a keepsake; but that Sir Wilfrid had told him to be very careful and not bind Canada, and above all, to keep the beloved autonomy safe and sound. And then I can imagine the Minister of Marine and Fisheries standing up before the assembly and saying something like this: Oh, I am so glad, my lords and gentlemen, that you have not taken away our autonomy from us—I was afraid you were going to. Don't let New Zealand and Australia carry you off your feet. See what I am doing. I am protecting our fisheries; am spending a lot on it; I have to put some more vessels on the Pacific or somewhere else; I do not mind putting them on—for Canada's advantage. I would be willing to buy them and pay for them, for ourselves; I have started the nucleus of a naval militia—invisible yet to the naked eye, amounting absolutely to nothing. At a pinch I might make this naval militia a little bit bigger, and in the end, if it came to be absolutely necessary, I might lend it to the British government, in case anything serious occurred. In fact, I have been commissioned by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to tell you that you need not be fearful if the German Emperor or any one else should come against you, for while you are spilling blood at the scene of the decisive battle, he will be busy with his coat off down in the province of Quebec stumping the counties. And with that they had to be content. And the gentlemen come back and put their policy before this House and the country, and that policy absolutely negatives any efficient help of any kind whatever to the British empire. What is worse, although great expense will be incurred, it is absolutely useless either for effective defence or for attack on the coasts of Canada itself.

Contrast that with what the other dominions are doing. My right hon. friend led this House to believe, and he is leading the country to believe, that Australia has seen the error of her ways and is building a fleet, as Canada is; and, mark you, he says, instead of Australia now making a contribution to Great Britain, Great Britain is making a contribution to Australia. Well, that representation could scarcely be more misleading. My right hon. friend ought to know that, and my hon. friend the Minister of Militia knows that if he has read the documents. I have gone through the whole debate on the Defence Bill, on the Loan Bill and on the ratification measure, in the House of the Commonwealth of Australia, and I have done the same with reference to those of New Zealand. I have the Acts and have gone through them, and I know their conditions; and if the House will bear with me for a few moments, I will tell them what those conditions are. In the first place, there is in New Zealand and Australia no question, nor the shadow of a shade of a doubt, that their fleet is meant for the defence of the empire, and will go to the defence of the empire whenever war or emergency calls for it. Mr. Foxton, from Australia, and Sir Joseph Ward, from New Zealand, made that absolutely clear at the conference in London, as they made it absolutely clear in the parliaments of those two countries. Australia's Naval Defence Bill was introduced on the 21st December, 1909, by Joseph Cook, the Minister of Defence, and this is what he said:

> Great Britain has been paying the bills, and we have been enjoying the benefits. It is time to change. The three great naval powers have arisen—the United States, Japan and Germany. The Pacific is especially bare, facing Japan. Two things we must lay down: (a) We must accept the principle that the burden of defence must be borne by the whole empire; (b) that a fuller imperial partnership, particularly in defence, is indispensible to the security of the imperial fabric. Systematic and efficient combination is needed, and I hope that the present conference (which was then sitting) will give us that systematic and efficient combination. Australia has bound herself to build a unit—an armoured cruiser, three unarmoured cruisers, six destroyers and three submarines. The Australian is to be one of three units which make up the eastern Pacific fleet. We do not propose to go it alone. We do not propose to sit around our own waters and hold our hands. New Zealands unit, our own unit and the other unit shall form part of one great Pacific fleet, which shall visit the waters of each in time of peace and which shall be at the command of the admiralty in time of war.

What are the terms? Australia does not intend to build those vessels in Australia She does not intend for a moment to lose the time, to incur the expense, to run the risk of inefficiency, by attempting to build them in Australia, which is bare, just as bare as Canada is, of facilities to build. She proposes to build them in Great Britain, and they are to be ready by June, 1912, the whole unit; and already the first of their fleet has been launched and has been christened by Mrs. Asquith, the wife of the Premier of Great Britain.

My right hon. friend says that Great Britain is reversing the operation and giving

a subsidy to Australia. For the last ten years, Australia has been paying from £100,000 to £200,000 per year and that continues until 1913. By the end of 1913, Australia will have paid in over £2,000,000 as her contribution to the up-keep of the fleet of the empire for the ten years. Australia gives £200,000 per year, the up-keep is £950,000 per year. Consequently, under the present arrangement, Great Britain pays £950,000 per year, but receives from Australia £200,000, so that the net cost to Great Britain is £750,000 per year. This arrangement has been in existence since 1902 and continues until 1913. Now, what happens? Under the new arrangement Australia builds a unit, she assumes the up-keep, and Great Britain gives £250,000 per year, and thus saves £500,000 per year. She also takes over the naval base at £50,000 per year. In the House of parliament the responsible minister declares that as soon as that fleet unit was equipped and ready for action, Australia proposed to maintain the whole thing herself and not to take the £250,000 per year from Great Britain. That is the difference between the two. What said Mr. Fisher, the leader of the opposition, when the matter was under discussion. Mr. Fisher agreed with the Minister of Defence. He said:

> This is not a party matter. I never favoured the view that the fleet should not fight outside Australian waters. Co-operation with the imperial fleet is absolutely necessary.

What said Mr. Deakin? Here it is in substance:

> Upon the sea the future of the empire lies. They are not in fleets owned and manned entirely by the mother country but in a great imperial navy embracing the fleets of the mother country and subsidiary fleets built and manned and in times of peace controlled by the dominions which make them their care and charge. Each unit must be sufficiently strong and self-supporting to provide for adequate training of the officers and men employed in them. I look upon the condition as serious and urgent and the relations between the great powers are critical and within a few years likely to be more critical. We cannot afford to postpone the construction of our unit. We need it now. We need it without delay. We cannot afford six month's delay. You cannot buy naval efficiency on the market but you must prepare for it. That fleet, with its three units, will operate, as its name implies, as one fleet, under one flag and one control, to defend Australia and New Zealand and India. Australia building being impossible, that vessel (the Indefatigable) will have to be obtained in the great steamship building yards in the world, under most skilled supervision. In the present special condition, the naval resources of Australia are barely able to build a destroyer.

In fact three of them are now being built in Great Britain. Young men from Australia are learning there the art of building, so that it is hoped one or two of these destroyers may be put together in Australia and perhaps the last one built in Australia. There is common sense, there is a disposition of money which brings its return. They passed a Bill to borrow £3,500,000 to build a fleet unit, and they provided a sinking fund which would wipe that out in sixteen years. The orders are given and in 1912, the Australian complete unit, built with her own money in British shipyards, under the best supervision in the world, will be ready to defend the coasts of Australia, New Zealand and India. In time of peace, that unit will show the flag to these young countries; and in time of war, will go to the defence of the empire, as loyal sons of the mother that bore them and has cared for them. Mr. Foxton said:

> In our unit, we have practically within it every branch of specialized work which is to be found in the British navy itself. It is in fact a segment of the British navy.

There is the admiralty's advice carried out. My hon. friend knows that Mr. McKenna said that if you want to do anything you must have a unit which will give you the range of the fleet. Otherwise, you will make no career for your young men. You will not get the personnel and the training which alone can place you in a position in which you will not jeopardize the greater fleet, but work in with it. Mr. Merriman, Mr. Fisher, and all the others from South Africa want no local fleets. They are willing to do their own part for land defence, but they say a united navy and one navy for the British empire. That shows you, I think, pretty well the position of Australia. Compare that with what the Prime Minister said and find out how absolutely wide of the mark he was. I am not concerned as to the outcome of the investigation—as to which of the two is correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Militia has very accurately defined the position of New Zealand. She will give a Dreadnought—two if necessary. In that conference, when the idea of a fleet for the Pacific came up, New Zealand fell in with it. Her Dreadnought is to be the flagship of the China squadron, and the vessels are to be interchangeable. Sometimes, you will have a part of the Chinese fleet in Australian waters and sometimes a part of the Australian fleet in Indian waters. They are interchangeable, they have the complete power of evolutions, and by complete range of practice, they are able to make themselves ready for conflict. The old times of wooden vessels are gone for ever. Some of us scarcely realize it. We speak of our hardy sailors, and we think that we can pick up

from amongst our fishermen and our lakemen men ready to go on board one of these cruisers or Dreadnoughts and do sailors' work. That, of course, is not true. It takes at least six years to drill a boy to make him efficient for such service. Watch these divisions of the English fleet as they are perfecting themselves for war. How do they perfect themselves? By scrubbing clean and keeping polished the decks of their vessels? That is one thing. By turning out in clean and natty uniform? That is another thing. By drilling on deck? that is another thing. But to find out the secret of efficiency, consider the fleet when inky blackness envelops the sea, when all lights are out, and when every ship is in its place with its servers and satellites in their proper places, and, in the inky darkness going full steam ahead. That is where they get their training, that is where they perfect themselves to steal upon the enemy and strike first. Could you get anything like this out of these vessels that these gentlemen pretend to build? The natty uniform, the well-filled table, the drilling on deck, the manning of the guns to a certain extent—these things can be taught, but these vessels would no more be allowed to go in as a portion of the British fleet going into war than you, Sir, would be taken as the general of an army. And my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) agrees with that.

Now, I approach another subject. I propose to speak what I think. I have shown this House that, from the entrance of my right hon. friend into these conferences, commencing with 1902, on the question of defence, he has taken one position and one only, a position of absolute antagonism to any effective help of the British empire as a whole. I have followed the history of this branch of the navy which he proposes to build for Canada itself and have shown by his own expressions and those of his followers that it is to be built in Canada, kept in Canada and used for Canada and Canada alone—an utter negation of anything like contribution or help for imperial defence. And he says that, unless you can prove an emergency, you should not get anything else. I take exception there and then. I say that, if for nothing else but the almost intolerable burden which the British taxpayer has been carrying and is to-day carrying, and which will be made heavier upon him with each succeeding year, for which he and he alone pays, but as the result of which we have the security of our commerce, the security and peace of our country, the peace of the empire and the world;—I say that, for this reason and, outside of all emergencies, Canada with her one hundred millions of revenue, with her strength and wealth and power, ought to contribute immediately toward that navy from which she has taken the benefits and to which she has given nothing in men or money. Well, I am led to conclude that my right hon. friend has taken this stand from the old-time conviction personal to himself. I do not think you can separate a man from his whole political experience. In Australia no man on either side has piped up with this tune of 'invasion of responsible government' or 'maintenance of autonomy.' No statesman on either side of the Australian House could be twitted with having spoken independence sentiments of having given utterance to any other sentiment than that of loyalty and fealty to the empire. Their men stand on the platform and in the House of parliament and declare that their fleet goes to the empire's support when the empire calls. Whatever order in council we have to pass, they say, whatever pro forma authority we have to give, these vessels shall go when the mother country needs them. If we had a government in Canada such as they have in Australia, we should have little doubts upon this matter. But, under the present government of Canada, led absolutely as it is by one man, we have a right to ask ourselves something as to the past history and past public record of this gentleman.

And first I have a quarrel with my right hon. friend, this pink of a British citizen, this example of an English Liberal, for doing what no British statesman, no English Liberal that I ever heard of, would do—going to a foreign country and animadverting unfavourably upon the conduct of his own country and of the motherland. Sir, in the city of Boston, over and over again, my right hon. friend, though he was under the oath of a privy councillor, stood before audiences and criticised the conduct of Canada and England in the civil war of the United States. And, in that troublous time, when we were asserting with courtesy and perfect fairness the rights of Canada to the waters that were given to her by the treaty of 1818, what did the right hon. gentleman say?

> In the civil war the English people and the Canadian people did not show then the least sympathy.
>
> England fitted out armed cruisers to prey upon and destroy American commerce.
>
> We allowed American filibusters to raid Vermont and New York frontier towns.
>
> Canada failed in her duty.
>
> In my opinion the conduct of England, of Canada, towards the United States during the war was a disgrace to the civilization of England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles; they required no help, but when they were engaged in a supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation; when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy, as ever engaged the devotion of men; when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England,

with the passive connivance of the British government, to destroy American commerce on the high seas; it was galling that rebel refugees could find shelter in Canada, and there, with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession.

I find no fault with my right hon. friend for holding these sentiments if he so reads history. What I say is that you would search far and long to find a British statesman who would take such an occasion, before a people that were not over-friendly at that time, to call in question the acts of his country.

Well Sir, I have another thing to say with regard to my right hon. friend. His frantic attempts to tack Canada on to the United States in its fiscal policy, and in 1891, to drive the wedge of discrimination and of separation between the mother country and Canada in favour of the United States, does not show to my mind that he is very much in favour of British connection. 1891 has a history fore and aft. It was preceded by continental union and commercial union, in both of which my hon. friend participated, it was preceded by statements made in the province of Quebec when my right hon. friend said of Mr. Mercier, 'Mr. Mercier is the greatest Canadian since the time of Papineau. I believe with Mr. Mercier, and I am here to make Mr. Mercier prevail.' And Mr. Mercier did prevail in 1890; then Mr. Mercier turned around in 1891, and he says to his people. 'I am fighting for the supremacy of Mr. Laurier my friend in the Dominion House. When we put him there, Quebec will get all that she asks.' If there ever was a treaty entered into and publicly ratified, it was between Mr. Mercier and Mr. Wilfrid Laurier of that time. Now what happened in 1885? A memorable day was seen in the city of Montreal, and on the Champs de Mars, Mr. Mercier, and a gentleman by the name of Wilfrid Laurier, both spoke; and this gentleman by the name of Wilfrid Laurier, who was a sworn Privy Councillor at that excited period, and before that excited congregation declared that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket and would have levelled it at the soldiers of the Queen. Immediately after that, two things took place. Mr. Mercier became an apostle of independence, and travelled the United States in 1892 and 1893, delivering hundreds of lectures, all in favour of the independence of Canada, declaring that only by being independent could we get our rights, amongst others the right to make treaties with such countries as we wished. He, (Mr. Mercier), was allied with men in the United States of America, he drew his salary from them, he paid his expenses out of their collections. He travelled the country, as I said, enlisting French Canadians, and men of other nationalities, prominent American citizens, all in favour of the independence of Canada; and along with it was the propagation of continental union, and the union of Canada with the United States. While this was going on, where was my right hon. friend? In Boston preaching the same doctrine in 1892; in the House of Commons preaching the same doctrine in 1891 and 1892, the doctrine of separation and independence. You have heard his words read, I need not read them again. Mr. Mercier's cardinal doctrine was: 'What we want is the power to make our own treaties.' He was outside parliament. My right hon. friend was inside parliament, and my right hon. friend was doing inside parliament what Mr. Mercier was doing outside parliament. In 1892 he advocated and tried to have passed by this House the following resolution:

> It is expedient to obtain the necessary powers to enable Her Majesty the Queen through her representative, the Governor General of Canada, upon the advice of his ministers, to appoint an agent to negotiate commercial treaties with other British possessions or with foreign states, subject to the prior consent or subsequent approval of the parliament of Canada.

And the parliament of Canada alone. Now, I ask my right hon. friend, and I ask this House: What would have happened in this country if my right hon. friend had been successful, and Canada had demanded and had obtained that power? There would have been no guarantee for the union of Canada with the empire for a single five years. It was a demand, not for autonomy, it was a demand for sovereignty, and a sovereignty which, if it were exercised, would make two nations where now there is the mother country and the Dominion under the mother country. They were working together, and in those ways. Well Sir, what more? We find that my friend, before confederation, was inoculated with this same virus. Here is what he wrote in 1866:

> We (of the Papineau school) do not care a fig for the English colonies. When any change whatsoever is proposed in our political or social institutions, we do not look to see whether this change will be of use to the English colonies or to any other neighbour; we think only of Lower Canada and the French race. What have we in common with the English colonies? What interest, what relations bind us to them? Is it a matter of origin, religion, language, national aspirations? No, not at all.

In 1888 in the House of Commons he says:

> The time is coming when the present relations between Great Britain and Canada

must either become closer or be severed altogether.

At the Club National, on the 2nd of July, 1890, he made another profession of faith:

I do not mean to say that we should always remain a colony; on the contrary, the day is coming when this country will have to take its place among the nations of the earth. But I do not want to see my country's independence attained through the hostility of one race to another.

That was directed against the attempt to form the Parti National.

I do not want my country's independence to be conceived in the blood of civil war. I want my country's independence to be reached through the normal and regular process of all the elements of its population towards the realization of a common aspiration.

Well Sir, when we come down to 1892 he says:

I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence. But whenever the day comes it must come by the consent of both countries, and we shall continue to keep the good feeling and the good will of the mother land.

If we are true to our record we will again exhibit to the world the unique and unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.....I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation, in due course of time.

These were not the outpourings of a youthful and immature imagination, these were the studied statements of an old and seasoned public man, uttered in Boston, and repeated in the House of Commons of Canada, and up to this day my right hon. friend has not disavowed that that is still his goal. I invite him to do so now.

He will not do it, he still maintains that opinion; that is still his goal. We can quite well see why in 1902, in 1907, in 1909, and now in 1910, he refuses absolutely to link up with the British empire, he declines absolutely to do anything else than to build what he builds in Canada for Canada, and to be used alone in Canada, with the exception of words—and of words my right hon. friend is prodigal. He makes his declaration that that is his settled policy, settled in 1902, settled to this day; yet on the face of it, he declares that the supremacy of the British empire is necessary to the security of this country, as well as to every other part of the empire. He declares that it is the only security for the commerce and the peace and prosperity of the British empire and the peace of the world. These are his words; those that I have been describing are words plus deeds and deeds in the tenor and line of the words.

And to-night, when I put his record before him and challenge him as to whether or not as Prime Minister of this country, leading the foremost Dominion in this empire of ours, he still adheres to his statement of doctrine, over and over made, that he believes and cherishes as his goal the independence of this country and a severing of the ties that bind us to the old land, I think this House and I think this country will come to its own conclusion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is not all. My right hon. friend has never missed an opportuntiy of belittling and deriding the diplomacy of the British empire, never.

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

Mr. right hon. friend is responsible for that statement.

What has been British diplomacy to us, Sir? British diplomacy, so far as Canada is concerned, has been a record of failure, of surrender, and of sacrifice.

Up and down this country he has preached that doctrine. Why? To lessen the respect of a British country for its home country and its home government, to instill the insidious poison into the minds of young and growing citizens that the old country does not know what it is doing and has not treated us fairly. To-night, Sir, I cannot go into the matter of the record of British diplomacy, but I am willing to do it at any time, and I have not much use, I say it straight, I have not much use for a public man representing the highest position in this country who finds nothing better to do than to go up and down this country deriding and misrepresenting British diplomacy and wishing for the day when we may be rid of it. My right hon. friend will not deny that.

But he has done more than that. He has never given up an opportunity, during the last 10 or 15 years, of representing Canada as engaged in deadly conflict, wrenching from the British government tyrannical government, rights and privileges, and he has stretched to the very verge of a very vivid imagination the rights and privileges which we to-day enjoy by virtue of the concessions of the British prerogative. And so his Minister of Marine afterwards comes back from the conference of 1909 and says: We have wrenched from Great Britain our political autonomy, we have wrenched from Great Britain our treaty-making autonomy, we have wrenched from Great Britain our fiscal autonomy, and now I come back with our naval autonomy. All these things my right hon. friend speaks, lesser men echo

what he says. These are but the results of teaching. The Postmaster General said the other day that a bad canvass was being used against the government in Quebec, that the government were represented as sacrificing on the altar of Moloch the youth and vigour of the country for the sake of European wars. I think I am not misrepresenting my hon. friend. My hon. friend knows the story of old, about the one who ploughed the furrow and who sowed the dragon's teeth therein and found himself straightway confronted by armed men. These are the armed men which were sown by my right hon. friend and his colleagues in 1896 and later. Don't I know it, don't I know that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. L. P. Brodeur), and Mr. Monet, since translated to his reward, and sundry others, went up and down the lines in the province of Quebec and represented to audience after audience that we had actually made a grant to get rifles for our soldiers and artillery for our troops, and that the babes were to be torn from the mothers' breasts, and the lovers to be torn from their sweethearts' arms and carried away to be sacrificed in this vortex of militarism? It was all very nice to erect Moloch's altars then and sacrifice on them, but the armed men have sprung up and they are confronting my right hon. friend and his lieutenants at this very moment.

But what more, Sir. Not only that, but then comes this last straw which breaks the camel's back. We have a good old song which often we have sung, thousands of throats have sung it throughout the length and breadth of the empire and delighted to do it: God Save Our King. But, now, we have got to substitute another word, and hereafter our song will be: God save our suzerain, long live our suzerain, God bless the suzerain. That may be a light thing for my right hon. friend, but it is exactly in line with every other effort to weaken the respect for sovereignty and the respect for the ties that bind us to the old land. Are these things of little moment coming from a man of high degree and of high place? I do not think so. This country is filling up with men who are foreign to our institutions and who have to be taught to become good British subjects. Is this the way to teach them? I do not think so. This may be a little thing to my right hon. friend, but is one of the things which in unison with the others shows the trend. Now, my deduction from all this is simply: If in Australia and New Zealand there is no unrest in the public mind, that when war time comes their fleets will go to the defence of the empire, it is because they have not been blessed with public men who have given utterance to diverse sentiments such as these I have been quoting. In 1899, this country knows what took place. It knows that the deliberate intention of my right hon. friend was to prevent a single Canadian being sent to South Africa. We were the laggards, and if it had not been for the power of public opinion outside we would have been so far laggard that we would never have been in the race at all. I listened the other night to the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) in his desire to Lincolnize the head of the government, and I asked myself what in the world is he after that he puts it on so thick and so often. My hon. friend from South Ontario in comparing the Prime Minister to Lincoln, said that all the progress of this country in all its great epochs was due to the policy and the effort of my right hon. friend.

Mr. CONMEE. Quite correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Quite correct says the hon. gentleman. Now, to this eminently sane and sound and unprejudiced hearer, let me invite the consideration of four dates. There is the date of 1878, there is the date of 1882, there is the date of 1891, and there is the date of 1899.

Mr. TALBOT. And there is the date of 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. I never have treated my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) who has just interrupted me as being a serious subject; he is so good natured and has been so often through the composing room that I will not lose time dealing with him.

1878 saw the institution of the industrial life of this country under the influence of protection, which alone brought into existence and kept in its development to 1896. In 1878 where was my right hon. friend and the Liberal party? If they had had their way in 1878 would you have had industrial Canada as it is to-day? That is one epoch. The other date is 1882. In 1882 the splendid project of uniting this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific with a great transcontinental railway was launched, and it took stress and strain and money hardly to be got to carry it through. Does anybody dispute the proposition that the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway and its work has been one of the prime elements in the progress of Canada? Where would that railroad have been if my right hon. friend and his party had had their way?

In 1891 it was a struggle, life and death, for the perpetuation of British connection in this country. There is no doubt about it. My right hon. friend laughs at British connection. Edward Blake was a man intellectually far superior to my right hon. friend. He had so much imagination, he was not gifted with so

much levity of thought, he did not depend so much on airy rhetoric, but Edward Blake had a brain of tremendous power; Edward Blake was loyal. And when the 1891 propaganda of the right hon. gentleman was driven to its conclusion, Edward Blake left him and his reasons for leaving are on record to this date. He left the right hon. gentleman, because, he said, that if the right hon. gentleman's policy were to be successful it would end in severing the bonds that bound Canada to the empire. And, that the right hon. gentleman was not successful was due to the work of the Liberal Conservative party. The last date is 1899, and what happened in 1899? The Boer war broke out. The other colonies jumped into the field, the governments trying to keep ahead of their people and the people trying to run close to their governments. There was no schism between them. But in Canada the constitutional bogey was put up. Parliamentary sanction was invoked. There was no power to do this and do that, and if my right hon. friend had his way not a Canadian would have been sent to South Africa. Now, Sir, I hold that taken by and large, no one event that ever happened in the Dominion of Canada has done so much to elevate Canada in the plane of action, to widen its horizon and win it greater place and prominence in the wide world than resulted from Canadian volunteers going to South Africa and fighting as they fought on the plains of Africa for the old flag. For many a long distant day Canada will not cease to find the beneficial effects accruing to her from our part in that transaction. And, Sir, if my right hon. friend had had his way that would never have happened. Therefore, these four dates may well be conned over by hon. gentlemen and may well be thought out by the people of this Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I intended.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I have other things I would like to say.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Adjourn the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I do not think I will adjourn the debate. What I wanted to say in brief was this. I wanted to take up that question as to the emergency. My right hon. friend knows very well what there is in that. He knows how vital it is to his plan. He knows that if the people of this country believe that there is an emergency, his plan is damned from the time it gets before the country. The only hope of my hon. friend and his government is to persuade the people that there is no danger, that all is at peace in the borders of Israel, that there is no emergency, that we can all sleep in our beds and feel perfectly secure. Now, Sir, I do not feel that way. I do not need to ask Sir William White; I do not need to go to a writer in the 'Times'; I do not need to take excerpts from a column of matter in a review. I do not need to trot up and down election platforms of England during one of the most heated elections that country ever had. I do not want to go a bit farther than to the responsible heads of the government, who are in close touch with the admiraltv, the executive power of the empire, who sit on the very topmost heights of international outlook, and who know and feel the pulses of the nations and the throb of every menace and every danger. When those men, enjoying a majority of 350 in the House of Commons, are represented to me as engineering a scare against themselves, it falls awfully flat. And that is where it all commenced. That is where Sir Edward Grey spoke in words more momentous, I am bound to say, than a foreign secretary ever before used in the British parliament; that is where Mr. Asquith took his stand, and told the people of the British empire just where they were; and you cannot get me to believe that those men spoke before they ought. If anything, they spoke many months after they should have spoken; and the very subject of discussion which was prominent then, namely, by one party that the extra Dreadnoughts should be put down, and by another party that they should not be put down—that very question was answered by Mr. Asquith but a few days ago, when he informed an audience whom he was addressing that not only had they put down the four Dreadnoughts that were delayed, but that between the last of 1909 and the first months of 1910 the other four that were demanded by Mr. Balfour and by the country would be laid down as well. More than that, he said: Whatever is necessary to complete security and complete confidence we will be disposed to ask at the hands of parliament. I have no desire to pose as an authority on these matters. I am no authority—not a bit more than my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. All we can do is simply to read, to think, to inquire, and then come to our conclusions. I do not set up my conclusions. I take the word and the testimony of the men who are on the inside, and who know what is going on. When I read the history of Germany, I learn of the marvellous progress she is making, I see that she has the greatest army in the world—4,000,000 and more of men that she can call to arms, and with a fineness of detail, a perfection of drill, with plans and methods of mobilizing, furnishing and marching, with an intelligence department than which there is none superior. You cannot tell

me that it signifies nothing when a nation like that, bursting with a population that is now 303 to the square mile, and must have vent; full of workmen and factories that cannot find the market for their products in their own confines, and must seek it abroad, with few colonies and wanting more, suddenly undertakes with surprising rapidity and wonderful minuteness of detail, worked out to the very last degree, the construction and equipment of a fleet which in four short years has waked up old England, and which comes close indeed to rivalling her in the effective counting power of war to-day, the Dreadnought and the super-Dreadnought. When I look at all that and see Germany's allies, and see how few Britain has, and recognize that within sight of the homes of Britain all that immense fleet, like hounds in leash, are held together, sheltered by their mighty army and compact dominions behind whilst the British dominions circle the globe and are exposed in every quarter of the earth, and have to be watched and guarded and warded by the British fleet, it makes me think that the time now is and should not be delayed longer, when it should concern every man who believes in the continuance of the empire, every Caandian who believes in peace and strength and safety for the future of Canada—for at the moment the sea power of the British empire is broken, that moment Canada is submerged in a sea of difficulties, at the mercy of any conqueror who wishes to make the conquest—I say that it behooves every Canadian, outside of imperial considerations, to ponder seriously, think often and deeply, and consider this matter carefully. If they do, I believe they will come to the conclusion that it is not manly, it is not safe, it is not for the best future of this country that we, French or English, Irish or Scotch, men on the prairie or men in the ocean sea-port, should be left with a single shadow of a doubt in our minds. I put it to my right hon. friend, who made light of emergency and difficulty, and in the same breath declared that the supremacy of the British fleet was vital to Canada as well as to the rest of the empire. I ask my right hon. friend if he had better not err on the right and safe side. I ask him if, after he has put this policy of his into execution, and the quick years pass by and nothing comes of benefit or of help, and if some day Armageddon is fought out on the North sea or elsewhere, and the fate of the empire and of Canada hangs in the balance, and if—which God forbid—the scales should lower on Britain's side and the conqueror should take her place on the sea, where will my right hon. friend go for consolation in that time? I would not like to be in his place. Our counsel is that you stop this costly and ineffective project which adds no strength to the empire's defence and little to our own, that you take further time for consideration and for finding out the people's wishes as to this independent fleet policy, and that in the meantime you take the most effective means of meeting the present emergency, for it is an emergency, by strengthening the fleet of the British emipre. Here in Canada with her $100,000,000 of revenue, with all that has been given her and kept for her by the hardworking taxpayers of the British isles, in the way of protection and security, how is it that we can for a moment refuse to play the manly part, the Canadian part and the imperial part, and go to the present defence of the empire and ourselves in the quickest and most effective way.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Before moving the adjournment of this debate, I think that the remarkable speech which has fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Foster) deserves a word or two of comment from hon. gentlemen on this side. I want to say a few words regarding the unique position he occupies to-night. I have heard him on numerous occasions since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, but rarely have I seen him in a more desperate frame of mind. After having been compelled to eat every word he said a year ago, when, with all the adjectives and invectives he had at his hand he declared that it would be unwise and improper thing for Canada to give a contribution, and that the proper thing for her was to build her own navy,—after he had been compelled to do this by the men who supply the sinews of war during election times and who applied the thumb screw and the composing room to himself and his leader in order to make them withdraw from the position they had taken —after he and his leader had performed a feat, the like of which has only been heard of in history once before when 'the King of France with twice ten thousand men marced up the hill and then marched down again,' the hon. gentleman sought to cover his disgraceful retreat by endeavouring to discredit the right hon. gentleman who has guided the destinies of Canada so successfully since the Liberal party took office in 1896. If I wanted to go into ancient history, I could tell some home truths about the man who was premier of this country and leader of the Conservative party and who declared himself in favour of annexation, I could bring into prominence again the Pacific scandal and the notorious nest of traitors and moments of weakness, but I shall not be lead away by the example of the hon. gentleman. I say that it was undignified and unbecoming for a gen-

tleman occupying the position the hon. gentleman does, to talk as he did about the man who governs this country and whom every Liberal in Canada is proud to follow—to talk about his being an enemy of the empire and a separatist. Why, the fourteen years of his administration is a sufficient answer to the slander. What record has the hon. gentleman to show? When he was Minister of Finance did it ever enter into his head that Canada should show some slight appreciation of England's great watchfulness over her by giving a preference in the Canadian market? No, that was left for the Liberal leader to do. When there was a war in the Soudan, what course did the Tory government, of which my hon. friend was then Finance Minister, take? They said to the English government: We will allow you to enlist our young men in this country, but we will not give you a dollar. And yet this hon. gentleman talks about his party having forced Sir Wilfrid Laurier to send Canadian troops to South Africa. Sir, we all know it was left to a French Canadian, at the head of the Canadian government, to see that Canadians, for the first time in the history of this country, were sent by their government to fight the battles of the empire.

Let me give you an evidence of the opinion in which the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is held in England. You have all heard of Mr. Richard Jebb, the gentleman who ran as a Liberal Unionist in St. Pancras and whom the imperial federationists of this country asked Mr. Balfour to select as a candidate. Well, Mr. Jebb says, in his 'Sketches of colonial nationalism,' speaking of the Prime Minister of Canada:

> Reviewing the events which have taken place since the passing of the Transvaal resolution by the Dominion parliament in the summer of 1899, Canadians, after all, have no reason to think that their country has failed to keep her accustomed lead in the steady movement towards imperial co-operation. On the contrary, in the end as at the beginning, Canada figures as the resolute guardian when others were tempted to turn aside of that mutual independence which is the sure foundation of imperial union. Prominent amongst nationalist statesmen stands Sir Wilfrid Laurier successfully applying to the constructive problem of the empire the fearless and progressive spirit of this political tradition.

When Mr. Jebb, with his record on imperial subjects gives that certificate of character to the leader of the Liberal party in Canada, my right hon. friend need not care about what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says. One remark more before I move the adjournment. When listening to the hon. member (Mr. Foster) talking about the motherland and what Canada owed the empire, I asked myself whether his judgment would be as good as that of a young man, a son of Nova Scotia, who led the Nova Scotians at Paardeberg, who wears the decoration of Her Majesty for the distinction he won in fighting the battles of the empire in South Africa. Would not the judgment of such a man be worth far more than that of the hon. gentleman who has used up the time of this House for purely partisan purposes? To-night I received this letter from the young gentleman in question, whose devotion and patriotism cannot be gainsaid:

> Dear Mr. Macdonald,—Canadian attitude on the naval question being in the forefront, I hope you will not think me presuming upon your time and patience if I venture to place before you the situation as it appears to one who is not in the active political field.
>
> The first thing to be settled is to find out at what objects we are aiming.
>
> It seems to me that the only contribution truly acceptable to the Canadian mind must be in the form of Canadian flesh and blood, that is to say in trained Canadian seamen. If Canada is to pay Englishmen to do Canada's share of the fighting, we had better step down and out.
>
> Our immediate object should be to commence the training of a body of, say 2,000 Canadian sailors. These men can be drawn from inland cities and counties of Canada just as well as from the maritime ports, because the crew of a modern warship are not so much sailors in the usual sense of the word as they are artillerymen, riflemen, mechanics and engineers of all kinds, and the inland cities and towns can furnish their quota just as well as the maritime provinces.
>
> The reason that the South African War was of such vital interest to Canada, was because she had some 8,000 men there, all of them writing home, and every city, town, county and street in Canada could say that it had a representative fighting in South Africa.
>
> Had the contribution of Canada in the South African War taken the form of a cash contribution or the contribution of magnificent batteries of inanimate guns, Canada's enthusiasm would have been insignificant.
>
> Canada's proper contribution to imperial defence must be in trained Canadian men, and to train these men we must commence a navy.
>
> If war should be declared to-morrow, a contribution of $10,000,000 or five times that amount, if you like, can be voted by the Canadian parliament and placed at England's disposal.
>
> Outside of all this there is the constitutional question, and the Liberal government deserve the thanks and the everlasting gratitude of every member of the British empire in its refusal to be stampeded into committing a false step in our imperial relations.
>
> The surest and quickest way to an effective form of imperial union is the maintenance by Canada of a dignified attitude, and there is no occasion for us to lapse into the colonial position which our ancesters did so much to extricate us from.

If the process of giving Dreadnoughts is commenced the English people will expect a continuation of such policy, and its discontinuance will cause more friction than ever exists at present.

I entirely disapprove of any action which will lead to condition of affairs from which Canada will find it difficult to withdraw, and have not the slightest hesitation in saying that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy is merely a logical step in the process of colonial and imperial development at which we have been busy for so many years.

The surest aid which Canada can give to the development of the empire is the establishment of a robust Canadianism, able to place in the fighting line of the empire trained Canadian seamen as it has already placed trained Canadian soldiers.

And, after all this long harangue in which my hon. friend descended to the old game of abusing those who did not agree with him—because he had a poor case—and before moving the adjournment of the debate, I wanted to give the opinion of Richard Jebb, the imperialist, as to the estimation in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier is held in England—aye, and wherever the English language is spoken; and I wanted to give the answer from a man who knows—a man who went out and fought the battles of the empire, not one who stayed at home and dotted 'i's' and crossed 't's' and twisted words and distorted ideas. These are an answer sufficient for to-night to the address of my hon. friend, and so I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow is Friday and it is not likely that we shall have a full House. We will not take up this debate, but will go on with estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. What estimates?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Public works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.23 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 11, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Bay of Quinte Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

Bill (No. 140) to relieve Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—Mr. Wallace.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141) to amend the Indian Act. He said: There are only three clauses in the Bill. The object is to give definite effect to what has hitherto been understood to be the law, and in regard to which there seems to be some doubt which it is desirable to remove. The first clause relates to the occupation of Indian lands by others than Indians, and provides a mode of procedure whereby the rights of the Indians may be established in case of their lands being entered upon by those who are not entitled to do so. The other two clauses are merely to protect the right of the Indians in any moneys that are due to them from the government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WATERWAYS COMMITTEE.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government when the committee on the various waterways and water-powers will meet? This is a very important committee, and there has not been any meeting of the committee during the present session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will call the attention of the chairman to it.

THE 'SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN' AND THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM. My attention has been called to a criticism of the plans of the Quebec bridge by the 'Scientific American', which is a leading scientific paper. The writer seems not to be aware of the fact that the plans provide for a suspension bridge as well as a cantilever bridge. I presume some hon. gentlemen may have seen this article, and I have referred it to the chairman of the board of engineers, who have charge of the construction of the bridge.

TRACHOMA IN REGINA SCHOOLS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Interior to a matter which I consider of great urgency. I see a despatch in the 'Citizen' of to-day, from Regina, to the effect that trachoma has broken out in the schools of that city:

At present there are some ten cases discovered, but careful examination of all the children in the schools is to be made. The city health officer in reporting the matter to the city council attributed the outbreak to

laxity on the part of immigration authorities in permitting those infected with the disease to land in the country.

I think this is a matter that demands the immediate attention of the Minister of Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that every care is taken at the ocean ports to prevent the entry of immigrants suffering from this disease. But it is like all other diseases, it may pass inspection at a time when it is not in evidence, and break out later on and be communicated. I might mention that it is becoming a practice to attribute every form of disease that may occur in any part of Canada, to the laxity of the immigration authorities. I would suggest with all due respect that the municipal and provincial authorities would do well to assume their own share in the suppression of contagious diseases.

MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. BRADBURY. I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that apparently no action has been taken on the fisheries report laid on the table. I have had communication from some of the Selkirk fishermen asking if there are going to be any changes made, if the report is going to be implemented by new regulations. At this time of the year it is necessary that the fishermen should know if they are going to be allowed to fish next year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will give an answer to my hon. friend on Monday.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick—Dipper harbour—extension of breakwater—pier, $14,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Chairman, the object of this vote is to provide for the extension of the breakwater pier at Dipper harbour. Dipper harbour is in the county of St. John. The total estimated cost is $19,530 for 186,000 cubic yards of cribwork and contingencies to be added making $21,500, of which we are asking $14,000. That is what we expect to expend during the coming year.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the work under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we have not done anything and will not until we get the vote.

Dorchester wharf—level bed at outer end for vessels to lie on at low tide, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide a bed outside the wharf at which vessels may lie in safety at low tide. As the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) knows, the river is a tidal river and while vessels will lie afloat at high tide, at low tide they have to ground, and it is very desirable to have a bed on which the vessels may lie. The estimated cost is $1,000. There is to be something in the nature of cribwork, 2,500 lineal feet, and some excavation, ballast poles and the like of that.

Harbours, rivers and bridges generally—repairs and improvements, $21,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a vote that is usually taken to make repairs to wharfs and bridges generally for which there is no special appropriation. We took an appropriation last year of $24,000 of which we expended, up to the 1st December last, $10,975, leaving a balance of $13,000. Of course, whatever of that remains unexpended will lapse at the end of the year and we are taking the usual vote for the new year.

Kouchibouguac harbour—to complete work of closing new gap through beach and preserving the latter with breakwater, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount, we had hoped would be sufficient to complete the work, but I am sorry to say that I cannot give that assurance now, because by reason of a very violent storm recently I believe the work has been damaged, and I am not able to say to the committee just what amount we will require to finish it.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the total cost up to the present time?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost has been $6,300. We had hoped that the total expenditure would not have exceeded $7,800.

Mr. CROCKET. How long has the work been in progress?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was commenced in 1908.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the object of it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a long bar extending right in front of the harbour of Kouchibouguac. There is one channel running through this bar into the harbour, but some years ago the tide broke through at another part of the bar and that interferes with the current of the main channel. It was damaging the harbour as it appeared to be likely that it would silt up, and the object of this is to close that unnecessary entrance which was broken through by the tide.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what county is this harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the county of Kent. Kouchibouguac is quite an important place. It is not only an important fishing locality

but other business of considerable importance is also carried on. It is in the centre of an important lumbering district, and my report is that the value of the fisheries is about $50,000 annually. There has recently been erected a freezer of quite large dimensions and there are three lobster factories in the locality.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the work been done by day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Atkinson.

Lameque wharf—improvements, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the enlargement of the wharf and the erection of a warehouse at Lameque in the county of Gloucester. The total estimated cost of the improvements is $7,000 of which we expect we will have expended by the 31st March, $4,999.63. We are now asking for $2,000 to complete the work.

Mr. CROCKET. What depth of water will be provided?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that I am not able to give the depth of water, but I may say that passenger steamers go through. There has been established a line of steamers between points on the mainland of Gloucester and the islands also going over to the Quebec shore. and the steamers will call at this point, The water is deep enough for the steamers. The steamer will call at this point, so that the water is deep enough for that steamer. Lameque is an important place for shipping; it is estimated that the exports of fish alone amount to about $80,000 annually. There is a population of about 400.

Leonardville, Deer island — reconstruction and extension of wharf, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete the contract. It is for the extension of a wharf formerly owned by the provincial government. The contract is for $9,895, and contingencies are estimated at $1,105. We estimate we will have expended up to the 31st March next $4,000, leaving a balance of $7,000, which we are now asking to complete the work.

Lorneville—breakwater wharf, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make a payment on the breakwater at Lorneville in the city and county of St. John, a very important fishing village. The contract is let by tender for $27,000. We add for contingencies $800 and for right of way $200, and owing to a change in site an additional payment is made to the contractor of $1,150. Since these estimates were made up a very unfortunate accident has happened to the Lorneville breakwater. In a recent storm, perhaps the most violent ever known in that locality, the outer end of the breakwater was carried away and broke through an apparent crust under the water, and settled down, leaving a place between the head of the wharf which was carried away and the main body which will have to be filled in and for which we will have to ask a supplementary vote. Part of the wharf was on rock and a part was supposed to be on the bed of the ocean. In this violent storm, either the foundation was undermined by the storm or it sank through by reason of the heavy weight. It is one of those unforeseen accidents which sometimes will occur.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the extent of the damage?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $15,000 or $20,000.

Mr. CROCKET. The work had not been taken over by the government from the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; but the work was finished. I think we shall have to pay the contractor for it.

Mace's bay—connection of pier-head with shore—to complete, $1,150.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to connect the pier head now partly completed with the shore, a distance of 150 feet.

Moncton wharf—enlargement of, $14,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for cribwork construction, 160 feet long by 50 feet wide, and an approach from the shore of cribwork 90 feet long by 20 feet wide. The amount of the contract is $17,600 and, adding contingencies, we estimate the total cost will be $19,200.

Mr. CROCKET. Did this government build the wharf that is being enlarged?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a wharf that has been in existence since prior to confederation. It has always been a public wharf, recognized as such, and looked after by the Dominion. It is in close proximity to what is known as the wharf railway track at Moncton. I trust that the Minister of Public Works will expedite the completion of this work, the delay of which has been the cause of serious complaints on the part of shippers and others who have to use the harbour of Moncton.

Mr. CROCKET. Who has the contract for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Downey Bros., of Albert county.

Mr. CROCKET. How many tenders were received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Seven. The amount of Downey Bros. tender was $17,600.

Neguac—extension of wharf on Miramichi bay, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is proposed in order not only to give more wharf accommodation, but greater depth of water at the outer face, which is very much needed to accommodate the steamer which runs down the Bay from Newcastle and Chatham.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this cover the whole expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it will leave a balance of about $800 for which we will have to make further provision. $2,800 is the total estimated cost.

Mr. CROCKET. Was the original wharf built by the federal government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it was built between 1892 and 1894.

New Mills wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a wharf at an important point in the county of Restigouche where a large lumbering business is being carried on. The total cost of the wharf is estimated at $12,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What depth of water will there be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Five feet at low water and twelve feet at high water, spring tide.

Mr. DANIEL. Will any dredging be required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not anticipate that any will be required.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population of New Mills?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 1,500.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this work be let by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the government secured the title of the site on which it is proposed to build the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. I suppose the site has been determined on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have an offer from a party to sell for $100 the land for the site which has been selected. I have no doubt we shall accept the offer.

Mr. CROCKET. How much land does the offer include?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend how much, but it includes what will be required for the right of way and the site of the wharf on the shore.

Mr. PUGSLEY

Petit Rocher—roadway to breakwater pier and repairs to approach, &c., $1,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to grade and fence the right of way to the breakwater, and also to repair the approach, which has been damaged by storms.

Mr. DANIEL. How long is this roadway?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About a quarter of a mile.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the roadway on government property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was bought from the authorities of the Roman Catholic church, and the title was vested in the Crown. We paid to Valerie Frenette the sum of $100, but we have not settled yet with the church authorities, who are asking $500 for their portion. The balance of the appropriations is for repairs to the approach.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the original cost of the breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure on it up to the 31st of March last year was $63,277.13.

Mr. CROCKET. When was it originally built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was begun in 1903 and was completed in November, 1908.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the contract price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was one contract to Mr. McGregor for $24,150, and another to the same man for $32,900.

Mr. CROCKET. That makes $63,000 for this breakwater. What was the length of this breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. An isolated breakwater was begun in 1904 and finished in 1905. To enable this work to be used as a wharf and to give better protection to the area inside, a second contract was entered into on September 4, 1907, for an extension to the shore. The construction was begun December 11, 1907, and finished March 31, 1908. I take it the length will be 450 feet in addition to the length of the isolated breakwater, which I am told by my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), is about 400 feet, making a total length of 850 feet.

Mr. CROCKET. How is it there were two contracts, first one for $25,000 and then another for $32,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The first was for the isolated breakwater which had no connection with the shore. Subsequently it was decided to make connection between the breakwater and the shore so as to enable the breakwater to be utilized as a wharf and give better protection to the harbour.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any revenue from this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would belong to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. So long as the wharf remains in the Public Works Department no revenue is collected. The transfer of this wharf was made some time last year.

Mr. DANIEL. What depth of water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 18 feet at low tide.

Pink Rock wharf, Shepody bay, New Brunswick—extension of, $5,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete work now being carried on under contract. It consists of an extension of the wharf of 47 feet, also the construction of a pier head 75 feet by 28 feet, also the construction of a detached breakwater, 100 feet by 25 feet, the object being to break the seas and protect the harbour. Amount of contract, $10,440, and superintendence, $560, making total estimate of $11,000, of which we expect to spend up to the 31st of March this year, $5,500. This will complete.

Mr. CROCKET. Did not the government make an extension of the wharf before letting the contract of which the minister speaks?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there was some work done of an extension of the wharf, I think about 70 or 75 feet, but it was found that that was not sufficient to give accommodation for the vessels going there, and I decided to do the additional work provided in the contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that was under a former appropriation. The present work has very little to do with that except in so far as that completed a certain work, and this is additional and other work.

Mr. CROCKET. How much will this make the total expended by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $15,000.

Mr. CROCKET. $11,000 under the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. And $4,479 previously.

Mr. RHODES. Does the government collect any revenue on the traffic over this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it has not yet been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. RHODES. Is it the intention to do so?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When completed, it will be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and they will collect wharfage.

Mr. CROCKET. This is the wharf concerning which I took occasion to say some days ago, when some other item was under discussion, that it was being built by this government for the exclusive benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company and another company, of which Mr. C. J. Osman, a friend of the minister, is managing director. That statement aroused the minister to that indignation he so frequently displays.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend said something more than that. He said he presumed this was the result of a bargain with Mr. Osman, under which the Albert company were to give land over at Hillsborough for a public building and get this improvement in return.

Mr. CROCKET. I made a very innocent statement, I thought. We were discussing an appropriation for a post office at Hillsborough the minister announced that Mr. Osman had generously donated the site. I remarked that perhaps Mr. Osman was doing that in return for the wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman call that an innocent statement?

Mr. CROCKET. I suggested simply that probably the honourable minister's friend was giving the site for the post office, in return for the wharf which the government was constructing for his benefit at Pink Rock. The minister characterized that suggestion as gross and vile concerning a man of the highest honour and integrity—expressions we hear so frequently from the hon. minister. I say that not only was the suggestion I then made that the wharf was built exclusively for the benefit of the firm of which Mr. Osman is managing director, absolutely true, but that the wharf is the property of the Albert Manufacturing Company. Furthermore, that a large portion of the expenditure was made by Mr. Osman under his own direction and control—he simply turned the bills in to the Department of Public Works, and some $2,000 or $2,100 was paid out of the treasury of this country to recoup Mr. Osman for this expenditure made by himself on his own wharf. So, when the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) seeks to discredit the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) by intimating that he makes suggestions very recklessly, the hon. minister at least will not be able to rely upon the suggestion made in this case, for I have the proof at hand

not only to fully bear it out, but to prove much more than I suggested. And this is the kind of thing that is going on all over this country. The other night I referred to dredging done at Dalhousie, New Brunswick, to the extent of thousands of dollars for the improvement of the shipping facilities of the Dalhousie Lumber Company, of which the minister himself is a stockholder. I have returns from the minister's own department which show that conclusively, and in such manner that the minister himself cannot controvert the statement that thousands of dollars have been expended from the public treasury to dredge the wharf of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. The dredge was kept there in the summer of 1908, and again last year dredging along the front of that property at the public expense.

I desire to refer to the return which I obtained in connection with this matter of the improvements at Pink Rock, so that the committee may see that the statement that this so-called public work was not in reality a public work, but was for the improvement of private property and paid for out of the public treasury was strictly correct. I find, by the correspondence brought down, that on July 6, 1907, a letter was written by Mr. Geoffrey Stead, the resident engineer of the department, to the chief engineer, in which he states:

I have your letter of the 13th June instructing me to prepare a contract plan for the extension of the wharf at Pink Rock, Westmoreland county, New Brunswick, at a total cost of $16,700.

The wharf is intended for the shipment of gypsum, and the length of the proposed extension is 275 feet.

I have just been in communication with Mr. C. J. Osman, M.P.P., owner or manager of the gypsum quarries at Pink Rock, who states that the 275-foot extension would be unnecessarily long and that 100 feet would be sufficient.

The 100-foot extension would require 69,000 cubic feet of cribwork, and at 7 cents per foot would cost $4,830.

Would you kindly authorize the construction of the shorter work instead of that originally proposed.

The extension could then be built by day's labour during the present season, which would avoid delay and enable the appropriation for the present fiscal year—$5,000—to be used.

Now, though the original estimate was for an extension of 275 feet, that was changed at Mr. Osman's request, he having stated that an extension of 100 feet would be sufficient. This enabled the appropriation for that year to be expended, and it was expended by day labour—day labour done under Mr. Osman's own direction. And, notwithstanding that Mr. Osman there stated that 100 feet would be sufficient, and that the original estimate was too much, the minister has now communicated to the House the fact that Mr. Osman is getting just exactly what was originally proposed. And it would seem that the change was made simply to enable this work to be carried along by the day labour system, with a foreman appointed by Mr. Osman and the expenditure made by him.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How long has the work been going on?

Mr. CROCKET. Three or four years. Here is another communication which will bear out the statement that this work was for Osman's benefit. It is from the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) to 'My Dear Pugsley,' under date 4th April, 1908, and reading as follows:

You will remember that Mr. Osman has urged the construction or extension of a breakwater at Pink Rock, in Westmoreland county. If the work goes on, I would like Gideon S. McFadden of Johnston's Mills post office, Westmoreland county, appointed to the position of inspector.

Will you please give instructions so that this may not be overlooked when the time comes.

Then, there is a memorandum from the minister to the deputy minister dated April 7, as follows:

Kindly let me know if the work of constructing breakwater at Pink Rock, Westmoreland county, New Brunswick, is yet under way.

Then, on 21st April, 1908, there is another letter from Mr. Geoffrey Stead, resident engineer, to Mr. Lafleur, which is in part as follows:

I have received your letter of the 14th April, asking a report as to how the work at Pink Rock, New Brunswick, stands at present.

I inclose a photograph which shows the whole wharf—the inner part 250 feet long, built by Mr. Osman, manager of the Albert Manufacturing Company and the New Brunswick Gypsum Company, and the outer section 75 feet long which is not yet complete.

The cost of the 75-foot section has been assumed by the department, as I have your authority to certify and forward the bills, but though I have asked for them several times I have not yet received them. The foreman has been away and I have just heard that the accounts will be sent to me in two days.

The cost of completing this section——

He then details an estimate amounting to $1,850. So, this work was in progress and paid for out of the public treasury without the resident engineer of the department having any knowledge whatever of the accounts, the whole matter placed in the hands of Mr. C. J. Osman, who made——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all, but of Mr. G. S. McFadden.

Mr. CROCKET. If the minister will only be patient for a few minutes, I think I can show him that he is a little previous in

that statement. Consider the statement in this letter:

But though I have asked for them several times I have not received them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From the foreman—read it all; he has not received them from the foreman.

Mr. CROCKET. Here is a further letter from the resident engineer to the chief engineer, dated 7th May, 1908:

Sir,—I have received your telegram stating, 'At request of minister, have wired Mr. McFadden, care of Johnston's Mills, Dorchester, New Brunswick, to go to work at once as inspector at Pink Rock, instructions to follow later. Please give Mr. McFadden whatever instructions may be required.'

The work at Pink Rock has been done by day labour under Mr. Oscar Downey, the foreman appointed by Mr. Osman of the Albert Manufacturing Company, before I had received instructions to certify the accounts.

Mr. Downey is now about to resume construction and complete the work by day labour. Would you kindly inform me whether Mr. McFadden will act as conductor, with Mr. Downey as sub-foreman—which would be satisfactory to Mr. Osman—the pay-lists being fairly large, as many as twelve men being employed at once; or is Mr. McFadden to act as inspector on the work as he would in case of a contract and send in his account apart from the pay-rolls?

So there we have a statement from the resident engineer of the department that the work at Pink Rock had been done by day labour under Mr. Downey, the foreman appointed by Mr. Osman of the Albert Manufacturing Company, before the resident engineer had received any instructions from the department. Mr. Osman sent in to the Public Works Department accounts amounting to upwards of $2,000 expended by himself, a good part of it for goods furnished by himself, while the expenditure was entered in the Auditor General's Report as if the work had been done under the direction of the department. On the 13th of May, 1908, there is another letter from Mr. Geoffrey Stead:

I inclose herewith accounts amounting to $2,018.96 in favour of the Albert Manufacturing Company for the construction of a 75 foot extension to the wharf 226 feet long which they had already built at Pink Rock, N.B., and am requested by the company to ask that the accounts be paid at an early date as the work was done some months ago and money is scarce.

There is a letter from the resident engineer of the department, in which he states that he is inclosing accounts of the Albert Manufacturing Company for $2,018.96 for extension of this wharf.

The accounts were paid immediately, and it was entered, as I have stated, in the Auditor General's Report as if the extension had been made under the direction of the Public Works Department, and many of these accounts, as I have said, being for supplies furnished by the company itself. Here is a letter from C. J. Osman to the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, dated June 26, 1908:

Dear Mr. Emmerson,—I am sorry to have to make further demands upon you in connection with the wharf at Pink Rock, as I confidently expected that the expenditure already made by ourselves and the government would be sufficient for all requirements.

I have, however, taken down three of our steamboat captains to inspect the wharf and bed before putting their vessels on to load, and they all declined positively to risk their vessels unless the wharf was extended and a 'T' or 'L' built out to break the swell which is quite heavy at this place even with a southwest wind.

You will perhaps remember that this was the plan originally proposed in the first survey made by Mr. Scammel, C.E.

We have now over 2,000 tons or rock quarried and piled on and near the wharf and cannot induce a vessel to go for it.

Will you therefore try and get enough appropriation included in the supplementary estimates to extend the wharf 75 feet, and an 'L' or 'T' about 60 feet added to this with a small block or crib on the roof just above the wharf end. This would then make a perfect little harbour, and I think can be all done for the original estimate of cost which was, I think, about $14,000 or $15,000, and up to this time only about $3,000 has been expended.

This matter is of very great importance, and, therefore, I venture to ask you to take immediate action.

And we have this appropriation going through now, the balance of the appropriation, just on the lines requested by Mr. Osman, and to the full amount of the original estimate which was altered at Mr. Osman's request, to enable the appropriation to be expended by himself without any check of any kind under the day labour system. So the total expenditure as stated by the minister will amount to fully what it was estimated to be in the first instance. Then, here is a letter from Mr. Osman to the Hon. Wm. Pugsley, dated 26th June, 1908:

Dear Mr. Pugsley,—I find that the work as now completed at Pink Rock is insufficient for the requirements of the locality.

We have over 2,000 tons of plaster rock quarried and piled on the wharf and near it, and are very anxious to get it shipped, but we have been unable to induce the captains of the steam vessels now under charter with us to place their vessels in the berth, as they state that they would be in considerable danger; that before they would take the risk of loading at this place the wharf would have to be further extended about 75 feet, with a protecting L on the end, and a small breakwater on the reef a little above the wharf.

When Mr. Scammel made the first survey of this work, the wharf extension, an L was

included and the total estimate of cost was about $6,000, but being desirous of having the work done at as little cost as possible, I decided to excavate the bed alongside the wharf built by us, and save a good deal of the proposed extension. This has been done as already stated but is not acceptable to the vessel masters. The extension demanded now is considerably less than the work first proposed, and I should be much obliged if you can see your way clear to make provision for this further work in your supplementary estimates.

I have written to Mr. Emmerson upon the matter and am quite sure that he will give his warm and earnest support.

Perhaps you would also arrange for Mr. Stead to go over the work again, in which case if he will communicate with me, I will take him down in our boat and explain exactly what is now required, and I beg to assure you that every effort will be made to cover absolute requirement with as small expenditure as possible.

Requesting your favourable consideration of this matter,

I remain yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) C. J. OSMAN.

To that there is a very courteous reply from the minister to Mr. Osman, dated June 30:

Dear Mr. Osman,—I am in receipt of your favour of the 26th inst., having reference to extension of wharf at Pink Rock, and have referred the matter to my chief engineer, with directions that Mr. Resident Engineer Stead look into same and report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is wrong with that?

Mr. CROCKET. Oh, nothing. The government did not lose much time, for on June 30, 1908, I find a memorandum from the minister to the chief engineer:

Kindly note letter of Hon. Mr. Osman, re extension of Pink Rock wharf, and direct Mr. Resident Engineer Stead to examine the work at once and report as to necessity for and cost of proposed addition.

Then, on September 11, the chief engineer writes Resident Engineer Stead as follows:

I enclose herewith file No. 321777, containing your report regarding the extension of the wharf at Pink Rock, N.B., the cost of which you estimated at $2,830, and would ask to let me have an answer to the deputy minister's query, as to whether this work would be done by day labour.

I may say that the vote of $5,000 in the estimates is for the building of an extension of 75 feet to the wharf at Pink Rock, built by the Albert Manufacturing Company and the New Brunswick Gypsum Company. This is the work for which you were authorized on the 10th August last, to prepare contract plans and specifications. Kindly let me know if the work mentioned in the inclosed report, the cost of which you placed at $2,830, forms any part of the proposed 75 feet extension.

Then comes a letter from Mr. Osman of the 12th of November, 1908, to the minister:

Mr. CROCKET.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Pugsley,—I am getting quite anxious about the wharf at Pink Rock, as we have a large cargo ready for shipment there, and have had it there all this season, but owing to the insecurity of the place, we have not been able to induce any of our steamers to go there to load.

Mr. Stead has, I believe, prepared plans for a small extension and breakwater block, which, I think, will make the place perfectly safe, and this work ought to be done as early as possible next spring, and as some funds from the old appropriation are available, perhaps you could see your way clear to instruct him to have the work finished by day work the same as the other work was done at this place, as it will be necessary to get timber out this winter, and have it ready for early rafting, in order to get the place available for use next year. If you will be kind enough to interest yourself in this matter, I shall feel very much obliged to you.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) C. J. OSMAN.

On November 24, 1908, the minister wrote to Mr. Osman as follows:

Dear Mr. Osman,—I am in receipt of your favour of the 12th inst., and in reply beg to say that I have given directions to have the work at Pink Rock done without delay.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) WM. PUGSLEY.

There is a further letter from Mr. Stead on the the 27th November, 1908, to Mr. Lafleur, the chief engineer at Ottawa:

Sir,—I have received a letter from Mr. C. J. Osman, of the Albert Manufacturing Company, of Hillsborough, stating that he is very anxious about the Pink Rock wharf, as the company have a large cargo of gypsum tied up there which cannot be shipped till the proposed extension is built.

Mr. Osman writes. 'I would like also for you (if possible) to obtain the consent of the department to carry on this work by day work, and authorize Downey (the former foreman) to go ahead with it, in which case we will arrange with him so that he can get the timber in Hillsborough off our own land, which is the most convenient point at which suitable timber can be obtained, and we will make the cost to him much lower than it could be procured anywhere else. If, on the other hand, a contract is to be let, it is of great importance that it should be let at once. Perhaps you will be good enough to communicate with the department, and find out exactly how the matter stands.'

I have read your instructions of the 24th September to proceed immediately by day labour with the construction of a 47-foot extension at a cost of $2,830—the balance of the appropriation for this year being $2,839.51—and I informed Mr. Osman of this, but on account of the difficulty of procuring lumber and working at the site of the wharf late in the season, I have not been able to have the work started.

The first work was done by Mr. Osman with his own men, he charged actual cost, and at the Hon. Mr. Emmerson's suggestion, I en-

deavoured to have the work on the extension carried on in the same way.

It would be very desirable to procure lumber for the extension early this winter, i.e., before the heavy snowfalls, as it can then be bought most cheaply. Would you kindly inform me, therefore, whether I may procure only sufficient lumber for the 47-foot extension, or expend the balance of the appropriation for lumber for the whole proposed work —the estimated cost of which is $13,000; and also what answer I can return to Mr. Osman.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) GEOFFREY STEAD,
Resident Engineer.

The following is the chief engineer's reply to Mr. Stead, dated 30th November, 1908:

In reply to your letter of the 27th inst., regarding the work at Pink Rock, I have to inform you that you may procure sufficient lumber for the 47-foot extension which you were authorized on the 24th September last to construct by day labour, but not for any other work.

There is another letter dated December 12th, from the chief engineer of the department of the deputy minister, Mr. Hunter, as follows:

Sir,—I have the honour to inclose herewith a memorandum from the hon. the minister asking that attention be given to the work required at Pink Rock, as requested by Mr. C. J. Osman in the accompanying letter. The matter was referred to Mr. Geoffrey Stead, resident engineer, whose report I now have the honour to transmit.

Mr. Stead states that what is necessary is an extension of the wharf 47 feet long and 28 feet wide, with a pier-head or 'L' 75 feet by 28 feet, and a detached breakwater 100 feet from the end of the 'L,' the estimated cost of the work being $13,000.

The estimated cost of the 47-foot extension is $2,830, and by your instructions Mr. Stead was informed, on the 30th ult., that he might procure sufficient lumber for this extension, which he was authorized on the 27th September last to construct by day labour but not for any other work.

So that I think, Mr. Chairman, it must be evident that the statement which was made that the extension of this wharf at Pink Rock was made for the benefit of the company of which C. J. Osman is a director has been pretty well confirmed by the quotations I have made from this return. Not only that, but far worse than the statement I made, it appears that the first year's expenditure of over $2,100 was made by Mr. Osman himself, who employed his own men to do the work, who purchased his own supplies, and who simply sent up to the Department of Public Works here these bills amounting to that sum of money which were paid out of the public treasury—

Mr. PUGSLEY. He charged actual cost without any profits at all.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not, at the present moment, discussing actual cost. I may have occasion to show what Mr. Osman's idea of actual cost was before I get through, by reference to some items in his accounts. This amount was paid out of the public treasury to Mr. Osman for work done by him without reference to the government and before the Department of Public Works had given any directions or instructions in the matter at all.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Who certified to the amount that was paid to Mr. Osman?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Stead. He simply forwarded the accounts. Mr. Osman sent his accounts in to Mr. Stead.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman knows more than that. Mr. Stead certified to the accounts.

Mr. CROCKET. I said, that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the hon. gentleman said that Mr. Stead simply forwarded the accounts. He certified to the correctness of the accounts.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr Haggart) asked who certified the accounts and I said Mr. Stead.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. I said that Osman forwarded the accounts to Mr. Stead, that Mr. Stead forwarded them to the department at Ottawa and, of course, a certificate 'fair and reasonable' can always be got in every case in New Brunswick—just such a certificate as we had in connection with the Richibucto wharf, and just such certificates as we had in many other cases in New Brunswick which were not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Would that not be a criminal act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would be a criminal act?

Mr. BOYCE. Falsifying a certificate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who said it was falsified?

Mr. J. HAGGART. The money was paid through the Auditor General's Department on a false statement of facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) has not made such a statement.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Then I make the statement based upon his statement of the case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has no foundation for making that statement, because, even according to the statemen

of the hon. member for York, what took place was that Mr. Osman furnished the accounts showing the material and expenditure on day labour, item by item.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Do you mean to say that the Auditor General had any knowledge that he was paying over money that had been expended on this man's own wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It just shows that my hon,. friend has been entirely misinformed as to the ownership of the wharf. If my hon. friend will look at the agreement which is on file in the Department of Public Works he will see that the right to the wharf and the right to collect wharfage on this wharf, which was built by the Albert Manufacturing Company, was taken over by the Crown and that the Crown owns all this extension which was made to it. This is the property of the Crown and the work was done properly in connection with this Crown wharf.

Mr. J. HAGGART. But there was no agreement by which moneys were being expended under the direction of the owner of the wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This wharf is not owned by Mr. Osman. It is owned by the Crown.

Mr. J. HAGGART. It is the extension that he owns.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. Under the agreement on file all the rights of the Albert Manufacturing Company in this wharf, except the solitary right to have their own vessels lie there, were transferred to the Crown. The right of way of the public and everything connected with it are vested in the Crown and this was an extension of a wharf owned by the Crown.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I do not understand it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course you do not, because the hon. member for York has not explained it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for York has the floor.

Mr. J. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CROCKET. I was going to deal with that question. I made the statement that it appeared that that extension was built for the benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company, of which Mr. Osman was the managing director, and that the first year's expenditure was made by him without any direction at all from the Public Works Department and that the money was paid out of the public treasury to pay his bills before there was any foreman representing the government or any inspector or anything else. In addition to that fact it appears that this property is not the property of the Crown, and if the minister made that statement this afternoon, he states what is incorrect. This wharf was the property of the Albert Manufacturing Company. It is quite true that there was a sort of sham agreement entered into to give this thing some colour, an agreement with Osman that he would graciously allow His Majesty the King to charge wharfage on all vessels other than his own, when the fact is that the wharf is so situated that there never had been and never will be any other vessel there, but the vessels of the Osman concern. That agreement that the minister speaks of is quite transparent, and any one reading it will see that it is of absolutely no avail. The minister stated in answer to my hon. friend from Algoma in reference to another proposed wharf extension in Ontario, that the government could not extend the wharf or make any expenditure upon a wharf without first acquiring a title to it. He made the same statement this afternoon before this item was reached that my hon. friend would understand of course, the government could not do such a thing unless it had acquired a title. In this case they have not acquired the title and there is no other agreement except the one I have named which amounts to nothing at all except that it provides that Mr. Osman will allow the King to charge wharfage, but the property remains in the Albert Manufacturing Company just as it did at the beginning, so that this is an absolute case of the public moneys of the country being used for the improvement of the private property of companies and of private friends of the Minister of Public Works. I referred the other night to the matter of the work at Dalhousie. These are only two samples; this thing is going on I have no doubt in the other provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Chairman I must ask you to see that my hon. friend confines himself to the item under discussion. We will come to Dalhousie later, and I will be glad to discuss it with my hon. friend to his heart's content.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the reference so far to Dalhousie is out of order, but a prolonged discussion would be.

Mr. CROCKET. I can quite understand that the minister does not want to hear more than one thing at a time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It tends to a clearer discussion and to coming to an issue.

Mr. CROCKET. I wish I had the time to give a series of the things of this kind that are going on in New Brunswick, but I ask the House and the committee to consider this as a sample of what is going on. It is time for the Committee of Supply of this House to shut down on this

kind of thing. There are hundreds of places in Canada urgently requiring money for legitimate public works. I have them in my own constituency. I referred to the case of a station required in Fredericton. The Minister of Finance admitted the absolute necessity for it, the Minister of Railways admitted its necessity, but last year we were told there was no money for it. Yet here are $15,000 or $20,000 going into the pocket of the Albert Manufacturing Company to improve their property, and $25,000 or $30,000 going into the pockets of the Loggies' to improve the property of the Dalhousie Lumber Company in which the Minister of Public Works is a shareholder. I do not object for a moment to legitimate expenditures. I believe whereever there are cases in which expenditure is required, parliament should make liberal appropriations, but I do object to expenditures of this kind being made simply for the benefit of friends of the ministry and to improve private property at the expense of the taxpayers of the Dominion. The minister has referred to Mr. Osman's statement that his accounts were actual cost. I notice in the Auditor General's Report of last year a bill of the Albert Manufacturing Company to the Department of Public Works for work and supplies furnished for this work which was for the benefit of this company and among the items are: June 21, to towing thirteen small rafts of timber from Sodom Creek to Pink Rock at $12, $156; lumber at $9 to $16, $563; 3,866 iron bolts at four cents, $154.66; in all $873.74. The Albert Company there charged for towing $563 worth of lumber a distance of three miles, $156. I suppose that would be actual cost according to Mr. Osman's statement. The fact need only be stated to show that this is a most outrageous charge for the Public Works Department to pay—and that was certified by Mr. Geoffrey Stead, as so many other things have been certified from the province of New Brunswick. It is only one of many instances, but a very instructive one for the people of New Brunswick who are familiar with the locality and will be very much surprised to learn the full facts of the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am very sorry to have to puncture the very nice little bubble my hon. friend has created in respect to this matter. Did the facts in the case justify it there would have been some excuse for the language which he used, but I think my hon. friend has jumped at a conclusion. The facts are these, that the Albert Manufacturing Company, a company composed of American gentlemen very largely, if not wholly, have been operating gypsum quarries in the county of Albert for a great many years, I think somewhere about half a century. Within recent years Mr. Osman has been their manager and they have very successfully operated these plaster or gypsum mines in that county. Some few years ago over in the county of Westmorland, which I have the honour to represent, there was discovered at Hard Ledge, near what is known as Pink Rock, a show of gypsum, and the people in that community were naturally very much excited and very hopeful as to results. The Albert Manufacturing Company went over and prospected the ground and took leases I think of the quarries. At that time the vessels which were in use in conveying this plaster from the quarries or wharfs at Hillsboro, at the head of the Bay of Fundy to Newark and other ports in the United States, were very small and no steamers were used to freight this plaster.

When the quarry was first opened it was only a prospecting operation, and the Albert Manufacturing Company, not Mr. Osman, expended a large sum of money in endeavouring to discover the extent of the gypsum deposit. Satisfied with the results, they built a small wharf for small vessels and scows, so that they might ship this material from the Pink Rock quarry to their wharfs at Hillsborough in order that it might be marketed in the United States. They made some shipments in this way, but the people in Hard Ledge, where this Pink Rock quarry is situated, were not satisfied with this, as they were hopeful of the development of the gypsum quarrying interest at Pink Rock. It had been demonstrated that the quarry was rich in this product, and the first essential after that was to have transportation facilities; and to that end the people of that community circulated a petition, which I fancy is among these papers, asking the government of Canada to construct a wharf at that point. That petition was circulated to show that there was nothing political in this matter, that it was simply a business proposition and something in the interests of the people; and I want to tell my hon. friend from York that Mr. C. Lionel Hanington, whom he knows as being identified with the Conservative party, with others circulated this petition, which was sent to me as member for the county of Westmorland, with the request that I would use whatever influence I could to induce the Department of Public Works to come to some arrangement whereby the wharf could be built. Now, although that work has gone on and has reached a certain stage of completion, I want to say that it is not solely in the interest of the Albert Manufacturing Company. During the past season, incomplete as it is, it has afforded protection for many fishing boats, vessels and scows. In that immediate vicinity there are also grindstone quarries which are only awaiting development and transportation facilities. The first grindstones ever quarried in Canada were

quarried in that section of the Dominion. Those used around Hamilton, Oshawa and other places in Ontario in the early days came very largely from that section. It was upon the strength of this petition that the work of exploiting this gypsum industry was commenced. It is now an established industry, affording employment to a number of men in a community where previously there was little employment. If this wharf and this harbour were not used by any other firm than the Albert Manufacturing Company, the facts would justify the government in constructing that wharf and creating that harbour in order that there might be established an industry of the size and character of the one which I have attempted to describe. Surely it is important, in the interests of that community, in the interests of the province of New Brunswick, and in the interests of the Dominion, that our gypsum trade shall grow and develop, that our export of gypsum alone should be expanded if it is possible to expand it. To show the extent of this business and of the export traffic connected with the plaster quarries of the Albert Manufacturing Company, I will read an extract from a paper which my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) hands to me, that seems to be apropos, that almost dropped from the clouds at this moment in order to demonstrate the importance of this industry:

Another section of New Brunswick enjoying development is Hillsboro, in Albert county, where gypsum is quarried. Last year was a most prosperous one for this industry, over 85,000 tons of crude gypsum being taken from the quarry and shipped to American ports, whilst 125,000 barrels of plaster were sent broadcast over the Dominion. Hillsboro is growing, and new public buildings of stone, besides residential and commercial structures are in process of erection or in prospect.

What has been realized in Hillsboro in connection with the plaster industry can reasonably be hoped for in the Pink Rock section, and the people were justified in having hopes and aspiration in the same direction, in order to develop this industry, in order that this gypsum quarry might be worked, it was necessary that this wharf should be enlarged and this breakwater constructed. If that were done alone for this industry, it could be justified. My hon. friend has sought to create prejudice against Mr. Osman. Well, take Mr. Osman's letters and there is not a sentence or an expression in them which does not indicate that he was simply anxious to serve the public interest by the development of this industry, and no one who knows Mr. Osman—and I appeal from one end of New Brunswick to the other—will speak of him as other than a most upright, good citizen and very able man. I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) is to be congratulated on being able to call Mr. Osman his friend. In this matter, with which I have been connected from the beginning, Mr. Osman had to be urged, in the first instance, to develop this industry at Pink Rock. Naturally, he was interested in the development of the quarries at Hillsboro. That business has been growing for years, and its character has changed. A few years ago small schooners came there and carried away their plaster. Now, large steamers are brought there and the wharfs at Hillsboro had to be reconstructed and changed in order to afford accommodation for these steamers. It must be borne in mind that the waters of the Shepody bay are not always to be seen in the river. They have a habit of slipping away and leaving the vessels high and dry on the mud banks, and it is very difficult to induce steamship owners to have their vessels lie aground. The change in the class of vessels which carry away this gypsum made it necessary to change the character of the wharf. Had there been no change in the character of the vessels, the wharf as completed in 1908 would have been amply sufficient, but since that time larger steamers have been found necessary, and it has become imperative to enlarge the wharf and give greater protection. As a matter of fact they could not induce steamers to go in there last year. The urgency of the case was such that Mr. Osman asked me to endeavour to induce the department to commence this work there and then by day labour in order that he might secure all the development of that industry at that particular place. Every letter from Mr. Osman shows him to be a man who is not working simply from selfish motives. Though the manager of the company, and naturally concerned in advancing the interests of the company, he could at the same time ask for these privileges without in any way interfering with the public interest. My hon. friend has spoken much of the charge for towing from Sodom creek to Pink Rock. If he knew the conditions as I do, he would say that the charge is only reasonable. Remember that Sodom creek lies away over what was known as Shepody flats, and you can only reach that creek at high water of the highest tide, and then, after you secure your load, you are kept there a tide, for you must have the top of deep high water in order to have egress from the creek. The mere matter of distance is nothing compared with the conditions, and it is these which make the charge very reasonable. My hon. friend read letters from me. I recommended a very excellent man, Mr. McFadden. He was a very good friend of mine, and I would not recommend any other. He was an excellent man, not only familiar with the construction of the wharfs and breakwaters, but also a good carpenter,

who had some 30 years' experience in the business. He was recommended as a foreman to see that this work was carried on in accord with the specifications and plans, and I venture to say that McFadden saw that the work was properly done. The original work was done under the charge of Mr. Isaac Downey.

Mr. FOSTER. Who appointed Downey?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was accepted as foreman by the department.

Mr. FOSTER. While the work was going on?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. The facts are these. Downey had done the work originally for the Albert Manufacturing Company. Mr. Downey is a man of many years experience in constructing wharfs and breakwaters on the mud flats of the Shepody river and Bay of Fundy. Mr. Osman secured him as a foreman, knowing his qualifications and ability. There is not a man at the head of the Bay of Fundy more capable in work of that character. When I was consulted, I felt it would be to the advantage of the department, if that work were carried on by day labour, to have a man of the standing and character of Mr. Downey in charge. The money was not forthcoming, and the Albert Manufacturing Company did pay it, and it was recouped to them.

Mr. FOSTER. While the work was being carried on, and Mr. Downey was supervising it, was he supervising it for the company, or had he been already appointed, and was he supervising it for the department?

Mr. EMMERSON. He was accepted as head workman for the department.

Mr. CROCKET. In the following year, after the payment of the two thousand dollars.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not in connection with that; that was in connection with the first work that was done and paid for by the government The original work, the nucleus of a wharf, was constructed by the Albert Manufacturing Company, and as I understand it, that has never been paid for by the government. That is an investment that they made, that is a contribution that they made towards the development of this industry at that place, and they have never asked to be recouped. I think they might have fairly done so, I think if justice were done them in the matter of the development of this work, that amount should be recouped to them. But the additional work is being constructed, and it is proposed to build a further work, not only in the line of an L, but in the line of a breakwater to break the seas from the southwest that roll in there from the Bay of Fundy. There are fishing establishments there, there are lumber mills, and they have never had the facilities for shipping. This is the first of the kind. There is not from the extreme point of the Cape Meranguin, which separates Chignecto basin and the Shepody basin, clear around the shores to the waters of the Dorchester river, there is not to be found any shipping facilities for either stone or lumber, or agricultural products, or anything of the kind. In a distance of some 12 of 15 miles, this will be the only harbour, and will afford the only shipping facilities, or wharf facilities, or breakwater. I am sure that this is in the general interest of the country, I am sure that it is a work that can be justified. It is not in any sense, I say it in all sincerity, a work for a private individual or a private corporation. It is not so recognized in the county of Westmorland. I make this challenge, that there is not a man on either side of politics in that section of Westmorland, either in the parishes of Dorchester or Sackville, who would hint at such a thing, much less approve the statement or the insinuation thrown out by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) this afternoon. It is not necessary that I should defend the department; they need no defence, and if they did, the hon. the minister can attend to that part of the business. I am speaking here as a citizen of Westmorland who knows the facts and conditions, and I think it is but fair that hon. members of this committee should know the facts. There is nothing political, there is nothing savoring of favouritism to any friend, individual, or corporation.

Mr. CROCKET. It is not surprising that the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), who has been in this thing from the beginning, should attempt to defend this transaction in the House. He started out by saying that he was going to refute some of my statements, but I leave it to this committee to say whether a single statement of mine has been refuted by the hon. gentleman. It is true that he has elaborated upon the development of the industries of the province of New Brunswick, and has shown how important it is that assistance should be given to the development of such industries as that of the Albert Manufacturing Company. What has that to do with this case? My statement was that this expenditure was made for the benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company—

Mr. EMMERSON. And my statement was that it was made for the benefit of the people in that section of the country wherein the industry was being developed, and which could not have been developed without the construction of this wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. I was proceeding to say that this expenditure was made for the benefit of the Albert Manufacturing Company, and I relied for proof of that statement upon the returns which I obtained from the Department of Public Works itself. I have shown, all through the correspondence, that it was at Mr. Osman's request that the work was done; it was for the shipment of gypsum for the company and not only that, but the first expenditure that was made was made by the company themselves, and it was recouped to them out of the public treasury, for work performed entirely under Mr. Osman's direction before any inspector or contractor had been put upon it to represent the Public Works Department. So far as the member for Westmorland's statement is concerned that this wharf will be used by fishing boats in Shepody bay, that is entirely beside the question, because it is not such a wharf as would have been built for the accommodation of fishing boats. Is there any question, from the return I have read, that this wharf was built to suit the particular purposes of the Albert Manufacturing Company? I am as anxious as any body to see industries in the province of New Brunswick developed, we are all anxious to see industries developed; but when companies are promoted to establish industries which are presumed to be profitable, is it the policy of this government to build wharfs for such companies? If that is their policy, then let us go on and grant bonuses out of the public treasury for these companies. But that has not been the policy heretofore—avowed, anyway, although it is the practice that has been adopted in many places, to make these grants for the promotion of the interests of private companies. Now my hon. friend sought, as has been sought in so many other cases, to justify this by stating that some Conservatives approved of this expenditure. I do not care whether any Conservative carried around a petition or not. The hon. gentleman sought to justify the Newmarket canal appropriation the other night, upon the ground that there was a Conservative or two in the delegation that appeared before him as Minister of Railways. Is that all the evidence this House wants to dispose of a statement of this kind, that some Conservative was in favour of the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is to show that it was non-political.

Mr. CROCKET. I have never been able to find in the returns any petition, it may be there is such a petition, but I am quite sure it is not in the return that has been brought down. But surely it is not enough to defend a transaction of this kind to say that some people petitioned for it. I say there is no manner of doubt, I make that statement upon the return furnished by the Department of Public Works, that the wharf extension was built primarily at the request of Mr. Osman for the benefit of the company of which he is a director, and this is what the hon. member has not been able to refute. But surely the hon. member for Westmorland does not seriously expect this House to take the statement he has made this afternoon with reference to this question as a refutation of the statements which are contained in an official return brought down by the Department of Public Works. Now my hon. friend has referred to Mr. Osman, following the line of his friend and successor in the Cabinet, and has spoken eulogistically of Mr. Osman.

I am not saying anything in criticism of Mr. Osman; I am criticising the Public Works Department. Mr. Osman, I assume, is like many other people—if they can get their property improved out of the public treasury they will do it, particularly if they have a pull with the minister in charge. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) has referred also to Mr. Downey. I was not making any reference to Mr. Downey's experience or capacity. I simply stated what the return showed—for I have my information, nor from any communication from that section but from the files of the department—that this work was carried on for the first year absolutely under the management and control of Mr. Osman and a foreman appointed by him. The expenditure was incurred in that way, much of it for supplies that appeared, from the Auditor General's Report, to have been furnished by the company itself. The accounts for these supplies were sent by the company to the Department of Public Works. Just as if the work had been carried on under the direction of the government which was not the fact. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) referred to the fact that Mr. McFadden was a very estimable gentleman. Of course, all these inspectors are very estimable gentlemen and are always able to get certi ficates of character from the member for the county and also from the minister re sponsible for the appoitment. I know nothing about Mr. McFadden except that the hon. member for Westmorland recommended him as inspector on a work long after it was begun, and that the minister of the day had him appointed as inspector and then, to suit Mr. Osman, a foreman whom he had appointed and who had carried on the work solely under his direction, was appointed as conductor or foreman of the work just as before. The engineer reported that this would be satisfactory to Mr. Osman and it was done to suit Mr. Os-

man's purposes. I read a letter asking if, when Mr. McFadden was appointed as inspector, he would go on and act the same as though a contract had been let, or act as foreman. And, though the practice is to appoint inspectors only where contracts are let, they appointed in this case Mr. McFadden the inspector to inspect the work which was going on by day's labour, with a foreman under him and a subforeman under him. So, the whole matter was worked through exactly as Mr. Osman, the friend of the Minister of Public Works, and of the hon. member for Westmorland, desired. Mr. McFadden got his job as inspector and Mr. Downey held on to his as foreman, just as before. The hon. member for Westmorland stated, and hon. members generally must have observed the statement that the company had built the wharf in the first instance at their own expense to develop their own property as they should have done. Why, then, should this House be called upon to furnish means to extend that property without, at least, the property being taken over and conveyed to the Crown as in other cases? I say that the transaction is indefensible, and notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Westmorland, is one which not only the members of the Conservative party but many Liberals in that district will disapprove. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) said that I could not find a man, Liberal or Conservative, in Westmorland who would find fault with this transaction. I have many communications on this matter, from responsible people, calling my attention to the case and urging it as a case that should be brought to the attention of the House. It is very easy for the hon. member to make such sweeping statements, but those statements are not in accordance with the facts; and I believe he knows it. In any case, the statement of the hon. member does not affect in the slightest degree the proof adduced from the official file that this work was entered upon at the request of Mr. Osman or the manufacturing company of which he is the managing director, that it was for their benefit, and that the work was carried on practically by them and under their direction and control and yet paid for out of the public treasury.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. I have listened carefully to this debate. I know nothing about whether this wharf was necessary for the locality or whether it is only to suit private parties. What I was concerned in was the statement made by some hon. members in reference to the payment of money on the wharf. It seems that a certain sum of money was voted to be expended on a wharf in this locality. The gentleman who owns the wharf employed a foreman, Mr. Oscar Downey, to extend the wharf or make repairs upon it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to make repairs, but to build an addition.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. At any rate, he makes an expenditure of $2,100 upon the wharf for labour and supplies on this work. That expenditure was not under the control of the department. I would ask, is there any confirmation of the statement of the hon. member that Mr. Downey was appointed superintendent of this work by the department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I will explain, as the hon. gentleman has asked the question. When it was proposed to undertake this work by the day, Mr. Osman was requested to take steps to get material and proceed with the work, and Mr. Downey was suggested by him as foreman and approved by the department. What Mr. Osman did he did for the department, and not upon his own property or upon the property of the Albert Manufacturing Company, but upon the property of the Crown.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. My information is, as shown by the report, that $2,100 was paid out by Mr. Osman, part of which was in the payment of Mr. Oscar Downey, the foreman, and other men employed in the work, and part for supplies. Mr. Downey was confirmed by the department after the expenditure of the $2,100.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that is correct. I may say, it is extremely inconvenient to argue in this Committee of the Whole matters relating to accounts which are now before the Committee on Public Accounts. It is contrary to the rules to do it. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), I am sure, has been speaking of matters which do not appear even in the copy of the papers which he has submitted to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). I have looked them over carefully and find no statements to corroborate what he has said. The hon. member must have got some information from the examination of accounts which are now before the Public Accounts Committee. In that committee, witnesses can be called and the facts brought out. It is exceedingly inconvenient to discuss the matter when we have not the facts before us. I am sure that my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. John Haggart) will see that. It is exceedingly inconvenient to me, because my attention has not been called to the matter. It seems to me that the Committee on Public Accounts, to which these accounts have been referred, is the place where these matters should be discussed.

Mr. CROCKET. As to the statement of the minister that these things do not appear in the papers, I have the letter of Mr.

Geoffrey Stead in which he makes the statement specifically that this expenditure was made by Mr. Osman, that Downey had been appointed by him, and that the accounts, aggregating upwards of $2,000, he had sent to the department to be paid, and a subsequent letter asking that the work be allowed to go on in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Am I not right in this, that in the copy of the papers which the hon. gentleman handed over to the hon. member for Westmorland there is no account contained?

Mr. CROCKET. The account itself is not there, but he says in his letter that he is inclosing the amount, and here is the account in the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Downey was not appointed until after the expenditure was incurred and paid by the department.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. Here is an expenditure of $2,100 paid in some way by the department. There must have been collusion between some of the officials, or the accounts could not have passed the Auditor General's Department. An improper payment comes under the criminal law. Any party can be prosecuted and punished for the payment of any sum of money out of the treasury of the country in such a manner as this has been paid. The Auditor General's Report would lead you to believe that this $2,100 was paid in the ordinary form. The Auditor General must have believed that Downey and the other parties were employed under the direction of the Public Works Department, and their payment authorized in the regular way, or he never would have paid the account. If this account is paid, it was because he was deceived by the Department of Public Works, or by some one who gave him the information. The point I want to emphasize is the improper payment of this sum of money. It is claimed that Mr. Oscar Downey was appointed before the expenditure was made. If he was paid before, why does Mr. Osman pay him his wages? Why does he not come to the Department of Public Works for payment? Here we have the payment of the accounts of private individuals amounting to $2,100, and what I object to——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The payment to Downey and others does appear in the Auditor General's Report. I find in the report:

Conductor, Oscar Downey, 32 days at $2.50, $80.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Exactly. It appears in the Auditor General's Report as a payment by the Crown to these individuals, when the fact is, if the statement of my hon. friend from York is correct, the payment was made by Mr. Osman before Mr. Stead issued the instructions from the department to commence the work. I am protesting against the irregularity of this payment. I am not saying whether this public work is necessary or not, because I am not acquainted with the locality. An expenditure for the benefit of a private individual may benefit to a large extent the country around. I am not criticising that at all, but what I am criticising is the expenditure of money voted by this House in the manner in which it has been expended by the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think perhaps I ought to say a few words in reply to my hon. friend. I do appeal to him, and I ask him whether he has any facts before him, or are there any facts before this committee, which would warrant him in saying that there has been some criminal conduct on the part of the officials of the department?

Mr. J. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has my hon. friend seen the accounts?

Mr. J. HAGGART. I saw the accounts in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Here is the Auditor General's statement:

Pink Rock, Shepody bay, New Brunswick: Extension of Wharf.	
Inspector, G. S. McFadden, services during May and June, 29 days at $2.50	$ 72 50
Conductor, Oscar Downey, 32 days at $2.50	80 00
Sub-conductor, Warren Downey: 10 days at $2; 4-in. planks, 10,477 ft. at $12; 10x10 hemlock, 1,728 ft. at $13; ballast, 44·3 yds. at 80c.; scow and 2 men, 19 days at $8; sundry outlay, $1.50	357 14
Carpenters, 88·4 days at $2, 91 at $1.75; labourers, 24 days at $2, 237·5 at $1.50	740 30
Albert Mfg. Company: rd. hemlock timber, 43,429 ft. at $9; sq. spruce and hemlock, 10,054 ft. at $13; bolts, 3,866 lb. at 4c.; towing timber, 13 rafts at $12; sundries, $41.54	873 74
Small payments: rope, 20 lb. at 18c., 110 at 16c.; spikes, 3 kegs for $10.50; sundries, $5.11	36 81
King's Printer	17 25
	$2,177 74

Let me ask my hon. friend what there is either in this account or in the copy of the papers which the hon. member for York has produced that shows that there is a single false or erroneous statement as to the expenditure or payment?

Mr. J. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman seems to have misunderstood what I said. This $2,100 was expended by a private individual on that wharf before instructions were issued by the department for the commencement of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Well, then, there is a letter read by my hon. friend from York in which Mr. Osman sends these accounts to the department and asks for the payment of them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know my hon. friend is wrong in this——

Mr. J. HAGGART. Let us hear how I am mistaken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When he says that this work was undertaken by Mr. Osman without the consent of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. J. HAGGART. There is no evidence of the department's consent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; there is. It is contained in the copy of a letter from Mr. Osman, which is on file, and which the hon. member for York had the opportunity of reading, but which he did not read. In that letter Mr. Osman asks to be relieved from the duty and that somebody be appointed to take charge of the work. My hon. friend from Lanark perhaps could not be expected to take the trouble to examine that letter. Perhaps he thought that he could rely on the statement made by the hon. member for York.

Mr. CROCKET. So he could.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he had taken the trouble to read these papers he would have seen the statement that Osman, who had been authorized to take charge of these works, prayed to be relieved of the work and asked that somebody else be appointed to take charge of it.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Will you state another instance in the history of the department in which the owner of a wharf was told to go on with the extension of that wharf, hire labourers and do it at the expense of the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is where my hon. friend has been misled again. My hon. friend treats it as if this extension were on the property of Mr. Osman, that it was work which was being done for Mr. Osman, or for Mr. Osman's company. As to this my hon. friend is entirely mistaken. When I became Minister of Public Works I found these facts: The Albert Manufacturing Company had built a wharf 225 feet in length and 20 feet in width. I found that there had been a petition presented on behalf of the residents of Rock Port, Hard Ledge, Grand Anse and Pink Rock, in Westmorland, representing that this wharf should be extended and that greater accommodation and greater facilities should be given to the public. I found that petition had been presented by the hon. member for Westmorland, who had urged very strongly that this improvement should be made. Now, then, I determined that I would act upon the request of these petitioners, and I may say that as long ago as 1906 or 1907, before I became Minister of Public Works, there appeared an appropriation in the estimates for this purpose. I decided to carry that out. It was supposed that the cost would be $13,000 or $14,000 or $15,000. Mr. Osman was of the opinion that by making a short extension of some 47 feet the necessary public accommodation would be got, and he suggested that instead of going to the larger expenditure we should make this smaller expenditure. What did we do before we undertook it? I felt that it was not proper that we should make any extension or addition to this wharf unless we had control over it on behalf of the Crown. Mr. Osman, on behalf of the Albert Manufacturing Company, did not feel that they should deed to the Crown, free of charge, this large wharf, 225 feet in length, and in the end this agreement was made. My hon. friend will find it in the copy of papers submitted to the House. What was the agreement? It was that the Albert Manufacturing Company should give to the public a free right of way over this wharf and that the Crown should be entitled to collect wharfage from all vessels except the company's vessels using this wharf, and that, so far as this 225 feet was concerned, the company bound itself for all time to keep that part of the wharf in repair and as a return for that use of their wharf it was agreed that the company should be free from wharfage so far as the government wharf and the old wharf were concerned.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it an agreement of purchase and sale?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very good agreement from the standpoint of the Crown. The result was that instead of paying out any money for the 225 feet of wharf the Crown gets it for nothing; it builds its end as an addition and the public get a free right of way over the other part, which the company keeps in repair, and all the Crown does is to build the extension.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there a conveyance to the Crown or only an agreement of the two parties to the contract that one shall do certain things and the other certain other things?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a conveyance of an interest, a free right of way to the public over this wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. A conveyance of a right of way?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. There is an agreement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It gives a free right of way.

Mr. CROCKET. And the right to charge wharfage on all other vessels except their own?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, not only vessels lying at the new wharf, but lying at the old wharf, except those of the company.

Mr. hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) with that unhappy faculty he has of seeing something suspicious in everything which is done by a political opponent, suggests this extraordinary fact that Mr. Osman after it had been supposed it would be necessary to build a wharf which would cost $15,000, actually suggests it would be well to reduce it and bring the cost within the appropriation of $5,000 for that year. And so, said the hon. member, that that work might not only go on at once and be done by day labour——

Mr. CROCKET. That is what the correspondence says.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend knew perfectly well that Mr. Osman gives an explanation in one of the letters he had in his hand. He said that at that time he supposed the extension of 47 feet would be sufficient by dredging out a berth for the vessels beside the wharf, and that it would not be necessary to go to the further expense, but he says that the masters of three ships which the company had chartered to load plaster refused to go to the wharf because it was not extended out far enough and did not afford sufficient shelter, and that is the reason and the only reason why the plans were afterwards changed, and we went back to the original design to build out 75 feet and also build a breakwater to make a safe harbour. And yet with the copies of the letters in his hand, the hon. member thought it was proper to make the insinuation——

Mr. CROCKET. I read the very letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY——and that is the time I was obliged to ask the hon. member to raise his voice so that we on this side of the House could hear him.

Mr. FOSTER. Could the minister give the dates when the extension was asked, when the department decided to carry out the extension of the work, when the work commenced, and when Mr. Downey was appointed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not all these particulars now but can procure the dates. The application was made in 1906; the project was submitted to the chief engineer to build an extension on July 30, 1906. The work was begun in 1907, and 1908 when I think it was decided to build only the 47 foot extension.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that order given.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time in the fiscal year 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. These dates will tell the whole story.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Later on, I think in the following year, it was decided to build the extension when it was represented by Mr. Osman that vessel owners had refused to come to the wharf. I think the reasons given by Mr. Osman were amply sufficient and that we were justified in deciding to make the extension because it would be useless to expend that money unless the public could be accommodated. I do not intend to go into the details of these accounts beyond saying that it will be found there is a letter from Mr. Osman, in which, speaking of the timber, he says that if the timber is cut off the company's land it will be got at a lower cost than elsewhere, and I am sure that those who know Mr. Osman will corroborate what the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has said that he would not have any desire that he or his company should make a dollar out of supplying timber or anything else for this wharf.

I invite members of the committee who feel an interest in this matter to take the account to be found at page V-187 of the Auditor General's Report and look at the prices charged and then determine whether or not any excessive price has been paid. I find that for hemlock, 10 x 10, we paid $13 a thousand. I think no one will say that that is not a reasonable, that it is not a cheap price.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the price that is paid but the principle, the man buying from himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Round hemlock timber at $9 a thousand. I venture to say $3 a thousand less than it could be bought from any one else. Square spruce and hemlock, 1,054 feet at $13. No one will say that is not a reasonable and fair price. It does seem to me that when you bear in mind that Mr. Osman undertook this work at the request of the responsible head of the department, that he undertook it, as we then thought, in the public interest and that it is not suggested that a single dollar has been paid beyond a fair and reasonable price, and when it is remembered that every account was certified to by the resident engineer in the usual way that the prices were fair and reasonable, I do not see what my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) has to complain of. He says that this is a sample of what is going on in New Brunswick. Let me say to my hon. friend that if he is not able to produce any stronger testimony that

there is any improper expenditure on the part of the department he will make but little headway in the province from which we both come, and where we are both reasonably well known. I see nothing in this account in regard to which any reflection can be made on the department.

Just a word in regard to another suggestion made in reference to myself. He thought it necessary in the discussion of this item to go a good many miles away to Dalhousie in the county of Restigouche, and to state that the Department of Public Works was dredging out and improving a wharf property which belonged to the Dalhousie Lumber Company of which I happen to be a shareholder. I can appeal to my hon. friend who represents the county of Restigouche (Mr. Reid), a gentleman who stands as high as any other member of this House, as to whether or not the dredging work which was done there was done solely for the benefit of the Dalhousie Lumber Company. The dredge employed by the department was doing the work of improving the harbour of Dalhousie. Well, it is not my fault that I happen to be interested in the Dalhousie Lumber Company. It happened that some years ago I did take some stock in that company. It is my misfortune that, as I have made a little money from time to time, I have not laid it up in savings banks or bought bonds with it, but have invested it in industrial enterprises and in property in different parts of the country. Let me give to my hon. friend a pointer of which he may avail himself when we come to discuss harbour improvements for the city of St. John. Let me tell him that I happen to own property in that city, and he can make as strong a point in regard to the improvements there as he does in regard to the improvements in the port of Dalhousie. From the fact of my owning property in the city of St. John, improvements made in that port will to a certain extent benefit my property as that of every other citizen of that city. Let me give him another pointer. I happen to own property in the Northwest, and when my hon. friend goes back to his constituents, let him tell the people in the back country that all this development which the Minister of Public Works is seeking jointly with his colleagues to bring about in the Northwest, is really going to confer a benefit upon him, and that it is a dreadful thing that he should be interested in properties in various sections of the country which are likely to be benefited by the development which is taking place. But let me tell my hon. friend I am not going to stop making improvements in my department wherever I can develop trade, improve the facilities for doing business, make the people more prosperous and enable them to carry on their undertakings to better advantage, because those improvements may indirectly benefit myself as one interested in the community where the work is going on or having some interest in the country at large.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister in reply to a statement made by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked what evidence there was that the $2,018.96 set out in the Auditor General's Report had not been paid in the regular way to the parties therein named. I have already laid before the committee the evidence from the files of the department, namely, a letter from Geoffrey Stead of the 13th of May, 1908, in which he incloses the company's account, amounting to the very sum set out in the Auditor General's Report, and calls attention to the fact that the expenditure was made by the company who were asking the payment to be made to themselves.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this very return which my hon. friend had in his hand, does not Mr. Osman say that he had undertaken this work at the request of the minister, and then asks to be relieved of it and to have some one else take it?

Mr. CROCKET. If there is such a statement, it did not come under my notice. It is entirely new to me that Mr. Osman was asked by the Department of Public Works to construct the extension of their own wharf. If he was, it is very much worse than the case already presented. If the Department of Public Works, without calling for tenders, simply authorized the owner of the wharf to build an extension of his own wharf, and placed the matter absolutely in his control, how is it that the account is set out as it is in the Auditor General's Report? Surely the minister must be mistaken, because if Mr. Osman had authority to do that, the payment would appear as made to him. There is no question, from the return brought down, that this money was expended by Mr. Osman or by the company of which he is managing director, and that account was forwarded to the Public Works Department, and was paid out of the public treasury just as if the work had been constructed under the direction and supervision of the department. The minister has taken occasion to refer to the statement I made in reference to the dredging that was done at Dalhousie, and has stated that he is the owner of considerable property at St. John and in the Northwest, and that there would be just as much justification in my making the statement that he was benefited by the expenditure of his department in the city of St. John and in the Northwest as at Dalhousie. Surely the minister does not expect to deceive this House by such a

statement as that. At Dalhousie the dredging was done in front of and beside the wharf of the Dalhousie Lumber Company of which the minister is a stockholder, while other work was neglected.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What other work was neglected?

Mr. CROCKET. The dredge was employed month after month in 1908 and in 1909 dredging at the wharf of the Dalhousie Lumber Company, while the dredging at the deep-water public wharf was neglected to the detriment of the public interest.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I just wish to tell my hon. friend—and if the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Reid) be here, he will corroborate me that no other work of equal or greater importance has been neglected. I know that the Dalhousie Lumber Company ships from fifteen to twenty five million feet of lumber every year. They have a large mill and employ quite a large number of people. I do happen to know that they have an enemy there, a man who tried to block their enterprise from the time they started, and who is allied politically to the hon. member for York. He is possibly the man from whom my hon. friend has been getting certain information, but I can assure the committee that it has never been brought to my notice that any dredging of any kind in the harbour was of more importance to the public interest generally than the dredging done since I have been Minister of Public Works.

Pointe du Chêne, New Brunswick—repairs to and stone slope along base of breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the point of connection between the railway and the island steamers. This is work which has to be done every year.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was spent last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have reason to suppose that the whole $5,000 has either already been spent or will be spent by the 31st March next. That is the estimate of the chief engineer.

Quaco harbour—part reconstruction and extension of east pier, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This includes reconstruction of the head block of the pier at the east side of the entrance, also an extension of the pier, and a further length of sixty feet of crib-work.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the whole cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the business done there now?

Mr. CROCKET.

Mr. PUGSLEY. General business—lumber, fish, manufacturing, and this is required as a harbour of refuge.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the work under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, to Charleson and Burns of Ottawa. The amount of contract is $32,900.

Mr. CROCKET. How much has been paid on account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was expended to the 31st September, 1909, $25,633.

Richibucto Cape—breakwater wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for building a breakwater about six miles above the mouth of the river. The breakwater is 375 feet long, of which 225 feet is 15 feet wide and 150 feet is 20 feet wide; pier head 200 feet long on the inside face, and 30 feet long. The inside face is 25 feet in width. Crib-work estimated 220,000 cubic feet. Cost $17,600 when completed. Total estimated cost with contingencies $20,000. The expenditure last year was $9,080, we expect to spend this fiscal year $5,000, and are asking $5,000 more, making a total of $19,-118.

Mr. FOSTER. What public purpose will this work serve?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will afford safe anchorage and give a landing place at a point nearest to a very valuable fishing ground. It will be the best harbour of refuge in that vicinity. It is also the centre of a good farming country. The yearly catch of lobsters is about $15,000 to $16,-000 and herring about $12,000. There are forty-one boats engaged in the fishing industry, and they require a harbour of refuge.

Mr. CROCKET. Was not the work done last year, completely washed away?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no intimation to that effect.

Mr. CROCKET. My information is that the whole work done last year was completely washed away by a storm, and furthermore that the work done the year before was washed away last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is misinformed entirely.

Mr. CROCKET. I have a letter to that effect. The work of last year was completely destroyed by a storm, and every year's work is regularly swept away the following year, so that this expenditure is simply a waste of public money. This letter was written very shortly after the storm occurred. If the department wants to construct something, it would do better to

take a large appropriation and put up something that will stand the test of the weather and not go on making these expenditures from year to year to no purpose. This is like other expenditures made in that county—simply to put into the hands of political heelers public money. The object of the appropriation seems to be more for the purpose of circulating money among those who are doing party service than for any public benefit. It is very remarkable, if this work has been swept away by a recent storm, that the department has not heard of it. Although in one sense it is not so surprising, since the work has been in the hands of the persons who have been desirous of seeing it carried on simply for the purpose of participating in the expenditure. Mr. J. D. Irving has also been receiving large amounts of money on account of this work. Reference has been made to the fact that this same gentleman has been drawing $2 a day for a scow worth $50. He had been receiving that rental year after year, for a scow which cost hmi $150; in four years he has received over $600 rent from the government. This same gentleman has been selling hemlock stumpage for the purpose of this work. I understand the logs are cut by men employed by the government, and paid by the government, and Mr. Irving receives $4 for what he pays the local government 40 cents for. The men employed by the government do all the cutting and do all the work that is involved in the removal of the logs, which means that he gets $4 for stumpage for which he pays only 40 cents to the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope my hon. friend will seek to verify the statements, which may come to him from time to time. I am sure he has been the victim of a good deal of exaggeration. Now he made a similar statement with regard to Richibucto Cape some days ago, and my deputy informs me that he has made inquiry and he finds my hon. friend was entirely misinformed with regard to it; and he is not unlikely to have been misinformed also with regard to the breakwater at Richibucto Cape. We have no information in the department that the breakwater has been washed away. With regard to Mr. Irving selling material for a breakwater, I make the same remark. This is before the Public Accounts Committee. It appears in the reports of 1908, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that too much money has been paid to Mr. Irving or anybody else, I would invite him to have witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee to that effect.

Mr. CROCKET. With regard to the statement I made, I received it from the largest property owner at Richibucto Cape.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name?

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Richard O'Leary. He would have more interest in this work than any one else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the gentleman who wrote that letter to Mr. Waterbury?

Mr. CROCKET. It is the same Mr. O'Leary, from whom Thomas O. Murray bought the sawdust wharf for $700, to sell to the government for $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A wharf in respect of which no man from Richibucto, with the exception of Richard O'Leary, could be produced and swear that the property was not worth $5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I do not propose to discuss the Richibucto wharf now, we will have occasion to discuss that in more detail later on. But the minister asked me to verify these statements. I have made statements here in reference to expenditures in Kent county, based upon information received from that county. I have afterwards had the opportunity of examining witnesses, upon oath, in reference to those statements, and in every case, I may say the information which I had received was completely borne out by sworn evidence, even though some of it had to be extracted from unwilling witnesses. Unfortunately when Mr. Irving was on the stand, I omitted to question him about the item of hemlock stumpage, but I have no doubt had I done so, my information in this matter would also have been verified.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 113) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

On section 2,—time for construction of railway, Sudbury to Little Current, extended.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. I opposed this section as it was introduced in committee. My reason for doing so was that I thought the time should be made in accordance with the provisions of a Bill passed in the Ontario legislature, at its session of last year, relating to this company, which limited the time for the completion of the entire line from Sudbury to Little Current to not later than the 31st of December, 1911. Before the committee I urged the modification of the Bill, and the promoters, I am glad to say, saw the reasonableness of my contention and acceded to the view that the time should be extended only two years. I make this remark because of the fact that in a

newspaper that published the proceedings of that committee it is stated that I opposed the granting of the extension for two years and wished to have it made three years. Of course, exactly the reverse was the case.

On section 12,

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended that they should be controlled by the Railway Act with regard to the commencement and completion of the railway? There is nothing in the Bill as to when they shall commence.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is covered by the General Railway Act.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. Would not that include the bridge and tunnel as well?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Railway Act might not cover the bridge and tunnel.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is there a clause declaring this to be a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, this is a new charter. There is provision in the Railway Act that they shall commence within two years, complete within five and make an expenditure of fifteen per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. What about it being declared a work for the general advantage of Canada? It crosses from Quebec to Ontario, and you do not give it any powers of amalgamation.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a difference of opinion as to the necessity of that, particularly with reference to a new charter. I do not think it makes a great deal of difference whether you declare it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada or not. If you were taking over a provincial road and making it a Dominion road it might be necessary to declare it, but we are giving a new charter, and I do not think it is necessary to make such a declaration.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose we chartered a short road within a province, would you regard the fact that we were giving it a federal charter as bringing it under the provision which would declare it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada without saying so? The giving of a federal charter does not make it a work for the general advantage of Canada. Its crossing from one province to another might probably do that, but the giving of a federal charter would not.

Mr. LENNOX. In the British North America Act I think it is declared that a work which is interprovincial, is, without any declaration whatever, a work for the general advantage of Canada. Where it is not clear we may make a declaration when we find the facts warrant it. In this case it would not appear to be necessary.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is apparently a good deal of difference of opinion among legal gentlemen as to the necessity of making a declaration even when a road is all in one province and where we are giving it a Dominion charter. We have been in the habit, where it was in one province, of declaring it to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. We do that where it is crossing two or three provinces as well.

Mr. GRAHAM. When we are taking over a provincial undertaking we always do it.

Mr. LENNOX. We do it lots of times, any way, whether it is necessary or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. There is a question whether it is necessary or not, but perhaps it gives greater security.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think we do it uniformly in almost every Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. In almost every Bill, and it seems to me that it would be better to adopt one principle or the other. If it is unnecessary to say so we should keep it out of all; if it is necessary to say so in all we should put it in all.

Mr. GRAHAM. As there is a difference among legal men concerning it, the question might be raised when the company went to finance its road that there might be some trouble between the provincial and the federal jurisdiction. When the clause is in there cannot be any difference of opinion.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. What supervision will the department have with regard to the construction of the bridge? It might interfere with navigation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the Act no bridge can be constructed over a navigable stream until the plans are submitted to the Department of Public Works.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WESTERN POWER COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 86) respecting the Western Power Company, Limited.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would ask that the Bill stand.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The language of this Bill, as it is reported by the Railway Committee, seems to be unusual and objectionable. The frame in which the Bill is cast presents, to my mind, still more objectionable characteristics, and I should hope that it would be possible to meet the views of the promoters without adopting this form of legislation. The situation is that this Western Power Company is incorporated under letters patent of the Dominion. I have not seen the letters patent and they are not recited with any fullness

in the preamble of the statute, but I assume that the reason for obtaining letters patent to incorporate this company from the Dominion, was that its operations were not intended to be limited to any one province. At the present time all the operations of the company, I understand, are within the territorial limits of British Columbia.

What the company desires is to obtain power to carry on in connection with its undertaking the construction and operation of a line of railway or tramway, with the accompanying telegraph or telephone lines, for some 6 or 10 miles, between the powerhouse and other works of the company. The way in which it is proposed to accomplish that purpose by this Bill is to authorize the company to lay out, construct and operate these proposed additional works, as the company may from time to time be authorized to do so by the legislature of British Columbia. In other words, the form which this proposed legislation takes is that parliament here should empower this company, its own creature, to take powers from the provincial legislature such as that legislature might choose to confer upon it. I think that would be an altogether anomalous, and to a great extent a contradictory proceeding. My idea is that when any company is incorporated by this parliament, no matter for what purpose, that company must thenceforward look to this parliament alone for any legislation it may need for the purposes of its undertaking. Certainly no provincial legislature could diminish or cut down the powers which this parliament might confer upon a company which it incorporates. No more could it extend such powers. This parliament, having created a corporate body, this parliament alone, in my opinion, must thenceforward have legislative jurisdiction with regard to that corporate body. This company, it is true, was not incorporated by special legislation of this parliament; but it is to all intents and purposes in the same position, having been incorporated by letters patent of the Dominion; and in my view it is a matter of propriety, if it is not a question of jurisdiction, whether any other legislature than this could give to the company so brought into existence any enabling legislation. However, that may be, if I am wrong in that view, and if it can be that a company incorporated under Dominion authority may still receive something in the way of additional powers from a provincial legislature, it would certainly be improper that we should authorize the granting of such additional powers by a provincial legislature without knowing beforehand what those powers were to be—that we should confirm beforehand, as it were, and without seeing what we were confirming, legislation hereafter to be passed by some provincial body. The Bill as it comes before us proposes that this parliament should empower the company in question to lay out, construct and operate railway lines according as the company may from time to time be authorized so to do by the provincial legislature. I think we certainly ought not to legislate in the dark, and to empower a company to operate lines that we know nothing about, and that may or may not be of such a character as would commend themselves to this parliament if the particulars of the proposition were before the House for consideration. In that situation I certainly should press that this legislation receive further consideration, and that it should be studied by those who are promoting this Bill, with a view to finding some other shape in which the company which desires this additional power should be given it than in this particular form, which to my mind has so many objectionable features.

Mr. BARKER. I think the Minister of Justice did not hear what I am told was said by the gentleman whose name is on the back of the Bill, that he was willing to allow it to stand. I think we all, after what we have heard, would desire the promoters to consider the matter further before the final discussion on the Bill. I say that more particularly because some years ago I took similar objection to a Bill introduced by a gentleman on the other side of the House who wanted powers adopted by this parliament which had been conferred by the provincial legislature, and who rather objected to our inquiry as to what those powers were. I objected to it very strongly, and in the sub-committee on that Bill I was found fault with because I did so. The question was afterwards submitted to the Prime Minister, who found, on looking into the whole question, that the powers asked for were so objectionable that the Bill had to be withdrawn. I do not know anything about the merits of this particular Bill; but having taken that stand at that time, I agree with the Minister of Justice that we ought to be careful, and I understand that the hon. gentleman whose name is on this Bill is willing that it should stand.

Mr. EMMERSON. I took practically the same objection before the Railway Committee as that taken by the Minister of Justice to-night, and my suggestion was that the Bill should be referred to a sub-committee, having in mind the very Bill referred to by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). It seemed to me that would expedite the passage of the Bill, and I think it would expedite it now to refer the Bill

back to the Railway Committee rather than to allow it to stand on the order paper.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I did suggest, before the discussion commenced, that this Bill should stand. My object being to make just such an arrangement as has been suggested. I may say that the promoters of this Bill are in the rather embarrassing position of the old gentleman in the fable who tried to please everybody and pleased nobody. I hope the same result will not follow. The object of the promoters is very simple and very innocent. They have, as has been stated, a charter under the Companies Act, and they are dealing with power secured from the federal government. They want to construct and operate a tramway which is essential to the carrying on of their construction works. Their whole desire is to arrive at that object in the simplest way.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you not give them power to build under a federal charter?

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I may say that when this Bill was before the Railway Committee, the suggestion was that they should be empowered to build such lines as they might be authorized to construct by legislative or other competent authority, and with the desire to satisfy the committee, that was changed to read 'under the authority of the legislature of British Columbia'. All that the company desire is that they may be put in the position that any private individual would be in who had money enough to build that railway. Such private individual would not require to come to this parliament at all; but this being a corporate company, and not being empowered to engage in the construction or operation of railways, they took this step. I may say that I entirely concur in the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that the Bill should stand in order that an arrangement satisfactory to everybody may be arrived at.

Mr. CONMEE. I think there are other objections. It would create a precedent that I think should not be created. We give to this company power for all time to get such additional powers as the legislature may give to them. It is true, the legislature may guard the public interest. but the undertaking is entirely out of the control of this parliament. The Board of Railway Commissioners have not that control over it that they have over other lines. I think the best plan would be for the promoter of the Bill to refer it back to the Railway Committee to deal with it as was suggested in that committee before.

Mr. GUTHRIE. An amendment to the clause has been drawn by the promoters and has been submitted to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and I believe it is satisfactory to him. It practically strikes out the whole of clause 1 and enacts that subject to the provisions of the Railway Act the company may lay out, construct and operate a line of railway. They also insert the usual clause which makes this practically a railway Bill, declaring it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. Perhaps the minister will express an opinion on the proposed amendment, as I understand he will not be here next week.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This proposition, so far as the form of the legislation is concerned, is entirely free from the objections which I have just been suggesting to the Bill as it came from the committee, and so far as the merits of the legislation go, I have no word of objection to offer to the company obtaining the additional powers it desires. With reference, however, to the proposal to insert in the Bill the declaration that the undertaking of the company is a work for the general advantage of Canada, that is a declaration which I think we are all agreed had better be sparingly made. With regard to a company which is incorporated by the Dominion, I cannot see how it has any appropriate place. It is, of course, only this parliament which can make that declaration. No provincial legislature can make it. This parliament must be its own judge of the propriety of making that declaration with regard to any undertaking; but the whole effect of making it is that from the time it is made, no other body than this parliament has any power to legislate with reference to that particular company. Therefore, it is a declaration which it is appropriate enough to make when we are transferring some provincial undertaking to our jurisdiction, but which has no propriety whatever in the case of a company which we are incorporating, and which, therefore, never was under any other jurisdiction than that of this parliament. I cannot see any use that it has, because without it any legislation which this company was at any time to obtain would have to be obtained from this parliament, because it is a Dominion company, and if it is useless and inappropriate, I scarcely see the object of inserting it even though it might be unobjectionable.

Mr. BARKER. I hesitate to say a word against the opinion expressed by the Minister of Justice, but there seems to me to be this question involved in what he has just said. We sometimes pass Acts of parliament relating to companies, with power to construct railways wholly within a province, almost local concerns; but we have been in the habit, a very bad one, I think, of taking a railway which upon the face of the charter is a local railway under the

jurisdiction of a province, and removing it to the jurisdiction of the Dominion, by simply declaring it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada. We have done that deliberately, wantonly, and, if I were to use a legal term, I might say maliciously. If we are to understand that hereafter no Bill shall pass the Railway Committee merely because these magical words are put into it, and that every applicant for a railway charter shall be required to show that the railway is a work for the general advantage of Canada, I should be very glad to know that and to follow it up, But I am afraid we shall have to go back a great deal on the legislation that we have been enacting in the past, and will have to forget that for years we have been creating corporations to build railways that we have no right whatever to deal with.

Mr. CONMEE. Do I understand the hon. member to contend that this parliament has not the right to incorporate a railway within a province unless we declare it to be a work for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. BARKER. I assert, without a shadow of doubt, that again and again we have taken upon ourselves in this parliament to deal with undertakings which we have no more right to deal with than the declaration of faith. We have been creating companies to construct railways over which we have no right or jurisdiction whatever, and have enabled ourselves to do that by declaring the work to be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. CONMEE. Suppose we gave a charter without making that declaration?

Mr. BARKER. In many cases it would not be worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not agree with you.

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly I may be charged with being somewhat of a sinner in that respect, but there is only one body I know of in Canada which really regulates the rates of railways, and that is the Board of Railway Commissioners, and it has been my desire, so far as possible, to bring any railway that was going to do any kind of general traffic under that board. A question has been raised as to jurisdiction, but my standpoint is to get the greatest benefit to the public; and wherever it is possible to have a railway doing a general traffic brought under the control of the board, I shall go as far as I can to have that done.

Mr. ROCHE. There are provincial boards.

Mr. GRAHAM. They have not regulated many rates so far.

Mr. ROCHE. They are created for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Railway Commissioners are doing good work along that line. I am under the impression that a decision or an opinion has been given recently that it is questionable whether the board has the right to regulate the traffic, even if it be through traffic, when the charter was granted by a province. If that be the case, we ought, whenever possible, to bring these railways under federal jurisdiction and get control of their rates and operations.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think that, under our authority to control trade and commerce, we would have the right to build a railway between two points, though both were in one province, to carry on a through route trade? We have specifically provided that we shall have control of trade and commerce; and it seems to me, from the arguments I have heard, over and over again, in this House by very eminent legal men, such as the Hon. Edward Blake and the late Hon. David Mills, that we have a perfect right to build a railway anywhere, even if it were only five miles long and in the centre of a province.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 97) respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 90) respecting the Central Ontario railway.—Mr. Stratton.

Bill (No. 107) to incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Gladu.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 136) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Richibucto wharf—reconstruction of approach and headblock, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This amount is required to make further provision toward the repairs necessary to render safe this wharf which was purchased from the municipality of the county. It was purchased for $1,500, but was not in good state of repairs. The total estimated cost of the improvements is $11,500. Expended in 1908-9, $2,299, and there will be expended to the 31st March next, $3,156, and we are asking now $5,000, leaving $1,000 more to complete the work.

Mr. CROCKET. It is not intended to complete it during the present year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could not do so unless we asked an item in the supplementary estimates. We may possibly do that.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to know from the minister if it is the intention to continue Thos. O. Murray as the foreman of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is too far ahead to determine as to that. We shall not determine it until toward the spring when we make our preparations for continuing the work.

Mr. CROCKET. The reason I ask is that, Thomas O. Murray, I have no hesitation in saying, perpetrated a fraud upon the public treasury as conductor of that work. We have the proof of the fact that Mr. Murray, when conductor of the work, sent in a bill to the government for 60,000 feet of logs in the name of John Dumas, at $12 per 1,000 feet, half of which he purchased from Richard O'Leary, of Richibucto—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I call my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) to order, Mr. Chairman. If the committee have finished and made their report, he can discuss the matter, but while it is before the Public Accounts Committee, I submit, it is not in order to discuss it here. Certainly it is very inconvenient to attempt to discuss it here for we have not the papers. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CROCKET. Allow me to say, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister takes that ground the item will have to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a well known rule that when a matter is under consideration of a committee by action of the House, it is not in order, in other proceedings, to discuss the procedure of that committee. I have no official knowledge that any such matter is before the committee. The hon. member (Mr. Crocket) has not proceeded far enough in his remarks to enable me to judge whether they are pertinent to the question or not, so I do not, for the present, rule him out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am ready to be guided by the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) himself. If he says that the matter is not before the Public Accounts Committee I will take his statement. But my information is that it is before the committee and the committee has not reported upon it.

Mr. CROCKET. That does not debar me from making this statement—that Mr. Murray, the conductor of this work, sent in a bill to the Public Works Department in the name of John Dumas for 60,000 feet of lumber——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Order. I will take your ruling upon the matter, Mr. Chairman. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) admits that the matter is before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. So far as I have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) I am not yet in a position to rule his remarks out of order. But I would ask him to make his remarks as relevant as possible and to bring them to bear upon the item before the committee.

Mr. CROCKET. It is this very item that I am discussing. I say, in the presence and hearing of the minister, that Mr. Murray, the conductor, or foreman of this public work, has perpetrated a fraud —a criminal offence upon the government of the country—that he sent in a fictitious bill to the Public Works Department for lumber for which he paid only $6 and $7 a thousand, and for which he received $12 a thousand. I am simply astonished at the statement of the minister that, having that knowledge—as he must have it; as I know he has it—he will not be able to determine for a year or two whether Mr. Murray is to be continued—

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say a year or two, I said a month or two.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood that the work was to go on—

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be during the spring of the present year.

Mr. CROCKET—that he would not be able to determine until the work was to be resumed whether this man was to be continued. I ask members of this House what they think of this government employing men capable of such conduct as that? I make this statement now so that the minister will understand that he takes the full responsibility if he is going to allow this kind of fraud to be continued in the province of New Brunswick. This is the same Thos. O. Murray who bought the Richibucto wharf, the 'sawdust wharf' which has been mentioned, at $700, and immediately turned it over to the Public Works Department for $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) certainly will not help his cause, as a man never helps any cause by distorting the facts. He has made the statement that Mr. Thomas O. Murray immediately turned over this wharf to the government for $5,000. That, Sir, is absolutely incorrect. It is true—although it is out of order to refer to what has taken place in the Pub-

lic Accounts Committee—it is true that it appeared that Mr. Murray had bought the wharf property for $700 from Mr. O'Leary, and that the government, having in view the possibility that it might be required, had the chief engineer make an examination of the property. Mr. Murray gave to the engineer an option on the property. But the government did not determine to buy it for several months after that, and not until it was twice reported on, and not until the chief engineer of my department and myself were perfectly satisfied that the property was a good bargain at $5,000. I do not hesitate to say here to-night, and I do not hesitate to say anywhere, that the government got a good bargain for the sum of $5,000. And I want to repeat a remark I made before the recess, that it is an extraordinary thing that, although the hon. gentleman had all the witnesses here from Richibucto, although he had here one of the most prominent citizens of Richibucto, he did not venture to produce a single witness to testify to the value of the property except Mr. Richard O'Leary, although witness after witness was produced to testify that the property was well worth $5,000, one witness put in the value as high as $10,000. It is a fact which, I think, ought to have great weight with this committee that the hon. gentleman was not able to produce a single witness from the town of Richibucto, with a population of about 1,000, except Mr. O'Leary, who would question the value of the property, and who was prepared to say that it was worth one dollar less than $5,000. So far as that property is concerned, I have no hesitation in defending anywhere the purchase which was made by the government. That, however, is beside the question.

The hon. gentleman has asked me to give an assurance to-night that Mr. Thomas Murray will not be appointed foreman of this work. The hon. gentleman has chosen to make a statement as to what took place before the Public Accounts Committee, he has made a charge based, as he says, upon evidence before that committee, that Murray has been guilty of a fraud and a criminal act against the government. Sir, I have learned during the course of my public career, not to judge people until the tribunal which is called upon to try them has made its report, and I decline to-night, until that committee has reported the evidence, until I have had an opportunity of examining it, and until this committee has had an opportunity of examining it, I decline to express any opinion as to the conduct of Mr. Murray, who was the foreman of the work. I have not made any appointment of a foreman, I have not decided to make Mr. Murray foreman of the work for the coming year. When I do so, if I act improperly, my conduct will be open to question by the hon. gentleman, as well as by other hon. gentlemen. Now then, my hon. friend states that Mr. Murray fraudulently put in bills for $12 per thousand for lumber which only cost $7. I do not know what is the evidence before the committee; I was not present at all the meetings of the committee, though I was at one or two of them, so I did not hear all the evidence. But I have been informed that the average cost of the lumber was $12 per thousand, that some of it was bought at the lower price of $7, some of it cost $15, but it was all put in at the average price of $12 per thousand, which would be the average cost of the total quantity of lumber. I do not know whether that statement is true or not, and I am not prepared to discuss it until the committee makes its report and has been discharged from the performance of its duty in connection with that matter. As I have already said, I have come to no conclusion to appoint Mr. Murray. The matter has not been up for consideration. All I am asking now is a vote for the continuance of the work. When the time comes to appoint a foreman, I can assure my hon. friend that no one will be appointed against whom there can be a shadow of suspicion, so far as integrity is concerned.

Mr. BARKER. I do not intend to go into the question of the other work as to which Mr. Murray was charged with impropriety as an officer of this government; I propose to confine my remarks to the item before the House. I understand that the person alluded to has been doing certain work in connection with the item now before the House, and an hon. member of this House says that that person an officer of the government has been cheating this country in connection with that work, has been deliberately and wilfully defrauding the government by charging up an article as costing $12 when he only paid $7. That is the point. We are asked to give the hon. minister further money to go on with that work, and he is asked whether he is going to continue as foreman this man who is under that charge. He says, I will consider that matter at the proper time. Now I do not mean to say that because an hon. member of this House has made so grave a charge, upon his responsibility as a member, as that an employee of the minister has been robbing this country, that necessarily that charge should justify us in withholding the money from the minister; but I do say that it is a proper question for the members of this House to consider, to discuss, and it is proper to drag, if necessary, from the minister a clear, business-like answer. The minister knows that that charge has been made, I think he has known it, certainly he knows it now. I ask him now if, in the interest of this country, he thinks it right to continue that man in

the service of the department, in the expenditure of money on behalf of this country, so long as that charge remains against him. I say it is a most improper thing; no official of a corporation would dare to continue such a man in such a position; he would suspend the man until he had investigated the charge to the bottom.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not at all complain of the spirit in which my hon. friend has addressed the committee. I quite agree with him that when a member of this House states that the evidence before the committee shows that a foreman has been guilty of improper conduct, it is the duty of the minister to investigate the matter, to go through the evidence carefully, to weigh it, and if the evidence shows any improper conduct on the part of the foreman, then it is the duty of the minister not to retain him. That is the very course I intend to pursue.

Mr. BARKER. I intended to say that it was the minister's duty to suspend this man until the charge has been investigated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that that man is no longer in the employ of the government, he ceased to be employed at the close of the season. I shall feel it my duty to do exactly what my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) suggests. But I am not prepared to-night, simply upon the ipse dixit of any member of this House —I will not say, least of all, of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket), it would not be courteous to say that—but I am not prepared, until I read the evidence and have an opportunity of judging for myself, to pass judgment against any man who has been in the employ of the department. But as I have said, Mr. Murray is no longer in the employ of the government, and before we make a new appointment I should feel it my duty to investigate very carefully the evidence, and then determine as to whether he has been guilty of improper conduct; and if there is a shadow of suspicion against him, I shall feel it my duty not to re-employ him.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister has not, up to the present time, read the evidence taken before the committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not.

Mr. CROCKET. I am satisfied that if the minister reads this evidence which I have in my hand now, and applies a fair unbiased judgment to that evidence, he will not assume the responsibility of retaining, Mr. Thomas Murray in this position any longer. I do think that there ought to be not only a dismissal, but it is very questionable to my mind if some criminal proceedings should not be taken in such a matter as this. If the employees of the government are to be allowed to perpetrate criminal offences, and I say here that Mr. Murray did obtain money from the government under false pretenses, with impunity, the public cannot be expected to have much confidence in the honest administration of their officers. I have made this statement to-night solely for the purpose of drawing the minister's attention to it so that he will understand that he will have to take the responsibility if Mr. Murray is longer continued as foreman of this work.

Richibucto harbour—breakwater—piers on north and south sides, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an amount required to complete the extension of a section of 140 feet of the north breakwater begun in 1908, and also to complete the first 200 feet of the south breakwater. We are building two breakwaters, upon the north side and one upon the south side. This amount of $9,000 will not complete the whole work but it is expected that it will complete these sections.

Mr. CROCKET. How much additional will it take to complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends upon the extent to which the breakwater is carried. If it is carried out as far as it is recommended that we should go the cost will reach about $58,000. That is to do a thoroughly complete job, but we do not propose to do anything like that in the immediate future.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the department any plans of the work proposed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, but it is proceeding by sections.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that part of the Jardine contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was a work done by Mr. Jardine.

Mr. CROCKET. The Jardine contract is still running?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, his contract is completed.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is doing this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will let a new contract for this work.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the Jardine contract completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. August, 1908.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was paid under the Jardine contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was $17,000, and I think it was all paid—I am not sure as to that.

Mr. CROCKET. He was paid more than $17,000, was he not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps he was. There was some extra work which he was paid for.

Mr. CROCKET. How much was he paid in extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say that I have not a memorandum of the amount but I think it was some $3,000 or $4.000. I am speaking now from my memory. I can get that for my hon. friend and give it to him later.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the minister able to give any explanation of the extras?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a memorandum of them. I will undertake to get that information for my hon. friend before we get through with the items of some of the provinces and he can discuss it.

Mr. CROCKET. This $9,000, I understand, is for the commencement of a new work, for the extension of the work performed under the Jardine contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we will let a new contract for the work.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost of the work to be done under the new contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose only letting a contract at the present time for $9,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this work be completed during the coming year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

River St. John, including tributaries, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to do work, no separate portion of which is large in extent. Last year it amounted to $2,670. We did not expend the whole $6,000. We are asking for $6,000, which is the amount usually taken. This is to make improvements in various parts of the river, principally in the upper waters.

River St. John and tributaries—construction of wharfs in tidal waters, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a number of wharfs in the tidal waters of the river St. John and tributaries. I will give a statement of the expenditures for the construction of wharfs under the vote that we are now asking in 1908-9 and 1909-10, or up to the 10th of the present month:

—	1908-09.	1909-10 up to February 10.	Total expenditure up to February 10, 1910.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Long Island, Kings Co	894 31	298 07	1,192 38
Kennedy's Flat	237 00	.....	237 00
Mather's Island, Kings Co	543 33	408 67	952 00
Chase Wharf, low water, Queens Co	1,662 87	.....	1,662 87
Chase's Point, Queens Co	1,962 31	194 26	2,156 57
Oromocto, Sunbury Co., high water wharf, inclusive of right of way	4,530 14	1,203 49	5,733 63
McGowan Sheffield, Sunbury Co	2,719 11	29 75	2,748 86
Maugreville, Sunbury Co	2,941 96	.....	2,941 96
Rothesay, Kings Co	3,970 49	376 85	4,347 34
Lower Jemseg, high water wharf	.....	1,377 36	1,377 36
Newcastle Creek, Queens Co., for right of way	.....	150 00	150 00
The Range, Queens Co	.....	659 34	659 34
Young's Cove, Queens Cove	.....	803 17	803 17
Barker's, Sunbury and Queens	.....	1,437 56	1,437 56
Bur on Courthouse, Sunbury Co	.....	1,212 04	1,212 04
Milford	.....	85 75	85 75
McAllister's Sunbury and Queens Co	.....	59 14	59 14
Scotchtown, Sunbury and Queens Co	.....	526 34	526 34
Salmon River	.....	50 00	50 00
Guimond's	.....	61 05	61 05
			28,393 49

Mr. DANIEL. Is that all new construction or repairs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are some of the smaller amounts that I think would be for repairs, but all the larger amounts are for new construction. Mather's island, Chase wharf, Chase's point. Oromocto, McGowan, Sheffield and Rothesay, are all new. Rothesay was the wharf that was purchased from the Almon estate and rebuilt. Burton court house, Barker's,

Jemseg and Scotchtown, are all new. A very large number of them are new works.

Mr. CROCKET. Are these wharfs all completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not at this moment say whether they are all finished or not. We are getting that work done at considerably less than the estimated cost.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister should alter the item and call it construction and repairs. It is simply down as construction. That, I take it, means new construction.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The suggestion is a very good one, and in making up the statement another year, I shall have it so made that we can see exactly what is for new construction and what for repairs.

Mr. DANIEL. What wharfs does the hon. minister expect to construct with this $20,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give my hon. friend just what number will be undertaken. We have demands for quite a number. Application has been made by the mayor of the city of Fredericton, and I think also by the Board of Trade for the taking over by this government of a wharf which belongs to the city on condition that we rebuild it and make it a government wharf. I have that matter under consideration, and it is not unlikely that a considerable amount of the vote of this year will be used towards the rebuilding of that wharf.

Mr. BARKER. Are you buying the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The city will convey the wharf free of charge. It is an old wharf, owned by the city, which requires rebuilding. The city offers to hand it over to us provided we rebuild it. I think the claim which the city makes is well founded. The Dominion government has not spent any money in building wharfs in the city of Fredericton. The city has done the whole of that work itself. There is scarcely a city in Canada, situated as Fredericton is, in which the government has not expended some money in the form of wharf accommodation. But that has not been done in Fredericton, and I think its claim well founded.

Mr. BARKER. Is the city giving to the government that property in absolute ownership?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $20,000 to rebuild.

Mr. CROCKET. I suppose that is the wharf the minister promised during the election campaign two years ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman proud of that statement?

Mr. CROCKET. I am not particularly proud of it, neither am I ashamed of it. It is simply the statement of a fact. The minister did, just in the midst of an election campaign, make such a promise, and no doubt for political effect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend urge that the item be struck out?

Mr. CROCKET. No, but I was going to complain that the hon. minister had been very slow in carrying out the promise he made during that election campaign. It was expected that it would have been done last year. But last session he had to announce that the government had not the money to provide for that improvement, and I am glad to have his statement that at last we are to have the work. I agree with the minister that the city of Fredericton occupies a very unique position so far as wharf expenditures are concerned. I have been in this House a number of sessions, and have seen vote after vote going for wharfs in all parts of the country, but no appropriation at all, though I have several times asked for one, for such an important city as Fredericton. That city has maintained all wharfs at its own expense during all these years. I trust that the minister will see that work is put through as quickly as possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman can rely upon the minister doing this, as he endeavours to do everything else, in a proper manner and with no unnecessary delay. I am glad that for once my hon. friend and I agree.

Mr. CROCKET. Will there be a contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, as usual.

Mr. CROCKET. The work will not be done by day labour with these so-called conductors in charge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will not be done by day labour.

Mr. CROCKET. I hope not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend's hope is well founded.

Sackville—wharf on Tantramarre river—revote of $6,000 lapsed, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the construction of a public wharf at Sackville upon the Tamtramarre river. The wharf will cost about $17,000, and we are asking now for $10,000. We have made some expenditure in the year which ended

the 31st March, 1909. That was for the purpose of acquiring land for the site and approaches for the wharf and incidental expenses.

Seal Cove, Grand Manan island—breakwater pier—to complete, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete work under contract for the construction of a breakwater and pier 388 feet long and 35 feet high at the outer end, extending to 15 feet depth at high water. The amount of the contract is $29,000, and I think this will complete it.

Mr. DANIEL. You have already expended $32,000 on it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; we will have expended altogether, on the 31st March, $27,000. The hon. gentleman is confounding the vote with the expenditure. There is a revote of $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this to be cribwork?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the timber creosoted?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. Some time ago the minister told us that he had rather improved on the plan of his predecessors because they used ordinary timber and he was using creosoted timber.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say in all cases.

Mr. DANIEL. But where the teredo worm was likely to attack the wharf. The hon. gentleman must know that it does its business all right in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not understood that at the island the teredo is as destructive as in other places. At all events the engineering branch of the department did not think it necessary to use creosoted material at this point. I quite agree that it is better as far as possible to use creosoted timber. In some places the teredo worm is much more destructive than in others. In St. John harbour it is not destructive owing to the volume of fresh water running into the salt.

Shediac wharf — revote of $2,000 lapsed, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose building a wharf 1,100 feet long, stone block, 210 feet long, twenty-two spans of twenty feet and twenty-one blocks of twenty feet square, also pier head thirty feet square. Depth six feet at low water and ten feet at high water of ordinary tide. This is sufficient for fishing boats and small schooners. In connection with this we propose using creosoted timber, but nothing has been done as yet. Total estimated cost $19,000. That was the original estimate. Since then a further estimate has been made of $2,000, and the probable cost will be $21,000. That is the estimate of the resident engineer.

Mr. BARKER. Why take a revote of $2,000 for a $21,000 vote on which nothing has yet been spent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The reason is we had an appropriation of $2,000 the year before last. We took a vote of $2,000 for the purpose of beginning the work, such as purchasing the site, right of way, and possibly calling for tenders. But owing to the fact that the wharf will cost such an amount as we would not be justified in entering on its construction, having the vote of only $2,000, we made no move and allowed the vote to lapse. We are now asking for $10,000, but we will go ahead in a substantial way for the purpose of building the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should such a vote come under the heading of a revote? If the vote was for last year, it could be properly called a revote; but if not used within the year at all, it lapses and goes back to consolidated revenue, and after that should not come up as a revote but as a regular vote.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is quite right, but if he will look at the item, he will see it was not put in the revote column, but we put it in as a revote lapsed so that the committee may see it is not new.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it should be called a revote at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is more for the information of the committee.

Shippigan harbour—improvements and repairs at Shippigan gully, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the improvements. These are general repairs to the west breakwater.

St. Andrews wharf—to complete, $7,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was for $15,900 besides contingencies. The estimated expenditure to 31st of March next is $11,000 and we shall require $7,000 to finish.

St. John harbour—improvements, repairs and renewals,—$25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for improvements and repairs to the breakwater which have to go on from year to year.

St. John — Partridge Island quarantine wharf, $13,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build the wharf. It has been urged upon us for some time by the Department of Agriculture, and there was a vote for it for the year ending 31st March, 1909. We did not do anything under that vote and are asking for this amount.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this enlarge the old work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, we are building a little to one side. This is a new work.

Mr. BARKER. There will be a contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the contract been put up for tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Upon the vote for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1909, plans and specifications were prepared and tenders were recalled for the work. I decided to award the contract to the lowest tenderer. Then, owing to the depression which came and the declining revenues, I decided to let the construction stand over, and so informed the contractor. I am inclined to think it would be fair now not to call for new tenders, but to give the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is he?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. John E. Kane, a very reliable contractor.

St. John—to provide for the purchase and improvement of property for wharfs for the accommodation of government vessels (a vote for the same amount was taken in 1909-10 under lighthouse and coast service), $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to purchase property and make improvements so as to give very much needed accommodation to both the Public Works Department and the Marine Department by supplying a place for repairs, for building scows and for making repairs to vessels and buoys.

Mr. DANIEL. I can quite understand that a wharf and property of that kind is very much needed for the government vessels. Can the minister state where this wharf is to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not yet decided.

Mr. DANIEL. Have there been any negotiations? This item has been in the estimate for two years under another heading.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There have been no negotiations, but there have been some suggestions and some offers of property.

Mr. DANIEL. The hon. minister has had offers of property for this purpose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there have been offers in a general way. I do not know that prices have been made, but certain properties have been offered.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the hon. minister any objections to say what properties they are?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One which was offered was on the northern side of the harbour. That was offered to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DANIEL. About Hilliard's block?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Somewhere in that vicinity, but that was not in my department. There was a property, where the Maritime Warehousing Company is, offered my department. I am not aware of any other.

Mr. DANIEL. The department has not yet made up its mind as to any definite location?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is just the possibility that might be placed in Courtenay bay.

Mr. BARKER. Why should there be any negotiations with the Marine Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the vote previously made came under the Marine Department items. We are now putting it under Public Works.

Tracadie—improvements and repairs, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for repairs.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected it will.

Traynor's Cove—wharf, $2,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an old provincial government wharf at this point, about 50 feet by 40 feet, built many years ago; but it is beyond repair, and must be removed. This is to build a new wharf to take its place.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimated cost of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2,800.

To purchase creosoted timber for works in the maritime provinces generally, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present we are obliged to import all this timber from the southern states, or rather it is imported by the agents of the two companies engaged in that work. Quite recently I have been interviewed, as has also the Department of Railways, on the subject of establishing works in the city of St. John for the purpose of creosoting timber for wharfs and for railway ties. It is proposed, I think, to bring the material from Sydney. If we had creosoting works along the line of the Intercolonial railway, I believe that a great deal of birch would be used for railway ties. It has been demonstrated that birch takes the creosoting quite as well as soft timber, and it would give an extra market for birch, of which there are large quantities in New Brunswick. The creosoting adds greatly to the life of the timber. An English company is anxious to obtain a site for the purpose of establishing these works.

Mr. McCALL. How much per thousand feet does this creosoted timber cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From $50 to $56, according to the place where it is delivered.

Mr. McCALL. What does ordinary timber not creosoted cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not say offhand. Our department has never purchased southern pine which is not creosoted.

Mr. McCALL. I am not disposed to criticise the department. Unquestionably there are processes for preserving timber; but it is a question whether the cost of preserving it might not be equal to the cost of buying the timber two or three times over. Southern pine should be delivered at $16 or $17 a thousand feet. For creosoting timber a very extensive plant is required, and many of the railways are hesitating to put in plants on account of their great cost. While the process will preserve timber for a considerable length of time, it will not protect it from ordinary wear where it comes into contact with iron.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that the late deputy minister of railways, Mr. Butler, who has given a great deal of thought to this question of creosoting railway ties as well as other timber, expressed the opinion to me very strongly that it would be greatly in the public interest if creosoting works were established and if all timber used for railway ties and in the construction of wharfs were creosoted.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister state of whom the company he spoke of is composed, and whether this industry is to be established or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is that it is an English company, which was represented by two engineers who were introduced to me by the late deputy minister of railways, Mr. Butler. They were negotiating with me, and the question with them was as to whether they could get a site near the Intercolonial railway. I do not know that they have succeeded in acquiring a site, but it was represented to me that, if they could get a site, they were prepared to establish the works.

Mr. DANIEL. In what way does the minister propose to purchase this creosoted timber? Has he a purchasing agent, or does he get tenders, and, if so, from whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The purchases are made through the engineers, and the directions given are to get prices from the agents of the different concerns that sell this creosoted timber. There are not many of them.

Mr. DANIEL. That is, the local agents in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister is aware that for more than twenty years this question of creosoting timber for ties has been before the railway companies, but not a railway company, so far as known, has yet gone into this business, because the officials have never been able to satisfy themselves that the very large expense is justified by the extension of the life of the tie. Has the minister gone into that question before expending $50,000 on behalf of a couple of gentlemen from England who want to establish an industry here at the expense of the government? What efforts has the minister made to ascertain whether this is really a thing that we ought to spend so much money upon, or whether it is simply a little bonus to some English gentlemen who are coming out here to try what they can do in Canada in the way of an experiment that is about twenty years old?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not propose, out of this vote, to pay any bonus. This is simply for the purchase of creosoted timber. At present the intention is to buy it as we have bought it hitherto—from the companies in the southern states that creosote timber. But, if works are established for the production of creosoted timber in Canada, and if it offers timber on favourable terms, we would naturally prefer to buy our creosoted timber in Canada rather than from the southern states.

Mr. BARKER. I am aware of that. But it was said that some gentlemen were going into the establishment of works for creosoting timber. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) ascertained whether the Grand Trunk, for example, or the Canadian Pacific railway, who have had this question before them for twenty years have determined to go into it, or is he going it blind because he has $50,000 of public money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) means. We are only asking the vote that is taken year after year for the purchase of creosoted timber to be used in certain waters where the teredo worm is very destructive. Incidentally, I mentioned the fact that there was a company which was contemplating the establishment of creosoting works in the maritime provinces, and said that, if these works were established, we would expect to be able to obtain the creosoted timber—or have timber which we should buy in its crude state creosoted—at a cheaper price than we now obtain material for from the southern states. As to railway ties, I have not gone into the matter fully with Mr. Butler. But I would take his opinion on this subject as quickly as I would that of any railway manager in Canada. And I know that he is strongly of opinion that it would be

greatly to the public interest if creosoting works were established, that treating adds very much to the life of railway ties, and that it would bring into use for ties many varieties of timber which, when not treated, are not suitable for that purpose.

Mr. BARKER. The minister says that this vote has been passed year after year. What has been the experience heretofore? Has the minister tried this timber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. With what result?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Good.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has that from the officers of his department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. The creosoted timber has been used by the Department of Public Works, I understand, for building piers which are subject to the action of the teredo worm, and not for building on land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, only to protect the wood from the teredo.

Mr. A. McCALL. The American railway companies, I understand, are using creosoted timber to a certain extent. Has the minister inquired with a view to ascertaining whether he has been paying a fair or an excessive price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is pretty keen competition between the agents of the several companies which are dealing in creosoted timber, and the instructions to the engineers are to obtain material at the lowest possible price, and always to get prices from the different agents.

Mr. A. McCALL. By tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes—not by advertising in the newspapers, but by asking agents for their prices.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario—Brockville—reconstruction of superstructure of dock on south side of Tunnel bay, $9,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been urged very strongly by the town of Brockville to make this improvement, and it seems a desirable work in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be of stone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not entirely of stone. The top is to be of concrete, but the foundation under the water will be of timber. It is a public dock. Part of it is owned by the Canadian Pacific railway and part by the Crown, and we propose to have it all vested in the Crown. We have been urged strongly by representatives of the council and board of trade to construct this work, and an influential delegation was here not long ago urging it.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not aware of any docks being built upon wood.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me that the wharfs at Montreal and Quebec are built upon a wooden substructure and then from a little below the water line they are carried up with concrete.

Burlington channel piers—reconstruction, $40,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the work of reconstructing in concrete the wooden superstructures of the north and south piers of the Burlington channel. We have been urged to continue this work, but we hesitated to do so last year because of the state of the revenue. The work is urgently needed in order to prevent considerable injury to the harbour. Of this $40,000, $15,000 is a revote. In 1908-9 we spent $34,000, in 1909-10, $36,000.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to know what the whole expenditure in connection with this work has been, and will be. I understand that there has been a good deal of bad work done there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard of that.

Mr. BARKER. I have heard so. I understand that the amount appropriated is not more, and has not been more, than was necessary for the work, but the money has not been judiciously expended. I would like to know what the original estimate of this work was, and what it is going to cost.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate submitted by the chief engineer included reconstruction of wooden superstructure, $37,500; reconstruction of wooden superstructure in concrete, $15,000; reconstruction of wooden superstructure of north pier in concrete, $49,900; superintendence and contingencies, $8,600. Total estimate cost, $111,000 of which there has been expended during the two last years $70,000 leaving a balance of $40,000.

Mr. BARKER. Will that $40,000 complete all the work that was originally contemplated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me it is supposed to complete the work.

Mr. BARKER. Has the chief engineer made an estimate that $40,000 will do all the work originally contemplated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has made such a report to me.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that a deputation waited upon the hon. gentleman's department asking for the construction of an embankment along the water side of the beach, extending northerly from Burlington bay towards the village of Burlington, with a view of preserving the beach and widening it. Has the hon. gentleman any intention of proceeding with that work this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a report on that work, but it has not yet been decided to undertake it during this year. That is as far as I can say to-night. The hon. gentleman understands with reference to any work not in the estimates, that I would not be able to say what the government would do until the matter has been considered in council.

Picnic islands—improvement of northern channel in Georgian bay, $45,000.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Is it the intention of the government to deepen the channel opposite Picnic islands? I asked the same question last year. I understnad that the channel has a depth of 24 feet up to that point, and it is almost useless, the same depth is provided opposite Picnic islands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is quite right, and the object of this vote is to deepen the channel at that point, to straighten it, and make it available for navigable purposes.

Providence bay, Manitoulin island—extension of wharf—revote of $4,500 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Has this wharf been completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision towards extending outward the stem of the present government wharf on the east side of the bay. We propose, in making this extension, to add ballasting and cribwork 300 feet long in a northwesterly direction.

Providence Bay wharf, Manitoulin island—warehouse built on stone embankment protected by cribwork, $3,650.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH. Is that work going on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but we will put it under construction the coming season as early as possible.

Blanche river — improvements on main stream and south branch, $7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What improvements are you making there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to improve the navigation of the channel. There is a good deal of traffic on this river. It is to complete improvements, remove snags, do dredging work and to maintain the plant which we have there.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is there any navigation on the Blanche river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, there are some small boats.

Mr. S. SHARPE. I would like to ask the minister if he has received any complaints lately in connection with the lowering of Lake Couchiching and Lake Simcoe? There has been considerable public money spent at Washago, taking rocks out of the channel and putting in stop logs, and there is a great deal of difficulty in regard to the regulating of these waters, farm lands being submerged on account of the stop logs being kept in too long. I received a letter the other day complaining that the stop logs are in now. There is no necessity for these stop logs being kept in now because they should let the water out and allow it to run away in order to avoid the spring freshets. If the water is kept in the land is submerged and the farmers cannot get on their land in the spring. I understand there is a man in attendance, paid by public money, for the purpose of regulating these stop logs. There are some interests desiring to have the stop logs kept in continuously. I would like to ask the minister if there have been any complaints received by the department lately, in connection with this matter, who is in charge of the stop logs and why the logs are kept in during the winter season. The object and purpose of keeping the stop logs in is to keep up the water and thereby improve navigation, but there is no possible excuse for keeping the stop logs in at the present time. They should be left out until after the spring freshets are over so that the farmers can get upon their land in spring. There have been several thousand dollars spent in opening up the channel and blowing out rocks in order to lower the water and the stop logs, of course, have been put in for the purpose of regulating the depth of the water. You are defeating the purpose of the spending of this money by keeping the stop logs in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad the hon. gentleman called the matter to my attention a few days ago by sending me a letter bearing on the subject. I sent it to the chief engineer with directions to have it looked into at once, and the chief engineer tells me that he will see that the matter is inquired into to see exactly whose fault it

is that the water is not properly regulated. We have a man in charge of the dam. There is no reason why these stop logs should not be so handled as to preserve navigation there during the season and to prevent lands from being overflowed in the spring.

Mr. S. SHARPE. The stop logs should not be in during the winter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, there is no reason why they should be in in winter. They should be taken out in the fall and put in in the spring. Of course I can quite understand that there may be some diversity of interests, and that in the interest of navigation they may try to keep the stop logs in. But, it is our duty to take all possible means to prevent lands from being flooded.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. The navigation of Lake Couchiching and Lake Simcoe is not to be compared with the importance of the farming community. The navigation interest is infinitesimally small compared with the great interest of the farmers. There are thousands and thousands of acres being submerged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe there is a power interest as well at Orillia.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. I do not think the interest of Orillia enters very materially into the question of the stop logs being maintained at Washago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer will look into it carefully.

Byng inlet, improvements—revote of $10,000 lapsed, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For the year ending March 31, 1909, there was a vote of $10,000, which we did not use. The Canadian Pacific railway are contemplating making very considerable improvements at Byng inlet, and this is for the purpose of doing work which fairly belongs to the country. It is for improving the harbour, and these improvements will go on in conjunction with those made by the Canadian Pacific railway company.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of improvements are you going to make?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose to dredge a passage 20 feet deep with a minimum width of 100 feet and to remove shoals in the steamboat channel. There will be a basin with a minimum width of 500 feet and a length of 2,500 feet opposite the site of the projected coal dock. Officials of the Canadian Pacific railway assure me that there is likely to be a very large business developed there as a result of the improvements contemplated.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any contract let for dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose to do it by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. What is the object of this vote from the public point of view?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Byng inlet has been selected by the Canadian Pacific railway as one of the harbours of their Toronto-Sudbury line. They propose to erect large coal unloading docks there and they will connect with the Sudbury line by a spur two miles in length. It is represented to me that a very large business will be done when the necessary improvements are made. The Canadian Pacific railway are going to do their share in the way of building docks upon which they purpose spending a considerable sum of money and we have thought it not unreasonable that we should go to the expense of doing the dredging for the purpose of improving the entrance and making the channel navigable.

Mr. BARKER. What public needs are there, what is the population and what is the nature of the place which requires you to expend all this money in the public interest? I can understand that a railway company wants to have coal and wants the facilities to get in, but the government does not usually supply the money for that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My own vieiw is that we can fairly as a government co-operate with a railway which is prepared to develop any place along its line, any harbour or any navigable water, to the extent of doing the dredging work. I know that wherever a railway, particularly a large railway like the Canadian Pacific railway, establish coal docks it means the gathering there of a large number of men, it means the building up almost immediately of a thriving town or village and it adds in that way to the prosperity of the country. In accordance with the policy that has been pursued for some years past we feel that it is not unreasonable that we should co-operate to the extent of doing the dredging.

Mr. BARKER. There is no population there at present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at present, I understand. The Canadian Pacific railway have given me the assurance that they propose to do a large business there which will convert Byng inlet into a thriving place.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is this in the interest of some private company that is doing business there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is in the interest of the traffic that is to be brought over by the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. SEXSMITH. What is the traffic created by, there is nobody living there

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the Canadian Pacific railway establishes large coal docks and makes that the point of transfer for the coal for that part of the country it must lead to the establishment of a town. That is the manner in which communities are being built up all over this country.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Is there not a large lumbering company interested chiefly in this dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of that.

Mr. McCALL. It is fair to say that there is a large mill at Byng Inlet which would be served by the intention of the railway at that point to give a rail outlet as well as a water outlet.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is the railway company the only interest that has asked for this expenditure?

Mr. SEXSMITH. So far as I recollect, yes.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister believe that the railway company will not take its coal there for the purpose of its own operation unless the government gives that $10,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that, nor would I say that the company would not create a harbour at Victoria, but we have thought it not unreasonable that we should do our part in assisting them in their important work by doing the dredging, they undertaking at their own expense to build the docks. The operation of such works by a railway company gives employment to a large number of people, and I believe it is fairly within the duty of the federal government to do its part in the way of improvement, particularly in reference to navigation.

Mr. EDWARDS. If, as I understand, the minister feels that this appropriation is justified because of the benefit that will accrue, not only to the railway but to the people who are living there or will likely live there, I would urge on him the claims of the people of Wolfe Island to have some dredging done along the side of their dock. Some dredging was done at the end of the dock where the passenger steamers call, but a few hundred dollars' worth of dredging along the side of the dock would enable coal to be unloaded there and would save to the people from 60 cents to 70 cents a ton on their coal. Can the minister give me an assurance that an appropriation will be put in the estimates this year for that work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The statement which my hon. friend makes does appeal to my judgment. I believe there is no better work the government can be engaged in than the deepening of navigable channels to enable vessels to get to wharfs and to enter rivers and so give to the people cheaper transportation. I will have the matter looked into by the chief engineer; it will not be necessary to have a special vote because that work can be done out of the general vote for dredging in Ontario.

Mr. EDWARDS. I brought this to the attention of the minister near the end of last session and I accepted in good faith the reasons then given by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Money was pretty scarce then.

Mr. EDWARDS. For the sake of the people of Wolfe Island I am glad it is more plentiful this year, and I hope the minister will see his way clear to expend this small amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not give my hon. friend the assurance that it will be done, but I will give him this assurance: I have asked the chief engineer to make a note of it to have it examined and see what the cost would be, and if it can be done for any thing like what my hon. friend has stated, I can assure him it will be done. It will be money well expended.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has the minister an estimate furnished by the reeve of Wolfe island as to the depth to be excavated, and as to the nature of the bottom along side of the dock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We may have that in the department, I shall ascertain.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. It seems to me there are objectionable features about this vote of $30,000. It is a case of getting the cart before the horse. I could understand $30,000 being spent in dredging where there are centres of population, but spending $30,000 to attract population and build up centres of population strikes me as an extraordinary expenditure. It is serving no great interest, but serving the private interests of a corporation, which in the coarse of events, will have to make this expenditure on its own account. Surely it is an objectionable grant. Is the minister sure that this is serving the public interest, or is it the private interest of some dredging company that wanted work up there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No dredging company made any suggestion of any kind in regard to it. The application for the grant

was made by the Canadian Pacific railway, and they have given me the assurance that they propose constructing large docks at Byng Inlet, and making that the principal coal depot for all that section of country. If they do that it will mean the handling of very large quantities of coal. My hon. friend says that we have no right to undertake dredging for any railway company until you get a population. Does my hon. friend not know that it is as the result of giving these facilities that population comes, and that business comes, and that if the Canadian Pacific railway establish these large coal docks they will necessarily employ a large number of men, which will lead to the building of houses and of stores and the development of a very considerable business. There was no population at Victoria harbour when we undertook to create the harbour. The Canadian Pacific railway came to us and said that if we would do the dredging they would build docks, and we felt that in the great transportation interests of this country, it was desirable that we should co-operate with an enterprising railway like the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE. What will be the nature of the dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clay and mud altogether, about 280,000 cubic yards of clay and mud.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any serious objection to this vote. Byng Inlet is quite an important place; I was there thirty years ago and there were people there then. I see it has a postal revenue of $800 and $1,000 of money orders. Has the government any provision by which the public will be able to use the docks without paying a consideration to the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. BOYCE. I presume the government would only keep the channel open, and could not have any thing to do with the fees on the dock.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Will the minister make the extension to the wharf at Lakefield, which he visited last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was very much pleased with the wharf we have already built there. It is a fine concrete wharf and for the comparatively small amount of money expended we have splendid results. I was also impressed with the desirability of making the extension, but I have not yet succeeded in getting the money for it. That is the most I can say. It will continue to have, as it has and has had, my best attention in connection with other important works. Most of the items in these estimates are for works which were in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1909. I would ask whether there has been any communication sent or any arrangement made in respect to the Grand Trunk railway extending its tracks down to the wharf, which would be necessary if the wharf was to be a public convenience.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I was informed last summer that the Grand Trunk railway was ready at any time to make an arrangement if assured that this wharf would be extended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why did they not write the department to that effect?

Mr. SEXSMITH. I shall have to look into the matter. Now that money is plentiful, the hon. minister might take an amount out of the general estimates, or have a sum put in the supplementaries. These people do not give him much trouble with regard to their port.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like if the hon. gentleman would get the Grand Trunk railway to send to my department that agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister has not answered the question I put to him. I asked him if he had made any provision whereby the public would have the use of the docks without paying.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see how we could very well do so, as we are not building the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. You are improving the harbour, and in consideration of your spending so large an amount of money, could you not reach an understanding with the company to give the public some consideration in the use of that dock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would rather assume that the Canadian Pacific railway would make arrangements with vessels, and I would take it for granted that they would not charge any dockage tolls on these whatever. The suggestion of my hon. friend, however, like all his suggestions, is worthy of consideration, and I shall consider it, but I do not see at present that we could say to the Canadian Pacific railway: As we are going to dredge the channel for you, you will allow all vessels to use your docks free of tolls. They might feel we were imposing some obligation on them that we have never done in respect to any other railway company.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not thinking so much of the vessels as the people in the district who go there to load coal. Has the Canadian Pacific railway intimated any intention of building grain elevators there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have not.

Mr. McCALL. I wish to say a word on behalf of Port Dover harbour, Lake Erie. The hon. minister has given the committee

abundant reasons why harbours with railway connections should receive public aid, and I would ask if he could see his way clear to meet the views of the people of Port Dover by repairing theirs and doing some dredging at that port. The piers are in very bad condition and dangerous to life. Port Dover is a harbour in which there is a great deal of excursion business. Two large railways carry people there and there are excursion boats from the American side, and the harbour is not in a condition to properly handle that traffic. I would also ask the minister what has been done by the International Waterways Commission with regard to the maintaining of the water level of the harbours upon Lake Erie. The American shipping interests desire to dam Lake Erie at the mouth near Buffalo for the purpose of maintaining a uniform water gauge in all the harbours on the lakes. I have not heard what action has been taken by the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the raising of the level of Lake Erie by means of a dam, I have received a very interesting, exhaustive and valuable report from the International Waterways Commission, and that report is adverse to the building of the dam. In a general way their opinion is that it would not accomplish the purpose intended unless it will have the effect of lowering the waters of Lake Ontario. Holding back the waters by means of a dam to raise Lake Erie would necessarily lower the waters of Lake Ontario and the canal system as well, and of course that could not be thought of for a moment. For these reasons the commission concluded that it would not be advisable to attempt anything of the kind. With regard to Port Dover, I have been a good deal bothered as to what ought to be done there. That port is in the same unfortunate situation as several other harbours which, before confederation, were handed over to private companies. That was the most extraordinary legislation I ever heard of. Private companies were made harbour companies and given control of the harbours. I believe that to-day the harbour of Port Dover, including its wharfs and waters, is owned by the Grand Trunk railway, and it is difficult for the government to undertake to improve wharfs which are owned by a private company or to undertake even the dredging of a harbour owned by a private company.

Mr. McCALL. In what respect is Port Dover different from Byng Inlet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Byng Inlet is a public harbour, and in a very different position from a private harbour. What my hon. friend ought to direct his attention to, and what the city council of Port Dover and the board of trade—with whose aspirations I heartily sympathize—ought to seek to accomplish is to get the Grand Trunk railway to hand over these wharfs, which are in a state of decay, to the Crown, free of charge, and then it will give me great pleasure to do something for the improvement of Port Dover. While on my feet, I may say that Port Dover is in the position of many villages situated upon ports on the Great Lakes, which used to do a thriving business, but whose business has been taken away from them by the building of railways, in many cases a few miles back from the lake shore. When the great movement for building railways was started, some of our people had the idea—which has prevailed down to a comparatively recent date—that the railways would give to the people of the country all the means of transportation they desired, so that water transportation has been neglected by the local authorities, and, I am bound to say, more or less neglected by public men. But the time has come when the people are being aroused to the necessity of better water transportation, the improving of harbours and the furnishing of facilities for the traffic of the lakes and great rivers. I sympathize entirely with the feeling now manifest in many parts of Ontario fronting on the Great Lakes, that the work of improving the harbours should be more generally taken hold of. So far as Port Dover is concerned, I throw out this suggestion with the hope that some effort will be made to get the Grand Trunk to hand over these wharfs and the harbour to the Crown, and then I shall feel it my duty to take the matter up in earnest to see what I can do to give the people of Port Dover the facilities to which I think they are fairly entitled.

Mr. A. McCALL. Port Dover was once a government harbour, but, about thirty-five years ago, the Grand Trunk extended a line of railway to the harbour and bought control from the government of that day. Since then, very little repairs have been made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What an absurd thing for a government to sell out a whole harbour to a private corporation?

Mr. A. McCALL. Still, I cannot quite understand why this harbour should not receive government assistance merely because the Grand Trunk railway owns these rights. Wherein does this harbour differ from any other on the lake? If in a given harbour the Grand Trunk railway builds piers and runs tracks upon them, the government would still do the dredging. And that is the condition at Port Dover. The railway, are not using it for anything, and, in the meantime, the public service is suffering. About eight or ten years ago some repairs were made and the piers were put into condition to make them safe for travel. But I do not think that any dredging was done. The expenditure required

is not large. I do not wish to limit what the minister might, in his generosity, think he could do there, but to repair the piers and give the harbour a depth of say, ten feet would be sufficient for the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. member (Mr. A. McCall) see that if I undertook to repair piers owned by the Grand Trunk, the very first people to criticise me would be the gentlemen sitting on his own side of the House? The question would be: What business have you to spend public money to repair wharfs belonging to the Grand Trunk? And I could not justify it.

Mr. A. McCALL. It has been done by the hon. minister's predecessor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Many things have been done, and some of them, perhaps, ought not to have been done.

Christian Island wharf—repairs, $3,000.

Mr. HUGHES. What is going on at Christian island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the renewal of the crib-work and superstructure.

Mr. HUGHES. Who owns this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government.

Mr. HUGHES. Now, does the minister know anything about it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know positively that we do not build any wharf on property that is not owned by the government. These are positive instructions.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Who live on this island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an Indian reserve.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Is this for the benefit of Indians particularly?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is used largely by a number of fishermen.

Mr. HUGHES. Summer tourists.

Mr. CONMEE. Some, perhaps; but it is used extensively by the fishermen of Georgian bay.

Mr. HUGHES. It is nothing of the kind. It is just a little bunch of islands at the entrance to Midland harbour. We have had this thing up in the House before, and we know all about it.

Collingwood harbour — additional shipping and landing facilities, including extension of entrance channel and enlargement of deep-water manœuvring area, $75,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Has this anything to do with the dock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to widen and straighten the approach. The channel is quite narrow and shipping is congested.

Mr. HUGHES. What depth will this give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 22 feet, we are aiming to get.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is the vote for the dock?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One dock is built. Which dock does the hon. member mean?

Mr. HUGHES. The dry dock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We don't require a vote for that. It is provided for by a subsidy.

Goderich—harbour improvement, $80,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is very necessary. Goderich is one of the most important harbours on the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who is most interested in this matter is not here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He will regret very much if the vote stood over. He is very anxious to have it passed.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the expenditure on Goderich harbour up to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member means from the beginning of the world? The expenditure has been $1,031,751.23.

Grand Bend—approach to piers—revote of $1,000 lapsed.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the explanation of the need of this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay for the land required for the approach from Huron street to the Grand Bend pier, 381 feet long by 40 feet wide. Mr. Charles A. Gibbs is the owner.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the government done anything with some wharfs between Goderich and Grand Bend lately?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not doing anything there this year.

Gravenhurst—wharf on Lake Muskoka—revote of $4,000 lapsed, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This seems to be a very necessary work. There is a great deal of traffic on these Muskoka lakes, and there is no public wharf there. The present wharf is owned by the Grand Trunk, and does not accommodate the public.

Haileybury—harbour improvements — revote of $3,400 lapsed, $17,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to extend the south wing 156 feet long and to widen the west side at an estimated cost of $14,000; protection of approach on the south side to permit of dredging, 172 feet long by 24 feet wide, estimated cost at $3,500; dredging work, estimated to cost $5,500.

Mr. HUGHES. I thought the minister was using concrete wherever it was possible below water.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are beginning to use concrete.

Juniper island, Stony lake—wharf—revote of $1,470 lapsed, $3,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Juniper island is in Stony lake, and I believe is quite a centre. During the summer season two or three thousand people live there, or in the vicinity. Juniper island is a distributing point.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister know who owns the island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is owned by an association of people, and they are giving to the Crown a conveyance of a site for a wharf.

Mr. HUGHES. I will give the minister a splendid site for $1, if he will build a wharf there of $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But Juniper island is a very central island.

Mr. HUGHES. Not half as central as my island; it is on the same water.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Surely a wharf should not be constructed on this island if it only serves the owner of the island.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It serves about 3,000 people.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. My information is that it is owned by a private individual who has his summer residence there, and it will only serve his private convenience. There is no hotel there. How could an island in Stony lake be a distributing point for other islands? The lake is studded with islands owned by private individuals who erect summer residences there. I understand the hon. member for West Peterboro (Mr. Stratton) owns this island.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The information given to me by the gentleman who formerly represented that constituency was that there are three steamers passing Juniper island every day. Juniper island is essentially a central point of distribution for the people of hundreds of islands. There are 2,000 or 3,000 people in that vicinity who will be convenienced by this wharf. The request for the wharf was strongly endorsed by both Mr. Hall and Mr. Finley, who were representatives of the two constituencies bordering upon that lake.

Kensington wharf—additions and repairs, $3,300.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was impressed with the observations which were made by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) with regard to Kensington wharf. He said he had been informed by the owners that they were not desirous of selling, from which I took it for granted they are prepared to improve the wharf themselves; therefore, I prove to strike out this item.

Mr. BOYCE. I would like to know what the situation is. I think the owners want to come to some understanding with the government. I would like to see Kensington wharf put in proper shape, but the owners say they object to the government taking hold of their wharf and spending $3,300 upon it without some understanding with them. This is not a private wharf in the sense of serving only the interests of private individuals, but it serves a settlement that is tributary to it. If the government will consider the advisability of taking over that wharf as they have taken over Fort Finley wharf above it, it would be a very suitable arrangement. But I think it would be objectionable to spend $3,300 upon a wharf which is entirely a private wharf without any arrangement with the owners. I hope the minister will see his way clear to take over this wharf as a public wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This wharf belongs to the Hiawatha Land Company, and some time ago I was urged to make provision for improving it. I took it for granted that the owners were not in a position to put it in repair, and were willing to convey it to the government. But my hon. friend has stated that the Hiawatha Land Company are not prepared to convey it to the government, and, as under this vote, we would have no power to purchase the property, I could not think of spending money upon it unless the title is vested in the Crown.

Mr. BOYCE. Would you take into consideration the purchase of this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not if we struck out the item.

Lion's Head—wharf repairs, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What repairs are you doing there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are renewing the superstructure of the old wharf. It is all right below the water line but above the water line it has decayed and we are putting in a concrete superstructure.

McGregor's creek—to complete sheet pile protection work on south bank of creek, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is necessitated by reason of dredging work done by the government.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is McGregor's creek?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Near Chatham.

Michipicoten, Lake Superior — wharf on Michipicoten river—revote of $2,600 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are you going to do there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to construct a public wharf, close faced, strongly built, 207 feet in length, 25 feet in width and 20 feet in height.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000.

Mr. BOYCE. Where do you propose to place this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose placing it along the south side of the ledge at the foot of the road leading to the village. It will be about 500 feet north of Michipicoten.

Mr. BOYCE. Are you going to commence work during the present season?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the intention.

Montreal river—improvements above Latchford, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to continue the construction of the Latchford dam. We have called for tenders and a contract has been let for this work.

Mr. HUGHES. This is only for the revote; we are not giving an extra $25,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. This is to raise the water and to improve navigation by means of flooding the rapids. It is really a very important work.

Mr. HUGHES. You are going to put a dam below the rapids?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. You will not require to spend a large amount for buying flooded land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a great deal. We have had to pay something in Latchford. We bought from the Ontario Railway Commission there.

Mr. HUGHES. Have you paid the Ontario government for land taken there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Port Burwell—improvements to harbour works—revote of lapsed amount, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an important work. Port Burwell is the point to which the car ferries come.

Port Hope—repairs to piers—revote of $3,300 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. HUGHES. Who owns that harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer tells me that we have taken it over.

Port Stanley—harbour improvements, $9,000.

Mr. HUGHES. What about the life buoy service there? Was there not trouble about the time of the wreck, or is that under the Department of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Was not the lighthouse out of operation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Rainy river—improvements at Long Sault rapids—revote of lapsed amount, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I explained to the House the other night in regard to this item. I do not know whether we will require to use it or not. We must get the consent of the United States before it can go on.

Mr. BOYCE. There is some international difficulty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. That has been a long standing difficulty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Has it been taken up by the Waterways Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they said they could not deal with it, and asked us to refer it to Washington. The United States government do not feel that they could allow a foreign government to build a work in their territory.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it the rule that no government is allowed to do work in another's territory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Well I take it for granted that the minister is opposed to damming the St. Lawrence at Cornwall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That might be different. Suppose parliament gave the authority?

Mr. HUGHES. But the minister would certainly oppose it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would depend on what his view might be of the whole question. The minister is not yet prepared to support it.

Mr. HUGHES. I understood the minister was one of the leaders in the movement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, you could not have understood that.

Rainy river — improvements at mouth, $60,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The mouth of the Rainy river is filling up. Strange to say there is not as much water in the mouth of the Rainy river by five or six feet as there was ten years ago. I suppose that owing to the clearing of the forests, silt is coming down more rapidly, and as the current is becoming more sluggish where it joins the lake waters, the silt is being deposited.

Mr. HUGHES. Why has the water gone down if the level is maintained at Keewatin?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As the forests are cleared away silt and mud come down the Rainy river with greater force each succeeding spring, and as the river flows out into the lake it naturally becomes more sluggish and has made a bar across the mouth of the river.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not this in American territory too?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is a boundary river.

Mr. HUGHES. It is in American territory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is a boundary river.

Mr. HUGHES. Half of it is in American territory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right, but we are doing the dredging in Canadian territory at the Lake of the Woods.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the minister know where the boundary really is? From the mouth of the Rainy river where does the boundary line run? It runs from the northwest angle to the lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. The minister should be sure that he is not dredging in American territory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By damming the outlet of the Lake of the Woods it was supposed it would improve navigation, but as a result of the raising of the waters of the lake and as a result of the storms which arose an island which was at the head of the lake was washed away.

Mr. HUGHES. Then you need the dredging.

Mr. BOYCE. How will the minister protect the channel when it is dredged, it is very sandy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose having very extensive pile work which the engineer thinks will be effective protection.

River Sydenham—second outlet from Chenal Ecarte to Mitchell's bay—protection of banks at Martin island with pilework, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the protection of this island. Erosion has taken place on the island which is alleged to be due to the diversion of the channel by reason of works carried on by the department. That is the only reason why we admit any responsibility. Several owners of property have protested vigorously and claimed that we should take steps to protect the island.

Mr. HUGHES. Is this not a wharf for duck hunters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no, it could not be used as a wharf.

Mr. BEATTIE. There is a large sugar beet business there, where beets come down to the main land.

Rondeau harbour—improvements, $200,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract to Mr. Birmingham of Ottawa, the lowest tenderer. This work has been before parliament for some time. A vote was taken the session before last, but as the amount was too small for the large improvements which were contemplated we did not proceed with the work. The object is to build break-waters to afford protection and harbour accommodation called for by the largely increasing traffic at the port.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What riding is this in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In East Kent. It is supposed that by building the breakwaters we will establish a very good harbour of refuge and a very important harbour. The north shore of the lake is singularly deficient in harbours of refuge for a long distance and I think it is regarded as essential by everybody that this work should go on. There was expended up to December 1, $21,000 and the total contract price of the work is $229,000. Then we have to do the dredging as a separate item.

Sault Ste. Marie wharf—addition to return on west side, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to add an extension westerly on the 'L' of the government wharf for 100 feet.

Mr. BOYCE. Does this include any dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There will be a concrete superstructure.

Mr. BOYCE. There is a nasty jog on the east side of the wharf which wants some

dredging. The Canadian Pacific railway and all big boats have to make a nasty turn there and the utility of the wharf is impaired.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are doing a good deal of dredging.

Mr. BOYCE. I hope the minister will see his way clear to get that straightened out.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give it consideration.

Sibley harbour, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to repair an old wharf to make it serviceable for traffic and to afford shelter to steamers. It will be a harbour of refuge on the north shore of Lake Superior. It was strongly urged by the member for the constituency, Mr. Conmee.

Mr. BOYCE. There are boats running out every week.

Mr. CONMEE. There is a good deal of mining going on there; it is a public harbour not owned by any one. It is a harbour of refuge for a line of vessels which run down the north shore to Nipigon and other ports and is a great resort for the fishing vessels of that section. This amount, I think, is hardly enough. I think the minister might double the amount, because it is a meritorious work. Three lines of steamers call regularly there. The people have for many years maintained a light there at their own expense. and I think it is time the government did something decent for that harbour.

Thornbury—addition and repairs to wharf, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the construction of 200 feet of cribwork as an extension of the wharf.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of cribwork?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Timber and stone.

Mr. SPROULE. What is its width?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend, but I assume that it would be the same as the other—24 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. There must be some mistake, for this amount will not build a fraction of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If we have to get more, we will come back.

Wiarton—extension to breakwater pier, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for the extension of the breakwater pier, to complete repairs and renewals to the shore end, and also for the removal of a wreck. The total cost of the extension is estimated at $21,000, and the removal of the wreck at $3,000.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 14, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Pelletier and the Hon. Mr. Justice Lemieux, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a judgment and report relating to the election petition for the electoral district of Bellechasse, by which the election petition was dismissed and the sitting member declared duly elected.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of election and return of Albert Allard, Esquire, for the electoral district of Ottawa City.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the orders of the day being called,

Mr. O. S. CROCKET. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The Toronto 'Globe' in its report of the discussion which took place in the Committee of Supply of this House on Friday last, upon the subject of the extension of the wharf at Pink Rock, in the province of New Brunswick, has this to say of myself:

By reading extracts from some documents and carefully refraining from reading others he sought to convey the impression that money was being taken from the public treasury and spent upon a wharf at Pink Rock owned by a company managed by a political friend of the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley destroyed Mr. Crocket's pretty little piece of political patchwork at one blow by producing an agreement which showed that the wharf had passed from the hands of the company referred to by the member for York into those of the Crown, and that the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

I desire to say that the statement that this wharf, to which the government is building an extension, had passed from the hands of the company into the hands of the Crown, is untrue. The wharf still re-

mains the property of the Albert Manufacturing Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I desire to ask if this is a question of privilege. My hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) is making statements which are unwarranted by the evidence, and it would seem to me that there is no question of privilege in what my hon. friend is now stating.

Mr. CROCKET. I submit that it is a question of privilege. This statement made concerning a discussion and concerning a statement which I made in the House surely is a matter of privilege and one that I have a right to correct. I am saying that the statement that the wharf which was under criticism the other day had passed into the hands of the Crown is an untrue statement. I say that the title to that wharf is still vested in the Albert Manufacturing Company, and in the New Brunswick Gypsum Company, of which Mr. Osman is manager, subject only to an agreement which was entered into by the company giving a right of way to and upon the wharf to the public and allowing His Majesty to charge wharfage upon all vessels other than their own vessels, or vessels chartered by the company, which agreement, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CROCKET. —is nothing more nor less than——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has read an article and has stated that the article has misrepresented him. He proceeds now to give an explanation. I do not know how far the hon. gentleman may be allowed to go, but he understands clearly that it is a question of privilege, and he can merely make a statement in reference to what he objects to in the paper. I do not suppose that to enter into a discussion of the matter now would be regular.

Mr. CROCKET. I have a right to show that this statement is untrue, and I say that the agreement which was referred to is nothing more nor less than a sham agreement inasmuch as the wharf is so situated——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) rises to a point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that when the hon. gentleman rises to a question of privilege he is certainly going beyond the privilege when he enters into a lengthy statement in regard to evidence which is before a committee of this House. This whole question of the Pink Rock wharf is before the Committee on Pubic Accounts. My hon. friend is certainly making a statement the truth of which I cannot admit and which will not be verified by the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) is accused of misrepresentation and surely he has the right of showing that he is not guilty of misrepresentation.

Mr. FIELDING. Would it be correct for every member of this House, when he is accused in some statement in the public press, to come here and make it a question of privilege? I would hardly think so.

Mr. FOSTER. If he is accused of falsehood?

Mr. FIELDING. No, almost every day, I am sorry to say, we find some statement in the public press to which we could take exception. I think my hon. friend should confine himself to a correction of the misrepresentation of his own speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the proper attitude. As far as discussing a matter that is now before the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has no intention of doing that?

Mr. CROCKET. No, I have no intention of doing anything farther than discussing the statement which was made. Surely an hon. member, in discussing a question of privilege, when he has been misrepresented in the public press, is not confined to the simple statement that the statement concerning himself is untrue? He can go further and show in what respect the statement is untrue.

Mr. FIELDING. The House will be kept busy.

Mr. CROCKET. In so far as the statement that this question is before the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, I say that this question is not before the Public Accounts Committee. It is true that the return from which I adduced the proof of this statement I got by a motion before the Public Accounts Committee. But the matter has not been under investigation by the Public Accounts Committee. I do not intend discussing the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee, but I merely wish to add to what I have already said of this agreement that it is nothing more nor less than a sham—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROCKET. Inasmuch as the wharf is——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) must be allowed to say something. He takes exception to a newspaper paragraph and says that the newspaper misrepresents him. He proceeds to give an explanation, and I do not know that he has given any reason so far why I should prevent him.

Mr. CROCKET. Inasmuch as this wharf is so situated that no other vessels than the company's own vessels or vessels chartered by them are using it or will ever use this wharf. The statement that the wharf has been transferred to the Crown is absolutely untrue and the Minister of Public Works knows it.

Mr. SPEAKER. That last remark is out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a figment of the imagination of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket).

Mr. SPEAKER. The last remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) is out of order.

Mr. CROCKET. I am discussing a statement which appeared in the 'Globe,' newspaper. I say that that statement is untrue. I say furthermore that the Minister of Public Works knows that the statement that this wharf has been transferred to the government is untrue. I am not saying that the statement he made in the House is untrue. I am saying that the statement which this paper makes is untrue, and I say that the Minister of Public Works knows that the statement is untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

THE BANK ACT.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the Minister of Finance when we are to expect the Banking Bill? We are getting along well in the session, it is an important Bill and we should have as much time as possible to consider it.

Mr. FIELDING. I had contemplated introducing an amending Act, but I have concluded it would be much more convenient to present a revised Act, and my officials are now arranging it accordingly. Inasmuch as there is an abundance of important matter on the order paper, I have thought that probably no disadvantage would be suffered if there was a few days delay in bringing forward the Banking Act. I am giving it my best attention and it will not be much longer delayed.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the action of the House is concerned there probably would be no disadvantage, but the sooner it is down the more quickly will members be able to make themselves acquainted with it.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite understand that.

UNITED STATES MINIMUM TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Finance any further information with reference to the inclusion or otherwise of Canada in the benefit of the minimum tariff rates of the United States to which it appears Great Britain has been admitted. I see also that Germany has been admitted although her colonies are still under consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is quite clear that the arrangement with Great Britain does not include Canada and that Canada will have to be dealt with by a separate proclamation.

Mr. FOSTER. None such is issued?

Mr. FIELDING. None such has issued.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Finance had any negotiation in any way to find out what is going on, or, is he simply waiting?

Mr. FIELDING. We have no official negotiations, but we manage to find out what is going on in a general way. The public press, in regard to the United States affairs, generally keep us well posted; they tell us all that is going on and some things that are not.

MANITOBA FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. BRADBURY. I wish to ask the First Minister when the fishery report will be brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I regret to say that the deputy minister is confined to his bed by illness and I could not have an interview with him.

RESIGNATION OF CHIEF ENGINEER LUMSDEN.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect that the committee appointed to investigate the resignation of Mr. Lumsden will be called together? The committee was named on the 3rd of this month, eleven days ago. Is there any reason why the committee should not be called together and the inquiry proceeded with; the session is getting on?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there is any reason, I do not know of it. I see no reason why the committee should not be called for to-morrow or the day after.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a curious thing that the committee has not been called together long before this.

PURCHASE OF THE 'NIOBE.'

Mr. FOSTER. I direct the attention of the Prime Minister to a question which has been up two or three times, and as to which the Prime Minister promised an answer would be given in the course of the explanations upon the Naval Bill. It would appear from the statement made by the Minister of Militia that the government has already purchased the 'Niobe' for over $1,000,000. Parliament has been sitting here since November, the government has not a shadow of a vote for any such expenditure, and the Prime Minister has not seen fit to acquaint the House with what he is doing. He seems to be entering into an arrangement to spend the people's money without having had any parliamentary authority and he has been doing it for two and a half months while the members of parliament, who ought to have something to say in what is going on, are deprived of all information. The Prime Minister promised that full information would be given, but he omitted to do so when moving the second reading of the Bill, and the Minister of Militia did not deal with the question either.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will see when the correspondence has been brought down, that it is subject to the approval of parliament. The correspondence is now completed and it will be brought down at an early date, perhaps to-morrow.

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Prime Minister anything further to announce with regard to the present position of the waterways treaty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; it is in the same position.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) respecting the British North American Mining Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 133) to incorporate the Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—Mr. Doherty.

Bill (No. 117) for the relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 134) for the relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company.—Mr. Knowles.

DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—Mr. Harris.

On section 2, subsection (b).

Mr. LENNOX. I observe that the words 'for the purposes of its business only' are introduced in this section. That phrase differs from the phrase regularly used in railway Bills 'for the purpose of its undertaking.' This may lead to doubt as to the precise meaning of the phrase used here, and I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to stand for further consideration.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that this Bill was referred to a special subcommittee and the amendments proposed were brought in by that committee. I believe the subcommittee considered that, with the amendments added, the section sufficiently limited the charter.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see why we should use one phraseology as regards railway Bills and another phraseology as regards private Bills of this kind, and I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

QUESTIONS.

LA REVUE HEBDOMADAIRE—WEEKLY REPORT.

M. G. BOYER asks: (Translation).

1. Is it a fact that the interesting weekly review called Weekly Report, is not published in both languages?
2. If so, will the Government have this remedied?

Sir W. LAURIER (Translation).

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

GRAIN SUPERVISION AT FORT WILLIAM AND PORT ARTHUR.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. How many men are employed by the government as grain supervisors at Fort William and Port Arthur.
2. What is the total cost per annum of the supervision?
3. What are the names of the men employed, and the salary of each?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. 24 at present; but he number is always increased when navigation opens.
2. About $18,000 per annum.
3. The list of names with salaries cannot be given, as changes are taking place more or less all the time. The men are paid $60 a month when working.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LACHUTE, QUEBEC.

Mr. PERLEY:

1. When was the new public building at Lachute completed?
2. When were the fixtures installed in it?
3. Has it yet been opened to the public? If so, when? If not, why not?
4. Is it the intention of the government to arrange for a customs officer and service in this building?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. The building is virtually completed; a slight change has to be made to the electric lighting and is now being attended to.
2. Early in January, 1910.
3. No, owing to the change to electric lighting.
4. To be answered by the Department of Customs.

POST OFFICE AT HALIFAX.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. At what time did the Post Office Department decide to reconstruct the inside of the post office at Halifax, and in what way did they arrange to have it done?
2. Was it done by contract or by day work?
3. If by contract, how were tenders asked, who were the tenderers, what were the conditions imposed upon the contractor, when was the work done, what was the penalty, if any, how much work has been done, how much money paid to the present contractor, and when may we expect the work to be done so that the Post Office Department may get the building back for the benefit of the public?
4. How many men are at work on the building at present, what has been the average number of men per month working on that building since the contract has been let, and what was the rate of wages paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. In 1907-08, through the Department of Public Works.
2. By contract.
3. (a) By public advertisement;
(b) M. E. Keefe.. .. .. $ 94,000
Doran & Devlin.. 114,000
J. McInnes & Son, Ltd.. 145,000
(c) Work to be completed according to plans and specification.
(d) March 18, 1910.
(e) Clause 21 of contract is as follows: Contractor shall be liable for and shall cause to be paid to His Majesty all salaries or wages which shall become due to person or persons superintending the work on behalf of His Majesty from the above named period of completion until the same shall be actually completed and received; unless reason for such delay satisfactory to the chief architect and approved by the minister shall be given by the said contractor.
(f) About ¾ completed.
(g) $31,710.
(h) About July 1, 1910.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

4. (a) 23 to 25.
(b) Average number of men weekly from beginning to date, 26.
(c) The wages to be paid are included in the specification, in the Fair Wages Schedule under labour conditions; the schedule is furnished by the Labour Department.

VESSELS PURCHASED BY MARINE DEPARTMENT SINCE 1896.

Mr. BLAIN:

How many vessels have been purchased by the government since the year 1896, what are their names, the cost of each and where purchased?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1. Thirteen vessels were purchased.

Name.	Where Purchased.	Cost.
'Princess,'	Charlottetown, P.E.I..	$45,000
'Restless,'	New Westminster, B.C.. ..	18,000
'Hudson,'	St. John, N.B..	3,600
'Newington,'	Victoria, B.C..	38,000
'Falcon,'	Vancouver, B.C...	9,000
'Scout,'	Kingston, Ont..	16,669
'Reserve,'	Ottawa, Ont..	3,300
'Bayfield,'	Quebec, Que...	50,000
'Gulnare,'	Charlottetown, P.E.I.. ..	36,000
'Shamrock,'	Quebec, Que..	21,500
'Lady of the Lake,'	Selkirk, Man.. ..	8,000
'Maisonneuve,'	Ottawa, Ont..	8,500
'Christine,'	Halifax, N.S..	17,000

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE

On the order: Question by Mr. Haggart (Winnipeg) as to keeping open for boxholders Winnipeg post office.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall be prepared to answer this question to-morrow. But as to sub-question 11, concerning representations made by citizens of Winnipeg on this subject, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should move for a return, because the answer is very bulky and voluminous.

Mr. SPEAKER. Subsection 11 of this question stands as a notice of motion for a return.

GREAT LAKES DREDGING COMPANY CONTRACT.

Mr. RALPH SMITH:

1. What dredging has been done since April, 1909, at Fort William to improve the harbour accommodation, and also deepening the Kaministiquia river, under contract given to the Great Lakes Dredging Company?
2. What is the total yardage dredged during that period, and the amount of earth and rock?
3. What price has been paid for the same, and has the said work exceeded the appropriation for the same?
4. What amount of moneys have been paid over to the company, when was the last payment made, and what amount is still due the company?
5. Is the contract to be extended? If so, for what term of years?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Dredging Kaministiquia and Mission rivers and Grand Trunk Pacific terminal basin at Fort William.

	Cubic yards.
2. Earth	3,362,661
Rock	36,765
Total	3,399,426

3. (b) Prices under contract dated June 27th, 1906:

Kaministiquia and Mission Rivers:

Scow measurement: $2 per cubic yard for rock and 9 cents per cubic yard for other material.

In situ: $3 per cubic yard for rock and 9 cents per cubic yard for other material.

Above rates include towing 3½ miles; if towed further, 1 cent per cubic yard per mile to be added.

Prices under contract dated June 4, 1909:

Kaministiquia and Mission rivers:

(For complete areas, to dredge an additional 3 feet beyond the depth of 22 feet as per original contract.)

Scow measurement: $2.85 per cubic yard for rock and 22½ cents for other material.

(For uncompleted areas under contract dated June 27, 1906, to an additional depth of 3 feet.)

Scow measurement: $2.40 per cubic yard for rock and 10½ cents for other material.

Prices under contract dated February 27, 1909:

Grand Trunk Pacific terminal basin, Mission river:

Scow measurement: $2.85 per cubic yard for rock and 16 cents for other material.

Cast over: Same prices.

Additional prices for dumping material in structures or back of cribs, when rehandling is required, 18½ cents per cubic yard.

Measured in situ: $4 per cubic yard for rock and 25½ cents for other material.

3. (b) Work has exceeded amount of appropriation.

4. (a) $315,017.72. (b) November 6, 1909. (c) $379,200.46.

5. The original contract was enlarged June 4, 1909, and the amount of work still to be done will necessarily require a longer period than that specified by the said original contract.

QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY'S FINANCES.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. What amount of money or its equivalent was in the hands or control of the Quebec Bridge Company at the time of the collapse of the Quebec bridge?

2. What became of the money?

3. Was any of the money paid to the directors of the company? If so, what sums, to whom and on what account?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM:

1, 2 and 3. There was no money in the hands or control of the Quebec Bridge Company at the time of the collapse of the Quebec bridge.

THE WHITBY POST OFFICE.

Mr. SAM. SHARPE:

1. What is the total cost of the Whitby post office to date?

2. What was the original estimate?

3. Who is superintendent of work, what salary is he being paid, and how long has he been engaged?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $23,727.77, including site.

2. $33,000, exclusive of site.

3. (a) W. H. Bradshaw; (b) $4 per working day; (c) Since July 1, 1909.

PAYMENTS TO NEWSPAPERS IN CITY OF QUEBEC.

Mr. CROCKET:

1. Have the 'Soleil' Publication Company, the 'Vigie' Publication Company, and the 'Daily Telegram' Publication Company, of Quebec, received any sums of money from the different federal departments and from the Transcontinental Commission, since the first day of March, 1908?

2. If so, what amount of money has each of these companies received, and on what dates, respectively?

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand as a notice of motion.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION AND THE FISHERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Has the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources the oversight of or the advisory powers, as to the regulation or control of the fisheries of Canada or any branch thereof? If so, what is the scope of their duties?

2. What action, if any, has been taken, or is in contemplation, with reference thereto?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The duties of the commission in this regard are defined by section 10 of the Act to establish a commission for the conservation of natural resources, chapter 27, 8-9 Edward VII.

2. The commission has appointed a Committee on Fisheries, Game and Fur-bearing Animals under the provision of section 10 of the Act. This committee will make investigations, and in due course, send recommendations to the government.

CREW AND WAGES PAID, ON STEAMER 'EARL GREY.'

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What is the name, place of residence, occupation on ship and wages paid to each person employed on the government steamer 'Earl Grey?'

2. Are they on ship's articles, where was each one engaged, and at what port did he sign contract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

CREW LIST OF "EARL GREY."

Name.	County from.	Rank.	Salary.
			$ cts.
A. Brown	Queens	Master	135 00
J. L. Read	Prince	1st officer	60 00
L. C. Rhude	Kings	2nd officer	45 00
H. R. Cook	Pictou	Operator	60 00
D. D. Ryan	Queens	Purser	60 00
A. Lavers	Kings	Checker	55 00
John McMillan	Queens	Quartermaster	25 00
John Blue	Kings	"	25 00
John Campbell	Queens	"	25 00
L. Williamson	Queens	Carpenter	35 00
Colin McDonald	Pictou	"	35 00
Wm. Landry	Kings	Deckhand	23 00
Wm. Grant		"	23 00
Neil McDonald	Queens	"	23 00
Gilbert DesRoches	Prince	"	23 00
Wm. Poole	Kings	"	23 00
Wm. Cousins	Prince	"	23 00
Albert McNeil	Queens	"	23 00
Dan Matheson	Kings	"	23 00
Peter Gillis	"	"	23 00
Geo. LeBlanc	"	"	23 00
Geo. Birch	Prince	"	23 00
A. Arsenault	"	"	23 00
Mungo Ferguson	Kings	Watchman	23 00
Alex. McDonald	"	Deckhand	23 00
Dougal McIsaac	Queens	"	23 00
Wallace McDonald	"	"	23 00
J. H. Hill	Kings	Steward	45 00
R. Beck	P. E. Island	2nd Steward	30 00
Jas. Rice	Pictou	Cook	40 00
Jas. Shephard	Queens	2nd Cook	27 00
John McCarvill	Pictou	Waiter	20 00
Geo. Rice	Queens	"	20 00
Wm. Beers	Kings	"	20 00
Alfred Cheverie	"	Pantry boy	20 00
Maurice Donovan	Kings	Mess steward	25 00
Tena Trainor	Queens	Stewardess	13 00
John Gillis	"	Pantry boy	17 00
Alex. Campbell	"	Stoker	25 00
B. Crookshand	England	Guarantee engineer	121 00
P. W. Lyon	Pictou	Chief engineer	90 00
Wm. Hislop	"	2nd engineer	68 18
Edgar Finlayson	Queens	3rd engineer	50 00
Geo. Harris	Pictou	4th engineer	40 00
Alfred Baines	England	5th engineer	50 00
Sam Martin	Kings	Oiler and storekeeper	30 00
James Donovan	"	Oiler	30 00
James Arbing	Queens	"	30 00
T. Buchanan	"	"	30 00
Jas. Wisener	"	"	30 00
John Steward	"	"	30 00
H. McEachern	Kings	Leading stoker	27 50
A. Stevenson	Pictou	"	27 50
A. Herron	Queens	Stoker	25 00
H. McNeill	"	"	25 00
N. Morrison	"	"	25 00
R. Davis	"	"	25 00
F. Flynn	"	"	25 00
H. Davison	Prince	"	25 00
F. Hogan	Queens	"	25 00
T. Doyle	"	"	25 00
J. McMaster	Pictou	"	25 00
H. Alchorn	Queens	"	25 00
B. Binns	"	"	25 00
L. Wood	"	"	25 00
F. Coyle	"	"	25 00
T. Ronahan	"	"	25 00
P. Matheson	Kings	Stoker	25 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

CREW LIST OF "EARL GREY"—*Concluded.*

Name.	County from.	Rank.	Salary.
			$ cts.
J. McLean	Queens	Trimmer	25 00
Geo. Beers	Kings	"	25 00
John Jennings	"	"	25 00
J. F. Hughes	Queens	"	25 00
E. Cantwell	Kings	"	25 00
A. Morrissey	"	"	25 00
Alex. Campbell	Queens	Stoker	25 00
Robert Trainor	"	Cleaner	20 00
Wm. Watts		"	20 00
Alf. Mills		"	20 00

2. (a) Yes; (b) Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island; (c) Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

POST OFFICE BUILDING AT PICTOU, N.S.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Who was the contractor for the work of copper roofing the post office building at Pictou, Nova Scotia, in 1909?
2. Who supplied the material for said work?
3. What was the quantity and weight of copper plate supplied, and what was the price paid for same?
4. What was the total cost of the work?
5. Who inspected the materials and work, and what was he paid for inspection?
6. Was the work done and material supplied under public tender and contract? If so, who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. W. C. Wetmore & Company.
2 and 3. The contract was for a bulk sum of $1,500, the contractor furnishing his own material; 16 oz. cold rolled copper specified.
4. $1,590.
5. D. H. Waterbury, who is on the permanent staff of the department at an annual salary.
6. Tenders were invited from W. C. Wetmore & Company and from Scott Brown, but the latter declined to tender owing to pressure of work.

TRANSFER OF MR. JUSTICE PRENDERGAST.

Mr. A. HAGGART:

1. Has Mr. Justice Prendergast been transferred from the Saskatchewan Supreme Court bench to the Court of King's bench for Manitoba?
2. If so, was there any lack of legal talent in Manitoba, making it advisable to resort to another province for a judge?
3. What was the reason for the action of the government in this case, in departing from the usual course of appointing judges from the bar of the province in which they are to be judge?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH:

1. Yes.
2. The legal talent of the Bar of Manitoba is beyond question—the hon. gentleman is himself a member of the Bar.
3. Mr. Justice Prendergast was a Judge in the province of Manitoba before going to Saskatchewan. He now returns to Manitoba.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Is it intended that the regulations adopted by the International Fishery Commission shall become effective on the date therein stated, without action on the part of this parliament?
2. Has there been any undertaking on the part of the Canadian government to make or maintain supplementary regulations with respect to fisheries in Canadian waters adjoining the international waters governed by the treaty? If so, what is the undertaking?
3. Has there been any similar undertaking on the part of the United States government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Parliament will be asked to pass legislation to effect these regulations.
2. Yes; but only so far as the Fraser river is concerned, and Canada has already there, as elsewhere in Canada, not covered by the treaty, adequate regulations in operation.
3. No.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONTRACT OF O'BRIEN, FOWLER AND McDOUGALL.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Since the letting of the contract for the construction of a portion of the Transcontinental Railway to O'Brien, Fowler and McDougall, have estimates been made of the quantities of work yet remaining to be done and of the material yet to be furnished?

2. If so, at what dates have these estimates been made, and by whom? If not, why not?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No estimates have been made of the quantities of work yet remaining to be done nor of the materials yet to be furnished.

2. Engineers have not had time to cover the line to revise the original estimate, work on some portions having just begun.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—McARTHUR CONTRACT.

Mr. LENNOX:

Who signed the September estimates on McArthur contract, 244 miles east from Winnipeg, for September, 1907?

Mr. GRAHAM:

C. O. Foss, acting district engineer

ROYAL CANADIAN DRAGOONS—ST. JOHNS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has the government under consideration the question of transferring the Royal Canadian Dragoons from St. Johns to some other point? If so, what point, and when will the transfer be made?

2. Has the government under consideration the question of transferring the barracks of St. Johns to the authorities of the Merrivale College?

3. Is the government considering the question of erecting barracks or other buildings for military purposes at or near St. Lambert?

4. Is it the intention of the government to use the quarters of the Governor of New Brunswick in Fredericton for military purposes? If so, under what conditions?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 No.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. No.

VALUATION OF IMPORTED BINDERS.

Mr. STAPLES:

1. What valuation is placed on a McCormick 6 feet, 7 feet and 8 feet cut binder for customs purposes coming into Canada?

2. Is the same valuation placed on a Deering binder of the same size? If not, what is the valuation?

3. What is the valuation placed on a 4 feet, 5 feet and a 6 feet cut mower for customs purposes?

4. What was the valuation placed on the above-mentioned machines in 1896, 1900 and 1904?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1 and 2. The valuation now placed for duty purposes on McCormick and Deering binders (imported wholesale) is as follows, viz.: 6 feet binder with carrier $107.50; 7 feet binder with carrier $110.50; 8 feet binder with carrier and T truck, $130.

3. The valuation now placed for duty purposes on 4, 5 and 6 feet cut mowers imported wholesale is as follows, viz.: 4 feet mower for one horse, $34 and $35; 4½ feet mower, $38.50; 5 feet mower, $41; 6 feet mower, $42.

4. The valuation placed on the machines above mentioned in 1896, 1900 and 1904 was as follows, viz: Binders, 1896 in quantities 1 to 25, $100 (Carriers $5 extra; 26 to 50, $97.50 (Carriers $5 extra); 51 to 75, $95 (Carriers $5 extra); 76 to 125, $92.50 (Carriers $5 extra); 126 and over, $90 (Carriers $5 extra).

Binders, 1900 for all quantities and sizes including bundle carrier, $102.

Binders, 1904 for 6 feet and 7 feet cut including bundle carrier, $97; for 8 feet cut including bundle carrier and truck, $110.

Mowers, 1896 for 4½ and 5 feet cut in quantities 1 to 25, $34 each; 26 to 50, $33 each; 51 to 75, $32 each; 76 to 125, $31 each; 125 and over, $30 each.

Mowers, 1900 for 4 feet cut, one horse, $33; for 5 feet cut, $37; for 6 feet cut, $39.

Mowers, 1904 for 4 feet cut, one horse, $32; for 5 feet cut, $36; for 6 feet cut, $37.

IMPORTATIONS INTO YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. McCARTHY:

1. How many dollars worth of goods came into the Yukon territory, duty free, under item 460 of the tariff since the beginning of 1906?

2. How many dollars worth of goods came into the Yukon territory, duty free, under item 461 of the tariff since the beginning of 1906?

3. How many dollars worth of goods came into the Yukon territory and paid duty under item 461a of the tariff since the beginning of 1906?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The value of the importations into the Yukon territory during the calendar years from 1906 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows, under tariff item 460:

1906	$ 37,690
1907	10,404
1908	142
1909	
Total	$ 48,236

2. The value of the importations into the Yukon territory during the calendar years from 1906 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows, under tariff item 461:

1906	$ 65,388
1907	124,372
1908	387,997
1909	239,735
Total	$817,492

3. The value of the importations into the Yukon territory during the calendar years from 1906 to 1909, inclusive, was as follows, under tariff item 461a:

1906	
1907	119,674
1908	16,850
1909	47,380
Total	$183,904

PETROLEUM LOCATIONS ON THE ATHABASKA RIVER.

Mr. McCARTHY:

1. What petroleum locations have been made on the Athabaska river between Athabaska Landing and the Athabaska lake to date?

2. How many of these locations have been proved up by the discovery of oil, what licenses have been granted to date, and upon whose reports were these licenses granted?

3. When were these reports made, and in what way would an intending locator get possession of copies of them in order to obtain information with regard to the resources of the country already proven?

4. What regulations, if any, are in force for the location of tar-sand?

5. What applications has the department for extensions of time in which to carry out the exploratory duties on petroleum or tar-sand locations in that district?

6. Is the department making any effort to prove the existence or extent of petroleum, tar-sand, gas, salt or asphalt in this district?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. In all some 280 applications have been received and dealt with for the reservation of petroleum locations on both sides of the Athabaska river, from a point about three (3) miles above the mouth of Horse creek to the mouth of Tar river. All of these applications with the exception of fourteen (14) have elapsed.

2. Six. No licenses have been granted, as the regulations only provide for sale, and no sales have been made. Reports were made by S. T. Blackwell, Alfred Von Hammerstein, Robert Volkoffsky, William Dwyer and F. B. Smith.

3. During the year 1909. These reports refer only to the particular location in respect of which the same were made. They can be made public on motion for a return.

4. No such regulations are in force.

5. W. A. Campbell applied for extension of time on petroleum location, claiming to have machinery on the ground.

6. Not at present.

Note.—The tar-sands were mentioned in the report of the Geological Survey for 1873-4 (page 22), and described in the report for 1875-6 (page 92). They were investigated by Bell in 1882 (Annual Report Geological Survey, 1882-4, part CC), and by McConnell in 1888 (Annual Report, volume V., part D). McConnell estimates the tar-sands to cover at least 1,000 square miles, and to contain 28·4 cubic miles of material having a bitumen content of 6·5 cubic miles. From 1894 to 1900 the Geological Survey spent $38,-501.24 in experimental boring in Alberta, and since that date have spent $11,500 in assisting in that work. It may now be left to private enterprise to prospect and develop these resources.

GOVERNMENT LANDS AT ST. JOHNS.

Mr. HUGHES:

1. How many acres of land are owned by the government of Canada at St. Johns, Quebec?

2. Are these all in military use, and what troops are now there?

3. Is it proposed to sell these lands?

4. What buildings are thereon?

5. To whom are the properties to be sold, and were public tenders asked for?

6. If not sold, before being sold, will public tenders be called for, or will the sale be by public auction or by private sale?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. 99 acres.

2. (a) No; they are not all in military use; (b) the following troops are stationed at St. Jean, province of Quebec: 'A' Squadron Royal Canadian Dragoons, 90; No. 4 Detachment Permanent Army Medical Corps, 6; total number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men, 96.

3. No.

4. St. Johns barracks, including:

	Buildings.
Men's quarters	2
Officers' quarters	1
Married quarters	1
Hospital	1
Guard room	1
Drill hall	1
New stable	1
Engineer shops	1
Sheds	2
Fairbank's scales	1
Old drill hall	1
Oil store	1
	14

5 and 6. Answered by No 3.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copy of all papers and instructions given to A. S. Williams, law clerk of the Department of Indian Affairs, and to S. Swinford, inspector of Indians, Winnipeg, in connection with their work among the St. Peter's Indians in Manitoba; also a copy of the report of these gentlemen in connection with the work they have been engaged in during the last few weeks among the St. Peter's Indians.—Mr. Bradbury.

Return showing the amounts that have been paid to the 'Whig' Publishing Company for printing and advertising by or for any departments of this government other than Militia and Defence and Marine and Fisheries, each

year from 1896 to the present time.—Mr. Edwards.

Copy of all correspondence with Major Lydon, or other persons, respecting an application on behalf of the Highland Cadet Corps of Montreal, for permission to import, free of customs duty, certain articles of uniform and equipment, the manufacture of which is not carried on in Canada.—Mr. Worthington.

Copy of all orders in council, correspondence, reports, documents and papers, relating to the right or privilege to raise the waters of Clear lake, province of Manitoba, application for which was made by a company to develop power on the Little Saskatchewan river.—Mr. Roche.

Copy of all pay-sheets, accounts and vouchers for wages, material and expenditure in connection with work on Skinner's Cove, Boat Harbour, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, in the years 1907, 1908 and 1909.—Mr. Stanfield.

Copy of all pay-sheets, accounts and vouchers for wages, materials and other expenditures in connection with work on the Causeway between Cariboo and Cariboo Island, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, in the years 1907, 1908 and 1909.—Mr. Stanfield.

Copy of all pay-sheets, accounts and vouchers for wages, materials and other expenditures in connection with work on the Toney river, Boat Harbour, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, in the years 1907, 1908 and 1909.—Mr. Rhodes.

Copy of all correspondence, submissions, references, reports, returns and orders in council, in reference to the adjustment of the disputed item of 581 cubic yards of excavation, claimed at $10 instead of $2.50 a cubic yard, referred to in a letter of the Auditor General to the Secretary of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, dated the 18th August, 1909.—Mr. Lennox.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. G. V. WHITE (North Renfrew) moved for:

A copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, documents and papers, not already brought down, relating to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, or any portion thereof, or relating to the surveys thereof, and all offers, proposals and written negotiations not already brought down, with respect to the construction of the said canal or any portion thereof by any company, corporation or syndicate, or with respect to the guarantee by the government of bonds or debentures for the purpose of raising the necessary capital for the construction of the said canal.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in arising to address the House on the important question of transportation, dealing particularly with the advantages to commerce which Canada will derive by the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, I recognize my inability to deal intelligently with this subject. However, I realize the importance to Canada of cheap transportation, and I also feel the duty which devolves upon me as a member of this House of bringing to the attention of parliament matters which not only appertain to the constituency which I have the honour of representing, but also to the welfare of the Dominion in general. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), a short time ago, in the city of Toronto, made the statement that as a young nation we had far more important questions than defence to deal with, and the all important one was this question of transportation. I think it was Macaulay who said that of all the inventions, the alphabet and printing press alone excepted, these inventions which abridge distance have done most for civilization. Especially do these words apply, Sir, to a country of the magnitude of ours. A glance at the map will demonstrate that Canada, from her geographical position, holds the key to the solution of the water transportation problem of the North American continent. This is a fact which is not only recognized by ourselves, but also by our neighbours to the south of us. As regards railway transportation we are, for a young country, pretty well supplied. By the completion, in 1885, of the Canadian Pacific railway, recognized to-day as one of the greatest railway systems in the world, and having a gross revenue equal to the revenue of the Dominion during the last fiscal year, communication was established between the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans. In 1908, according to the Year-book, I find that there were some 23,000 miles of steam railway lines in operation in Canada. To-day we have in course of construction two other transcontinental lines, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, besides many branch lines, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) stated the other day that within a short time work would be commenced on the Hudson Bay railway. We need our railways, but we also need to develop and improve our waterways which are the natural means of communication placed at our disposal, especially adapted to the carriage of large and bulky commodities. It is a mistaken idea, which seems to be more or less prevalent, that the improvement of our waterways will retard railway development.

To verify my contention I need simply call the attention of the House to the fact that such men as Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific railway, Sir William Van Horne and James J. Hill, probably the three best authorities on modern transportation requirements have announced themselves as favourable to the construction of the Georgian bay canal. At a banquet tendered to him by the Toronto Board of Trade, on the 15th June, 1908, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said:

But while we are giving attention to our agricultural interests, and encouraging the development of our farms and our fruit lands, and our mining and lumbering operations, we have other things to do in Canada, which we must carry out if we are properly to fulfil our destiny. We have our internal water-

ways. We must endeavour to shorten the distance between the Georgian bay and the seaboard, and improve the routes so as to make traffic cheaper.

Now, Sir, I have here some statistics as to the development of waterways in European and other countries, and it would appear that while these other countries have been making use of their natural means of communication by water, Canada has apparently been at a standstill in this direction. Let me quote from Mulhall, the eminent British statistician; he gives the mileage of existing canals and rivers in use in Europe at over 77,000 miles, of which 13,293 miles are canals. The total mileage of the world's canals reaches 26,000 miles, costing in excess of two billion dollars. The British isles have some 4,000 miles of canals, Germany has 10,000 miles of internal waterways, including 3,000 miles of actual digging, and Germany has spent $60,000,000 on canals alone, and has under way a programme of waterway improvement which runs into an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Mr. Mason, one of the German consuls-general to the United States, says:

Germany foresaw that in a fully developed transportation system the proper role of the railways would be to carry passengers and the higher classes of merchandise manufactured from the raw staples which the waterways had brought to their doors.

France has some 3,000 miles of canals. Since 1814 France has spent $750,000,000 for harbours and waterways, $700,000,000 on railways, and $600,000,000 for wagon roads. M. Defreycinet, when a member of the French Cabinet, having control of transportation matters, said:

It is conceded that the waterways and railways are destined, not to supplant, but to supplement each other. Between the two there is a natural division of traffic. To the waterways gravitate the heavy commodities of small value, which can only be transported where freights are low. In procuring for manufactures cheap transportation for coal and raw materials, they create freights whose subsequent transportation gives profit to the railways.

It will be seen, therefore, that both Germany and France are one in believing that the improvement of their waterways does not hamper railway extension. China has a system of canals comprising some 5,000 miles; Belgium has 1,240 miles of internal waterways on which she has spent from $80,000,000 to $100,000,000; Austria-Hungary has within recent years spent on rivers and canals $200,000,000, and she has 1,700 miles of canals and over 5,000 miles of natural waterways. The Corinth canal in Greece which is four miles long, cost $500,000, and it saves ships a distance of from 100 to 175 miles. Russia purposes building a 27 foot waterway 1,000 miles long, from the Black sea to the Baltic, and costing approximately $100,000,000. Now, in reference to the United States, while the United States has actually 4,000 miles of canals, about 2,000 miles of these have been abandoned, and to show the reason for the abandonment of these canals,I shall quote from the last message to Congress of ex-President Roosevelt in December, 1908, in which he said:

Action should be begun forthwith during the present session of the congress, for the improvement of our inland waterways, action which will result in giving us not only navigable but navigated rivers. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars upon these waterways, yet the traffic on nearly all of them is steadily declining. This condition is the direct result of the absence of any comprehensive and far-seeing plan of waterway improvement. Obviously we cannot continue thus to expend the revenues of the government without return. It is poor business to spend money for inland navigation unless we get it.

Inquiry into the condition of the Mississippi and its principal tributaries reveals very many instances of the utter waste caused by the methods which have hitherto obtained for the so-called 'improvement' of navigation. A striking instance is supplied by the 'improvement' of the Ohio, which, begun in 1824, was continued under a single plan for half a century. In 1875 a new plan was adopted, and followed for a quarter of a century. In 1902 still a different plan was adopted, and has since been pursued at a rate which only promises a navigable river in from twenty to one hundred years longer.

Such shortsighted, vacillating and futile methods are accompanied by decreasing water-borne commerce and increasing traffic congestion on land, by increasing floods, and by the waste of public money. The remedy lies in abandoning the methods which have so signally failed and adopting new ones in keeping with the needs and demands of our people.

In the report on the measure introduced at the first session of this present Congress, the Secretary for War said:

The chief defect in the method hitherto pursued lies in the absence of executive authority for originating comprehensive plans covering the country or natural divisions thereof. In this opinion I heartily concur. The present methods not only fail to give us inland navigation, but they are injurious to the army as well. What is virtually a permanent detail of the corps of engineers to civilian duty, necessarily impairs the efficiency of our military establishment. The military engineers have undoubtedly done efficient work in actual construction, but they are necessarily unsuited by their training and traditions to take the broad view, and to gather and transmit to the congress the commercial and industrial information and forecasts upon which waterway improvement must always so largely rest. Furthermore, they have failed to grasp the great underlying fact that every stream is a unit from its source to its mouth, and that all

its uses are interdependent. Prominent officers of the engineer corps have recently even gone so far as to assert in print that waterways are not dependent upon the conservation of the forests about their head waters. This position is opposed to all the recent work of the scientific bureaus of the government, and to the general experience of mankind. A physician who disbelieved in vaccination would not be the right man to handle an epidemic of small-pox nor should we leave a doctor sceptical about the transmission of yellow feved by the stegomyia mosquito in charge of sanitation at Havana or Panama. So with the improvement of our rivers; it is no longer wise or safe to leave this great work in the hands of men who fail to grasp the essential relations between navigation and general development and to assimilate and use the central facts about our streams.

Until the work of river improvement is undertaken in a modern way it cannot have results that will meet the needs of this modern nation. These needs should be met without further dilly-dallying or delay. The plan which promises the best and quickest results is that of a permanent commission authorized to co-ordinate the work of all the government departments relating to waterways, and to frame and supervise the execution of a comprehensive plan. Under such a commission the actual work of construction might be intrusted to the reclamation service, or to the military engineers acting with a sufficient number of civilians to continue the work in time of war, or it might be divided between the reclamation service and the corps of engineers. Funds should be provided from current revenues if it is deemed wise—otherwise from the sale of bonds. The essential thing is that the work should go forward under the best possible plan and with the least possible delay. We should have a new type of work and a new organization for planning and directing it. The time for playing with our waterways is past. The country demands results.

I have also an extract from a recent report of the commissioner of corporations on transportation by water in the United States giving further reasons for the abandonment of certain canals in the United States. This report says:

Among the causes for the abandonment of canals have been the original improvident location of some canals, mismanagement, the adverse control of strategic connections and terminals, and above all the inability of shallow towpath canals to adopt their physical conditions to the demands of modern transportation. Practically all the canals now in most successful use are ship canals, forming comparatively short links between important natural waterways and opening up extended routes of transportation by water for large vessels.

Then I find that the North American Conservation Conference which met last year at Washington calls the attention of the country to our waterways. It says:

We recognize the waters as a primary resource, and we regard their use for domestic and municipal supply, irrigation, navigation and power, as interrelated public uses, and properly subject to public control. We therefore favour the complete and concurrent development of the streams and their sources for every useful purpose to which they may be put.

The highest and most necessary use of water is for domestic and municipal purposes. We therefore favour the recognition of this principle in legislation, and, where necessary, the subordination of other uses of water thereto.

The superior economy of water transportation over land transportation, as well as its advantages in limiting the consumption of the non-renewable resources, coal and iron, and its effectiveness in the promotion of commerce, are generally acknowledged. We therefore favour the development of inland navigation under general plans adapted to secure the uniform progress of the work and the fullest use of the streams for all purposes. We further express our belief that all waterways so developed should be retained under exclusive public ownership and control.

Before discussing the report of the Georgian Bay canal survey, which was laid on the table of the House last session, I wish to offer my congratulations to the board of engineers in charge of this survey work. The report which they have presented to the House contains a mass of valuable information compiled in such a manner as to make it both interesting and instructive reading. Having had the advantage of a course in engineering myself, I feel that I can appreciate the value of this work. I shall take up simply the results and conclusions submitted by the board appointed to investigate the feasibility and probable cost of a deep waterway from the Great Lakes to the sea-board via the French and Ottawa rivers. The first conclusion at which the board arrive is as follows:

That a 22-foot waterway for the largest lake boats (600 ft. x 60 ft. x 20 ft. draft) can be established for one hundred million dollars ($100,000,000) in ten years, and that the annual maintenance will be approximately $900,000 including the operation of storage reservoirs for the better distribution of the flood waters of the Ottawa river.

This board of engineers investigated the cost of two routes the results being as follows:

SUMMARY OF COST.

Route A.—Via Montreal, Lake St. Louis, Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Ottawa, Rocher Fondu Channel, Coulonge, Pembroke, Des Joachims, Mattawa, Talon Lake, North Bay, Lake Nipissing and French river.

Locks, dams, channels, piers, lighting, damages..	$88,626,108
Contingencies, engineering, administration, &c..	8,862,892
Storage of flood waters, regulation basins, telephones, &c..	2,200,000
Total..	$99,689,000

Feeder at summit when required..	$ 987,485

Route B.—Same as route A excepting that Rivières des Prairies (Back river) one of the branches of the Ottawa river, north of Montreal Island, is followed instead of Lake St. Louis and the St. Lawrence river from Ste. Anne to Montreal as in route A.

Locks, dams, channels, piers, lighting, damages..	$83,354,508
Contingencies, engineering, administration, &c..	8,335,492
Storage of flood waters, regulation basins, telephones, &c..	2,200,000
Total..	$93,890.000

With an extra amount of $987,485 for feeder at summit, as in the previous case. They have figured out the cost of maintenance, and it amounts to, as I have already stated, some $900,000.

Distance from Montreal harbour to French river village on Georgian bay equals 440 miles. The rise from Montreal harbour to the summit of 659 feet can be overcome by 23 locks, ranging from 5 feet to 50 feet in lift and that the descent of 98 feet from the summit to Georgian bay can be made by four locks ranging from 21 feet to 29 feet in height of lift,—27 locks in all, connecting twenty-three navigable pool levels of various lengths.

That sufficient water may be stored within its own and adjacent watersheds to operate a summit level above Lake Nipissing. That to use the Lake Nipissing level as a summit would increase the cost by at least $10,000,000, and introduce twelve additional miles of canal cutting.

The reports point out that there were two alternate methods of getting over the summit level:

1st. By carrying the Lake Nipissing level through to the Paresseux locks, making a raised summit of Lake Nipissing the summit level.

2nd. By raising all the lakes between Lake Nipissing and the Paresseux locks to a common level, thus making a summit level above that of Lake Nipissing.

3rd. By augmenting the supply of the watershed of the second or adopted condition from outside sources.

The first establishes the summit level at elevation 648·0 feet over a distance of 56½ miles from the Chaudière Falls at the outlet of Lake Nipissing to the Paresseux locks at the foot of Talon lake, and whose supply is derived from the watersheds of Lakes Nipissing, Trout, Turtle, Talon and Nosbonsing, the combined area being 4,420 square miles. These watersheds would together yield a minimum outflow in excess of 4,500 cubic feet per second, with control at the present outflow of Lake Nipissing at the Chaudière Falls. This outflow is obviously much beyond the limit of any canal requirement, so that further discussion of this level with regard to supply is unnecessary.

So that as regards getting a sufficient water supply, there is no doubt so far as the first method is concerned but on account of the extra cost, the engineers saw fit to adopt the second method:

The second is that which applies to the project as laid down and calls for a summit level at elevation 677·0 or 29 feet over the raised Lake Nipissing level, and extending from the small upper lakes or sources of the Ojibwaysippi creek at the west end, to the lower end of Talon lake at the east end, and embracing Trout and Turtle lakes, the Little Mattawan river and Talon lake, a distance of about 24 miles.

This will be accomplished by ten small puddle core earth dams at the west end, and a concrete overflow crest dam just above the present overflow of the Talon chute at the east end. The effect of this will be to raise Talon lake 41·7 feet, and Trout and Turtle lakes 14·3 feet above their present levels, thereby creating a summit basin of 22·4 square miles in area.

This elevation of 677 feet is the most economic height to raise the water now contained in these lakes, in order to use them as a summit level from the comparative standpoint of increased height and consequent cost of the lock structures at either end and the minimizing excavation to obtain grade between them.

By fixing the summit grade at elevation 651·0 a storage of six feet is obtained in the summit basin over the minimum projected draft of 20 feet on the upper sills of the summit locks.

So it will be seen that by saving some ten miles of excavation they got sufficient water for canal purposes by adopting the second condition. The report goes on to say:

That the natural low water flow from the Ottawa and French rivers is most ample to meet all the requirements.

With regard to the flow regulation, the report says:

The Ottawa valley or watershed is bounded toward the north by the height of land, or west of the ridge which marks the commencement of the slope to Hudson bay along the west and south the ridge marks the slope towards the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence. The encircled valley is 55,700 square miles in area, all of which drains through creeks and rivers eventually into the main stream. The rain and snowfall within this area alone has to be considered. Of the total area 45,000 square miles lie to the north of the river and 10,000 —practically all in Ontario—to the south. The northern area from Montreal to Mattawa forms a rectangle 300 miles east and west by 150 miles north and south. Roughly speaking, this rectangle is divided in half by the Gatineau valley.

The western half or upper Ottawa basin contains the large lakes—Victoria, Expanse and Quinze, with an expansion of the Ottawa on its way westwards into its north and southlying expansion—Lake Temiscamingue. Here the Blanche and Montreal rivers enter, and the whole continues south to Mattawa.

That the spring flood in the Ottawa river can be restrained by storage throughout its watershed so that, under extreme conditions, the reaches will not overflow; currents therein will not be over three miles per hour, and locks will be workable, that is to say, prac-

tically slack water navigation will obtain.

That ordinary lift locks are best suited to the conditions found. That their minimum length should be 650 feet between the inside gates, with 65 feet clear width, and 22 feet clear depth throughout.

That the gates should be of steel, and for safety, there should be two pairs of upper gates, and two pairs of lower gates, with additional lower unwatering gates, if necessary. That the locks should be constructed of concrete with long approach piers of continuous cribwork at each end.

That all locks will be in secure rock foundation.

The fact that all locks will be in secure rock foundations is to my mind very important.

On the route the number of reaches is twenty-three, a flight of two locks being provided for at Roche Capitaine rapids, and at the lower and upper Paresseux falls.

The lock channels are to have a clear length of 650 feet and a clear width of 65 feet, with a depth of 22 feet over the mitre sills. These dimensions will accommodate vessels of the largest tonnage on the great lakes and will provide reasonable accommodation for any probable increase in the size of these boats. Duplicate pairs of gates are provided at both ends of the locks and, should a longer chamber be required occasionally, a clear length of 707 feet would be available by leaving the inner pair of lower gates open. Some of the lake boats for the iron ore trade, as has been stated, have attained a length of 605 feet. The common lake carriers of 6,000 to 10,000 tons are from 350 to 500 feet and over in length.

Conclusion No. 5 deals with the dams:

There will be 18 main dams required, some of considerable size, all being on secure rock foundations.

That regulation by stop-log sluices is amply efficient in most of the cases encountered, and 'Stoney' sluices and overflow regulation are adapted to the remaining reaches.

6th. That excavated channels with sides showing above water should have a minimum width of 200 feet at bottom, and submerged channels a minimum width of 300 feet at bottom, with marking piers at intervals, and that the minimum depth throughout should be 22 feet. That the project presented contemplates: 28 miles of canal excavation, 66 miles of channel dredging, and 346 miles of river and lake with a width of 300 feet to a half mile.

That is 6·36 per cent of the total route is of canal excavation, 15 per cent of channel dredging and 78·64 per cent of river and lake requiring no improvements. You will see, Mr. Speaker, what a small percentage of this waterway is to be improved in any way.

Conclusion No. 7 deals with the time of transportation.

Mr. G. V. WHITE.

That the total time taken by a lake freight boat of 12-mile maximum speed, without delays at locks or in meeting other boats, from French river harbour to Montreal would be 70 hours. That the season of navigation will average 210 days from May to November.

This is one of the objections which have been raised to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal by parties opposed to the scheme—that the short season of navigation would be a hindrance. But, when we consider that the time occupied in the trip from the mouth of the French river to Montreal would be only 70 hours, we can see that, in a navigation season of say 210 days, which means 5,040 hours, there would be 72 trips of seventy hours each. I compiled figures of the reports of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, showing the opening and closing of navigation at different points along the great lakes for ten seasons from 1898 to 1907, and I find that the number of days during which navigation was open averages 214. During last season, navigation on the great lakes, as stated in the report of the Trade and Commerce Department, opened on April 28 and closed on December 10, making 226 days in all. So, we find that the season of navigation of this Georgian Bay canal route will be practically the same as the season of navigation on the St. Lawrence at Montreal.

Conclusion No. 8 says:

That the proposed reaches will be generally held at about the ordinary high-water level of their vicinity, and much of the area to be flooded is now inundated each spring, so no extensive damage to the farming districts will occur.

Conclusion No. 9, in my opinion, is one of the most important arrived at by this board of engineers. It deals with the question of water-powers and is as follows:

That with a storage system as planned, and the tributary basins thereto required for the navigation project, a reliable water-power supply is secured at various dams amounting to 1,000,000 horse-power, which can be developed at $50 per horse-power.

I have gone pretty fully into the question of water-powers, for, as I have stated, it is, to my mind, one of the principal questions to be dealt with in connection with this important project. Water-powers, as we all know, will play a very important part in the future development of our country, and it is pointed out that the force unused on the Ottawa river at present is enormous. Through the construction of dams and locks, the water-powers will be concentrated at various points along the route. The first essential in water-power development is an average flow, such as can be accomplished by the construction of a perfect system of reservoirs. For example, we find that, in Minneapolis, they

have installed a storage or reservoir system to govern the flow. In the report of the United States chief of engineers, it is stated that the reservoir system has already directly benefited the milling interests of Minneapolis to the extent of $500,000 annually, the production of flour by water-power amounting to 16,000,000 barrels at less than 1 cent a barrel, which by steam would cost 5 cents. The preservation of our forest areas at the head of the streams is also essential to the maintenance of our water-powers. Power will be required along the route for canal purposes, for lighting, for the operation of the locks, &c. The plans which have been presented create at least 12 water-powers, which consume the entire head of the river from Mattawa to the Lake of Two Mountains, aside from the possible two powers on the Back river should that route be selected for the waterway. It is also pointed out that this water-power would materially assist in paying interest on the total cost of construction.

It is clear that, ultimately, owing to the work of the federal government, the energy available will be from 15 to 20 times more valuable than it is at present, and it would seem to be good business for the Dominion to acquire the powers now if they could be reasonably purchased.

The industries which would utilize the water-powers: Pulp and paper mills. Electric smelting. Electrification of railways, Chemical works.

On page 295 of the report I find the following with regard to this waterway:

Ideal sites for the location of flour mills for milling in transit will also be available and, no doubt, many other manufacturers will be attracted by the combination of cheap power and transportation. The advantages of these two combined have been shown particularly at the Soo and Niagara. In neither of these cases can the power be considered as cheap as can be developed in other portions of the country. But the advantage of cheap transportation and local market has developed these before the other cheaper powers have been touched.

The construction of the canal will furnish one of the principal reasons for the development of the powers by giving cheap transportation both for the raw material and the finished product. The powers will be still better adapted for the manufacture of paper and pulp with a waterway both to the American and European markets.

It would seem advisable, in view of the above circumstances, that if there is a probability of the canal being constructed, that immediate control of the various water-powers be acquired by the Dominion government.

A study of the intimate relations between the proper development of the powers and the construction of the canal will show the truth of this statement.

Then I have here some figures with regard to the powers along the route in their present condition, and what they could develop after the canal was constructed:

Proceeding by way of Ste. Anne, the first power will be located at Pointe Fortune, near Carillon, 49½ miles from Montreal. The present low water head is 13½ feet, which, with a discharge of 17,400 cubic feet per second, is capable of developing 19,300 electrical horse-power. After the canal is constructed, there will be concentrated here the fall of the series of rapids above, making a head of 40 feet, which with a regulated discharge of 43,950 cubic feet per second is capable of developing 148,000 electrical horse-power. This power would, undoubtedly, be of great value as being in such close proximity to Montreal, where the market for electrical energy is rapidly increasing.

The next power site is situated at Hawkesbury, which is 60 miles from Montreal and 10½ miles from the Pointe Fortune power just described. On the Quebec shore, the Hawkesbury Lumber Company have developed some 1,200 horse-power under an 8-foot head. Canal regulation works will maintain a maximum fall of 25 feet, but, allowing six feet for slope of the water surface in the 67 miles above, friction, losses, &c., an effective head of 19 feet can be utilized and 71,800 electrical horse-power developed. The large cost of this development, as tabulated, is owing to the heavy expense in the construction of outer works, the main channels of the river being taken up by sluice-gates for the proper maintenance of the canal levels; also the head being comparatively low, the adoption of smaller electrical units is necessary. This improved power at Hawkesbury would most likely be used in different lumber and pulp manufactories for the district below Ottawa.

The next lift at the Chaudière Falls is 126·8 miles from Montreal. There is at present a turbine installation of about 50,000 horse-power under heads varying from 16 to 27 feet. Those present powers are being greatly improved by the construction of a massive stop-log dam across the river, just above the falls. The canal dam will, probably, be placed about three-quarters of a mile above the falls, and, in order not to interfere with the present interests, a development has been figured on with a twenty-foot head which will be the difference in the level between the water in the reach above Ottawa, and the water surface to be maintained by the power owners' dam. Hence, with a regulated discharge of 28,000 cubic feet will be an additional 45,000 electrical horse-power available at the Chaudière after the canal is constructed. This increase of power would be welcomed, as even at the present time the supply of hydro-electrical power is insufficient.

By the erection of the canal dam at Ottawa, the Deschenes rapids will be drowned out.

The Chats Falls is the next power site situated twenty-eight miles above Ottawa and 155 miles from Montreal. A thorough study being made of a development here, it is proposed to raise the head water sufficiently to drown out the Chats rapids above. Under a 48-foot head, there is at present 43,300 horse-power available here. In contrast to this, the conditions when the canal is built, will be a regulated low water flow of 27,400 cubic feet per second which, with on effective head of 48·5 feet is capable of generating 113,500 horse-power. For both present and future developments, it is proposed to construct a canal head race, 2,100 feet in length on the Quebec side. The Chats Falls are situated within

comparatively short transmission distance of numerous cities and towns, which would, no doubt, flourish if the canal were built and consequently, greatly increase the demand for power.

Passing up the river twenty miles further, the Chenaux rapids are reached. The available power at present is practically negligible owing to the fall being very small, but the canal will concentrate here a head of 35 feet and of 68,300 horse-power capacity. Besides the Chenaux lift being a power directly created by the canal the other sites on this reach of the river will be greatly increased in value. From the Chats to Pembroke there are long stretches of shallow rapids, &c., where frazil and anchor ice troubles would abound but which will be eliminated by the raised canal levels.

At mileage '183' the Ottawa river is divided into two channels by Calumet island. The south channel consists of a series of pitches and rapids, twelve miles in length. By the canal, these rapids will be concentrated into two lifts three miles apart, and of 35 feet each, called the Rocher Fendu No. 1 and the Rocher Fendu No. 2 with a total of 78,000 electrical horse-power available.

The Grand Calumet falls are situated on the north channel caused by Calumet island. In a distance of a mile there is a drop of 56 feet made up of a number of cascades of great turbulence. Taking the present extreme low water flow of 4,635 cubic feet per second, there could be developed here, 20,100 horse-power. As the proposed canal route will most likely be through the Rocher Fendu channel, it will be necessary to put a dam in the Calumet channel for the proper maintenance of the canal levels. Properly placed, this dam, together with the other canal works could be utilized to develop a most valuable power site, with the following governing conditions: a maximum effective head of 69·5 feet and a regulated low water discharge of 9,700 cubic feet per second, making an available capacity of 56,000 electrical horse-power. The Grand Calumet is an excellent site for a pulp and paper industry, as a large timber country is available through tributary streams situated short distances further up the river.

The next fall will be at Paquette, 209 miles from Montreal. At present there is a maximum available head of 16 feet, capable of developing 8,700 horse-power. Extensive works are necessary to obtain this power which presents a great contrast with the power which can be obtained after canalization. By the latter, there will be concentrated here a head of 20 feet, making available 24,900 electrical horse-power.

Culbute chute is a small power situated on the north channel caused by Allumette island.

Fifty-six miles from the Paquette lift are the Des Joachims falls, 266 miles from Montreal. With a head of 35 feet, the present low water capacity is 22,740 electrical horse-power. The available head after the canal is constructed will be 40 feet, developing 60,400 horse-power.

Eighteen miles further, or 284 miles from Montreal, are the Rocher Capitaine falls. This is another of the large powers of the Ottawa river. The present physical conditions are favourable to development. The river swings around a neck of land across which a canal head-race one and one-half miles in length could be constructed—thus, to utilize an effective head of 59 feet, and develop 38,400 electrical horse-power. The same scheme of development could be adopted after the canal is built. The available head would also be 59 feet but with the increased regulated low water flow of 16,200 cubic feet per second, a capacity of 82,000 horse-power could be obtained.

The next fall at Deux Rivières has a present maximum head of 15 feet, with a capacity of only 9,360 horse-power. This could only be developed at a large capital cost. The canal will concentrate here a fall of 30 feet, making 38,400 horse-power available.

The last three water-powers, viz.: Des Joachims, Rocher Capitaine and Deux Rivières, are situated within a stretch of 31 miles and would aggregate a total of 180,800 electrical horse-power after the canal is constructed, as against 70,500 horse-power if developed fully for present low water. It is not probable that any improvement of these sites would be attempted under present conditions, as the country in the vicinity is sparsely settled and the land is very rough.

From Mattawa to Lake Nipissing, the various lifts which will be created by the canal will not be available for power purposes as the water supply of the Summit will be practically required for lockages and storage.

The water-powers of the French river are, at present, many in number but of small capacity. The Big Chaudière, Five-Mile rapids and the Dalles are the largest and most suitable for power purposes, especially so as the canal lifts on the French river will be concentrated at these three places.

However, with regard to this section of the route there is not sufficient data upon which to found any accurate statement regarding the power to be developed there.

Five-Mile rapids are situated forty-five miles from North Bay; the total low water flow is 5,000 cubic feet per second. A total effective head of 24 feet and 10,000 electrical horse-power is available. The capacity of this power being the same before and after the canal is constructed, the cost of development with the canal built is decreased only by the cost of the dam, which would be borne by canalization.

The Dalles falls are situated about a mile from Georgian bay. In order to obtain a head of 21 feet and utilize a low water discharge of 4,000 cubic feet per second, it is necessary to dam the four channels. Only 6,700 horse-power could be developed at Dalles falls.

There are many other features which are taken into account in the study and valuation of the water-powers, such as run-off flow at all stages, &c., but these are given elsewhere and it is deemed unnecessary to repeat the same here.

The report goes on to say:

Upwards of 1,000,000 horse-power can be developed along the Ottawa and French rivers by the improved regulated conditions proposed for canal purposes. It is doubtful if more than 150,000 horse-power at minimum conditions could be developed at present. Under present conditions the powers will not be developed for more than 150,000 horse-power, and the capital cost per electrical

horse-power at the out-going terminals of the power-house would average $75 per electrical horse-power.

With construction of the canal, this amount would be increased to 1,000,000 horse-power and the capital cost per horse-power exclusive of the works, which are constructed for canal purposes, would average $48 per electrical horse-power.

Considering the reduced price per horse-power resulting from the decreased capital cost and the improvement due to cheap transportation, it would appear that it would not be an improbable hypothesis as a basis of calculation to assume that the 1,000,000 theoretical horse-power would be developed in as short a time as 150,000 horse-power, under present circumstances.

Different methods might be followed in case of construction such as:—

1. The power might be leased on the basis of the reduced capital cost per horse-power of the development. The proceeds to be used in paying the interest on the investment and reducing the tolls of the canal. An annual rental of $5 per horse-power would result in an eventual revenue of $5,000,000 per year.

2. The power might be granted at nominal figures to attract manufactories from which the transportation of the raw material and manufactured articles would repay the privileges granted.

No. 10 refers to the alternative route:

10th. That an alternative route behind Montreal is entirely feasible and would cost $5,000,000 less that the front or St. Lawrence river route; the time of transit by the back route being less than one hour longer than by the front of Montreal, and having one lockage less.

11th. That locks 800 feet long and 75 feet wide would increase the total cost by $5,000,000 That building all locks to a depth of 24 feet so reaches might afterwards be deepened, would cost another $6,000,000. That a depth of 25 feet along the route behind Montreal for 16 miles to Sault au Recollet would cost $7,250,000, nearly $2,000,000 more than the 22-foot depth for the same distance. That increased depth up to 26 feet can be secured temporarily by filling the reaches above ordinary working level, and in a case of emergency will pass boats of 24 to 25-foot draft, if the terminal locks and those into Lake Nipissing are given a 25 foot depth, and slight additions made to the overflow dams.

The 12th and last result pointed out by this board is that no international waters are affected which is very important. I have an extract here which I have taken from a work by Mr. Herbert Quick on American inland waterways. It is probably one of the most recent works on American waterways it having been published in July, 1909. Mr. Quick, referring to the Georgian Bay canal, says:

That twenty-one feet of water through this channel means much of prejudice to us in a military way any one can see. That it imperils all our foreign bound and much of our domestic trade on the lakes where most of our merchant marine is to be found, ordinary common sense must make plain, leaving out of account the deliberate utterances to the same effect of statesmen and publicists on both sides of the line.

I have read most of this work of Mr. Quick and he admits that Canada is practically the greatest competitor which the United States have in so far as water transportation routes are concerned. He pays particular attention to the Georgian Bay canal scheme and points out that it would be of immense advantage to the North American continent in the movement of large and bulky commodities.

I have compiled some figures to show the sources of trade for this route should the Georgian Bay canal be constructed. In answer to a question placed on the order paper a few days ago by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) gave the following figures. The question dealt with the amount of arable land and the amount of land under cultivation in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Alberta at the present time. The figures are as follows:

	Total area.	Arable land.	Under cultivation.	Per cent. *
Manitoba ..	41,169,280	25,150,000	5,061,503	2·0
Alberta.. ..	155,400,000	52,200,000	1,483,400	2·8
Saskatchewan.. ..	151,900,000	66,600,000	5,814,723	7·8
Total..	348,469,280	143,950,000	12,360,000	8·5

*Per cent of arable land under cultivation.

So, we can look forward to the day when practically all of the arable land is under cultivation and like the Minister of Railways and Canals I view the future of Canada very optimistically. I believe that in a very few years the West, instead of contributing some 160,000,000 bushels of grain, as it has done this year, will contribute from 250,000,000 to 500,000,000 bushels and there will then be freight for all routes, the Hudson Bay railway included. In 1909 the wheat crop of Canada amounted to 166,744,000 bushels as against 112,434,000 in 1908. The average yield per acre in 1909 was 21·51 bushels as against 17 bushels in 1908. Therefore, there was an increase in the yield of 54,310,000 bushels or 48·3 per cent, practically 50 per cent of an increase. The total value was $141,320,000. Of this amount the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta contributed 147,482,000 bushels as against 106,000,000 bushels in 1908, or an increase of 38·6 per cent. The report of the Trade and Commerce Department for December, 1908, shows that Canada ranks tenth in the wheat producing countries of the world for 1906 and 1907, sixth in the production of oats, and eighth in the production of barley. In 1903 the crops in the west amounted to 56,000,000 bushels, and in 1908 they amounted to 106,-

000,000 bushels. Taking the average yield per acre at 19 bushels the crop in Saskatchewan and Alberta trebled in the five years between 1903 and 1908. Assuming the same proportion of increase during the next five years, say in 1913 the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan alone would produce at least 150,000,000 bushels of wheat. As to the prospect for this season's crop I quote from the Toronto 'Globe' of January 3, 1910, the statement of Mr. Wm. Whyte, vice-president of the Canadian Pacific railway:

The area under crop in Manitoba will not be largely increased in 1910 but in Saskatchewan the increase will amount to 20 per cent of the whole. Within a short time the province of Saskatchewan will be producing more wheat than any state in the union and in less than a decade it will produce more wheat than all the United States combined. In a paper read last summer before the British Association by Mr. W. B. Lanigan, assistant freight traffic manager of the company, he stated that all the land under cultivation in Saskatchewan taken altogether did not amount to more than the road allowances of the province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out by what routes most of our grain is taken to the markets. I have before me figures of the shipments of grain from Fort William and Port Arthur for the seasons, 1906, 1907, 1908 and 1909, and as these figures are taken from the government reports they are probably as correct as we can expect to find them:

Shipments of Grain from Fort William to Port Arthur for Season of Navigation 1906-7-8-9.

	Canadian Ports.	American Ports.	Total.	P.C. via American Ports.
1906..	34,634,674	16,451,909	51,086,583	32·2
1907..	44,426,428	15,384,381	59,810,809	26·0
1908..	48,319,113	19,875,187	68,194,300	28·6
1909..	54,816,798	23,089,304	77,906,102	29·6

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that during the last four years practically thirty per cent, of our grain from the west went by way of American ports, when, not only all our own grain should have been sent by Canadian ports, but we should have as well a large percentage of American grain through these ports. On pages 1858-1859 of the government report on grain, I find that the quantity of wheat exported from Canada in 1908 was as follows:

	Bushels.
Total to British empire	43,102,240
To foreign countries (including the United States)	552,428
To the United States	114,926
Total..	43,654,668

Deducting the 114,926 bushels that went to the United States we had 43,540,742 bushels of grain going to other foreign countries. Now, on page 1847 of the same report I find that for the year 1908 the export of Canadian grain from Canadian ports is as follows:

	Bushels.
Montreal	19,552,752
St. John, N.B..	5,845,073
Halifax	4
Total exported from Canadian ports	25,397,829

Montreal also exported 10,900,000 of foreign wheat in 1908. We, therefore, find that from American ports during 1908, there must have been shipped via American ports the difference between 43,540,742 bushels, the total exportation, and 25,397,829 bushels which went through Canadian ports, leaving 18,142,913 bushels to go through American ports, or, 41·7 per cent of the total Canadian grain exported to foreign countries that year went via American ports.

The trade area of the great lakes includes an area of agricultural and industrial activity of over 2,000,000 square miles, with a population of over 25,000,000. In this area over two-thirds of the iron production of the United States is manufactured. I wish to submit the following estimate of the traffic available for the Georgian Bay canal:

	Tons.
I. Through freight comprising chiefly wheat, corn and other cereals, flour, beef and hog products, cattle and live stock, and other farm products from the Canadian Northwest and the Western States en route for transatlantic markets or to eastern Canada and New England..	11,000,000
II. Sawn lumber and other forest products, including firewood, railroad ties and sleepers, posts, poles, staves, heading, pot and pearl ashes, &c..	3,000,000
III. Coal, including both the Nova Scotia product in bulk cargoes by vessels carrying grain or lumber as return to Sydney, and American anthracite from Lake Erie ports to which shipments of return cargoes of lumber and pulpwood can be made..	1,500,000
IV. Pulpwood, pulp, spruce, &c.. ..	1,500,000
V. Ores, minerals, building stones, marble, lime, clay, sand, brick, cement, peat, fuel, &c..	2,000,000
VI. General merchandise..	1,000,000
Total estimated annual traffic.. ..	20,000,000

With regard to the first item, the wheat raised during the year 1908 in the country

tributary to the great lakes, which area would be directly benefited by the construction of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, was about 580,000.000 bushels, or 17,577,000 tons. The shipments of wheat from this tributary area were over 9,000,000 tons. The shipments eastward from Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth, Port Arthur and Fort William, of wheat alone, during the year 1908 amounted to 132,001,285 bushels, or over 4,000,000 tons.

Of corn, the country tributary to the great lakes, during the year 1908, raised 1,770,000,000 bushels, or 50,610,057 tons. Chicago alone has shipped in a single year upwards of 3,700,000 tons.

Of flour, Minneapolis alone shipped, during the year 1908, 14,156,164 barrels of flour, or about 1,575,000 tons. The export of flour to Great Britain and Europe from Atlantic ports in 1908 totalled 11,644,400 barrels, or 1,300,000 tons. The consumption of flour in eastern Canada and the New England states, the great bulk of which is supplied by the area tributary to the great lakes, amounts to about 9,000,000 barrels, or 1,000,000 tons.

Of other grains, the receipts of grain other than wheat and corn, at five northern Atlantic ports, for domestic consumption and export, in 1908 amounted to 58,606,000 bushels, or over 1,670,000 tons.

From the above it is evident that the item of grain alone furnishes a present volume of traffic, as follows, for which the Ottawa is the shortest route, and the great bulk of which it is bound to attract:

	Tons.
Wheat for export..	3,600,000
Wheat for domestic consumption ..	1,000,000
Corn for export..	2,200,000
Corn for domestic consumption.. ..	1,000,000
Flour for export..	1,300,000
Flour for domestic consumption.. ..	1,000,000
Grains other than wheat and corn, export and domestic..	1,600,000
	11,700,000

For meat products, live stock, &c., the Georgian Bay route, being in a northern climate, would be especially adapted. Shipments of live stock and dressed meats from the west reach an enormous aggregate and constitute a most important traffic, a single Chicago firm paying out as much as $800,000 per month for freight charges. Chicago alone, according to the latest report of the board of trade of that city, ships annually upwards of 1,000,000 tons of dressed meats, and 200,000 tons of lard, besides 4,439,166 head of live stock. During the year 1908 the receipts of live stock from the west at three Atlantic ports were 8,953,899 head. The exports of hog and beef products from Atlantic ports in 1908 amounted to 631,948 tons. It may be safely asserted that almost the entire bulk of the export trade of western farm produce will be diverted to the Ottawa route, as well as a large proportion of the traffic for domestic consumption.

The following shows the extent of the export of farm produce from Atlantic ports during the year 1908. In many other years this amount has been greatly exceeded, and with the favourable rates and great shipping facilities afforded by the Ottawa water-way a great increase in this export trade is assured:

EXPORT FROM ATLANTIC PORTS.

	Tons.
Wheat..	3,600,000
Corn..	2,200,000
Flour..	1,300,000
Grains..	250,000
Meats..	1,000,000
	8,350,000

Practically all of which would be routed via the Ottawa water-way.

Lumber will undoubtedly furnish a great amount of traffic for the canal. The pine cut annually in the Ottawa district represents an annual freight of not less than 2,000,000 tons sawn lumber. Including hardwoods, rough lumber, firewood, ties, posts, poles and other forest products, the output without any increased cut of pine will probably not fall short of 4,000,000 tons yearly, and may greatly exceed that amount.

During the year 1908, the lumber output of the Ottawa valley amounted to 475,000,000 feet board measure. In 1909, it increased to 500,000,000 feet board measure. I have taken the trouble to get some figures regarding the quantity of lumber shipped from Montreal to England in 1908 and 1909. In 1908, there was exported 94,397,894 feet; in 1909, 102,499,883 feet, or an increase for 1909 of 8,101,989 feet. With regard to the lumber on the Ottawa, I have a letter from one of the large mill owners there, in which he says in a postscript:

> If we had water shipments, I think that fully one-half of our output could go to water points, perhaps more.

So that you see that from the Ottawa valley alone, the lumber trade would be a very important factor. At present, as we all know, there is any quantity of hardwood in the Ottawa valley which has to be left rotting in the woods for the simple reason that it is impossible to bring it down in tows as we float soft wood.

The quantity of coal, is another important matter. I find here that 9,902,460 tons of coal passed through the Sault Ste. Marie canal in 1908. I got some figures of the imports of coal in reply to a question I put on the order paper, and I find that there was imported into the Dominion from the United States during the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1909, 10,142,798 tons of coal, and of this amount the province of Ontario alone consumed 8,670,505 tons or about 85½ per cent. Taking the

figures for the last five years, I find that during those five years, Ontario alone, imported from 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the total quantity of coal brought into Canada from the United States. It seems to me that we ought to endeavour as much as possible to encourage our own industries. Would it not be possible for us to use Nova Scotia coal instead of coal from the American side? Perhaps, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Wm. Paterson) if he were in his seat, would not altogether agree with me, because, as I understand, most of this coal is subject to an import duty of 53 cents per ton.

With regard to the contention that there would be no return cargoes, on this route I have looked up the coal question and would like to give the House some figures which I have been able to obtain. Coal, which is imported from the United States, is imported principally to operate railways, and supply industrial plants. Suppose, for some unforeseen reason, our coal supply from that source were cut off, we would be in a somewhat embarrassing position for this reason, that many of our industries are depending on United States coal and consequently would have to close down. Therefore, would it not be advisable for us to develop our own mines by using our own coal and thus give employment to our own people instead of to people on the other side of the line? Here are the figures of Nova Scotia coal productions:

Output of Nova Scotia coal mines for year ending September 30, 1907.

Production was 5,730,660 tons (2,240 pounds). Shipments, 5,046,690 tons (2,240 pounds), at $2.25 per ton.

Of this amount 616,312 tons went to the United States (12·3 per cent) (2,240 pounds).

In 1867 import duty of $1.25 per ton killed our (Nova Scotia) trade to United States, which dropped from 338,492 tons to 16,099 tons in 1893.

In 1894 duty was changed to 40 cents per ton for screened coal and 15 cents per ton for slack, the former being raised to 67 cents in 1897. Shipments increased until in 1903 they were 968,832 tons, chiefly slack entering under the low rate of 15 cents per ton.

Under the Taft tariff recently the duty was again lowered to 45 cents 1907 exports were 616,312 tons which shows a decrease of 350,000 tons compared with 1903. Of this amount nearly 500,000 tons were shipped by the Dominion Coal Company comprised largely of shipments to the Everett Gas Works of coal classed as culm or slack and paying only 15 cents per ton duty.

Under a proviso of the new tariff much, if not all, of this would now be subject to a duty of 45 cents per ton.

The falling off in the trade has been very marked lately and prospects are that on conclusion of existing contracts the amount exported will be very small.

Let us open a market in Ontario for Nova Scotia coal and patronize home industries.

Mr. G. V. WHITE.

For year ending September 30, 1907:

1,709,592 tons (2,240 pounds) or 33·87 per cent was shipped up the St. Lawrence to Quebec and Montreal.

If Georgian Bay canal was built coal could be shipped by steamer direct from the mines in Nova Scotia to Fort William, and such shipments could be the return cargo for vessels bringing down grain and other commodities.

I have here some figures from a reliable American coal firm with regard to the cost of American coal:

	Per ton.
Average cost of Pennsylvania and Ohio bituminous coal, screened 3-4 inches mesh., f.o.b. mine, per ton of 2,000 pounds..	$1 10
Railway freight to Lake Erie 70 cents to..	88
Transfer..	07
Lake freight to Fort William..	30
For unloading, including interest on investment in equipment, &c., they allow..	25
And for degradation due to handling..	15
To which must be added import duty of.	53
Making total cost from $3.10 to.. ..	$3 28

A recent government report, the report of the Department of Mines, for the year 1907-8, estimates the cost of coal f.o.b. Sydney at $1.39 per long ton; say $1.25 per 2,000 pounds. Now, a comparison of the time from the mine to Fort William by the two routes is as follows:

	Hours.
Average time of steamer, Sydney to Montreal..	85
Average time of steamer, Montreal to Fort William via Georgian Bay canal..	100
Total..	185

A lake freighter takes 65 hours from Erie to Fort William. At the same rate of compensation as on the lake the freight charge to Fort William should not exceed 85 cents to $1 per ton. Nova Scotia coal should, therefore, be laid down in Fort William, irrespective of coal tolls, at a cost of $2.50 to $2.65 per ton, giving an actual advantage over American competition with the existing tariff. We have indication of this in the fact that for some years the Dominion Coal Company supplied coal to a railway company in Boston, Mass., at $2.80 per ton against an import duty of 67 cents, giving a net price, $2.13 per ton in Boston. Assuming that Nova Scotia should capture 25 per cent of the existing coal supply of Ontario or approximately 1,500,000 tons. In 5,000 ton barges this equals 300 cargoes, or two cargoes per day for five months of the year, each boat having a capacity of six trains of freight cars, each train being made up of twenty-eight 30-ton cars. The carriage of such a traffic would, in itself, require a fleet of thirty or more of these large vessels in constant operation during the season.

So we see that in this one commodity alone, if we undertook to develop our own mines, there would be no question about a return cargo. Besides, there are large quantities of pulpwood which could be exported by this route, and also, as I stated before, the establishment of pulp and paper industries would result from the development of the water-powers on the route. Then, there is the question of iron. The total quantity of iron ore passing through the Soo canal in 1909 was 39,994,693 tons. Without cheap water transportation, it is doubtful if one-hundreth part of this enormous output would be moved. Then, there are other minerals such as marble, which is found in large quantities along the route, at Portage du Fort, Arnprior and other points, also phosphate, peat and many other minerals. The general merchandise would consist of traffic between eastern Canada and the Northwest, local traffic between points along the route of the waterway, and also the traffic between New England and the western states, for which this is the natural route, all of which would help to build up traffic for this canal.

Now, I have taken from the government reports of 1908 the following statistics:

Welland Canal.

Total quantity of freight passed on the Welland canal during season of 1908:—

1,292,493 tons eastward,
410,960 " westward,

1,703,453 " total.
8,024 " were way or local freight.

1,695,429 " east and westbound through freight.

Of this quantity—

767,118 tons eastbound through freight carried by Canadian vessels.
518,111 " eastbound through freight carried by American vessels.
154,203 " westbound through freight carried by Canadian vessels.
255,997 " westbound through freight carried by American vessels.

1,695,429=total of 921,321 tons by Canadian vessels,
and " 774,108 tons by American vessels.
1,695,429

Or, in other words, of the eastbound traffic, American vessels carried 40·3 per cent of the total, and of the westbound traffic, American vessels carried 62·4 per cent of the total. Of total east and westbound traffic, American vessels carried 45·6 per cent.

St. Lawrence Canals.

Total quantity of freight passed through these canals in 1908 was:—

1,424,646 tons eastward,
584,456 " westward,

2,009,102 " total.

East and westbound through freight—

1,315,682 tons eastbound,
257,317 " westbound.

1,572,999

Or, in other words, only 16·3 per cent of the total was westbound traffic.

So, those who use the argument with regard to the Georgian Bay canal that there will be no return cargoes may well look at the statistics shown in the government reports with regard to the St. Lawrence canals, and consider what a small part of that traffic is westbound.

Welland and St. Lawrence canals.—Through traffic beween Montreal and ports on Lake Erie, 1908. Michigan, &c.

The total quantity of through freight passed eastward and westward through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals from Lake Erie to Montreal was:—

864,926 tons eastward to Montreal.
3,472 " westward from Montreal.

868,398 " total.

Welland and St. Lawrence canals.—Through freight from United States ports to United States ports, 1908:—

209,518 tons eastward.
239,136 " westward.

448,654 " total.

The total quantity of freight passed through the Welland canal from United States ports to United States ports in 1908 shows an increase of 51,997 tons as compared with the previous year, 1907.

Comparative statement of the traffic of all canals for the years ending December 31, 1907 and 1908:—

Freight.	1907.	1908.
Grand total ..	20,543,639 tons.	17,502,820 tons.

Decrease over 1907 of 3,040,819 tons.

According to these figures, Canadian traffic through these canals has decreased, while American traffic has increased.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. G. V. WHITE. At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was pointing out to what extent our American neighbours were using the Welland and St. Lawrence canal systems. I have here some extracts from a report by Mr. F. C. Stevens, Superintendent of Public Works for the State of New York. In a recent report to the government of that state, he advocates the construction of a 21-foot canal connecting Lake Erie and the Hudson river at a cost of $198,000,000, and he also advises the government of that state to build this canal before the Georgian Bay canal is started. I will just quote here a short extract from that report:

If this plan could be brought to fruition, it is my belief that not only would New York State be in a commanding position so far as commercial shipments go in the event of the completion by the Dominion government of the Ottawa-Georgian Bay canal, but it is not impossible that if the construction of the ship canal across New York State were authorized in the near future, the construction of the Ottawa-Georgian Bay canal would be abandoned altogether for the time being. The net result to the State would be a 21-foot canal from the Hudson river to Lake Ontario instead of a 12-foot canal, a completion at an earlier date than may be hoped for in the case of the barge canal as now planned and finally a solution of the water traffic problem as far as New York is concerned for all time to come.

In looking up the treaty of Washington of 1871, I find, by article 27, that the United States has equal rights with Canada to the use of the Welland canal. We have expended on that canal, $28,000,000 up to the present time. Our American neighbours use that canal; yet they do not contribute one cent towards the maintenance of it. If this scheme which Mr. Stevens proposes goes through, that is, the building of a canal from Oswego to Albany, in the event of the Canadian government deepening the Welland canal, the American government will be saved an expenditure of $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 in this connection. In other words, so long as the enlarged Welland canal was sufficient for the American trade, the Americans would not be called upon to contribute one cent towards the construction or maintenance of this portion of the canal. In the report of the Department of Railways and Canals from April 1, 1907, to March 31, 1908, I find that in 1906 the traffic through the Canadian canals was 10,523,185 tons, while in 1907 it was 20,543,639 tons. However, Sir, it is rather disappointing when, further on in the report, we find that some 8,464,073 tons of the increase was due to the American coasting trade, which means that the United States took advantage of the free use of our canals, to the extent of eight and a half millions tons more in 1907 than in the previous year. In the bumper year for waterways Canada only had a gain of 1,217,251 tons. The fact is that we have subsidized American trade on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence just to the extent that they have used our canals. The trade from Canadian ports to Canadian ports through our entire canal system was 1,491,027 tons in 1887, while in 1907 it was 4,196,891, or about treble what it was twenty years ago. I take this from the Year-book of 1908. The American coasting traffic during the same period increased from 344,333 tons in 1887 to 13,052,837 tons in 1907, or nearly 38 times what it was 20 years ago, and more than treble our own trade. It will thus be seen that whereas we built our canals to capture the American trade they are using them to beat us out of our own. At the same time the American people are fearful lest Canada should go ahead with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. I find in the report of the Committee on Railways and Canals of the 52nd Congress, 1892, the following:

On the day that it becomes possible to send ships direct from the great lakes to the ocean, by way of the St. Lawrence river, while they are unable to go by the Hudson, the sceptre of commercial supremacy will begin to pass from New York to Montreal, and the merchant marine of the United States, which has had a new birth on the lakes, will receive its death blow from Canadian competition.

In Mr. Quick's book on 'American Inland Waterways' I find the following:

The farmers of the Mississippi valley find their hardest competitors in the Canadian Northwest. Winnipeg is the greatest wheat market in the world. The sceptre passed from Chicago to Minneapolis, then to Duluth, and now has gone to the young giant of Manitoba. In 1907 Winnipeg exported 20 per cent more wheat than West Superior and Duluth combined—and the flood of grain from the new Northwest has only begun. One cereal competes with all the others. The grains of the Saskatchewan basin will displace the corn of the Mississippi valley; and when it goes to the sea in ships, while ours, if in American bottoms, must go in barges, shall we not be indebted to Canadian generosity if we stand on an equality with Canadian farmers?

From the Bently Congressional report I quote:

When we come to complete it says. 'with men of our own race, with a soil just as productive, and with transportation facilities immeasurably superior, the farmers of—our western states are going to have an agricultural depression such as they never knew before, unless our own nation shall give us a way to the sea, so that our ships can go and come as freely as they do on the ocean.'

Further on this report says:

It is not a question whether the products of the West and Northwest shall go by way of the Erie canal, or by rail from Buffalo or not go at all; but whether the transportation of these products shall be retained in American hands, on American soil and reach an American port, or whether it shall be surrendered to Canada.

Now, Sir, discussing for a moment the enlargement of the Welland Canal system I will simply say that the late George Y. Wisner, consulting engineer United States Department of Interior, before the Royal Commission on transportation in 1904, stated that it would probably cost twice as much to enlarge the Welland canal for twenty feet navigation and to deepen the St. Lawrence canals, as to build the Georgian Bay canal. It seems certain that if the Welland canal is to be deepened the whole St. Lawrence system must be deep-

ened, and on the authority of Mr. Wisner that would cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000. If we are simply to deepen the Welland canal system it only means that we will move the port of transhipment from Port Colborne to Prescott or Kingston, and what great advantage there would be in that I fail to see. With regard to rates by rail, and water transportation, I quote from the Georgian Bay canal survey report page 398 as follows:

It is well known now, that transportation by water on a first-class shipway is not only cheaper than by rail, but often much quicker.

It is recognized in the United States that the average movement of freight by rail is only twenty-five miles per day, or about one mile per hour, including of course all delays at stations and at terminals, where cars are frequently side-tracked for several days. Any one conversant with the movement of freight on the great lakes can see that the average there is considerably above this figure——

Mr. Joseph E. Randsell, president of the National Rivers and Harbours Congress in the annals of the American Academy of political and social science states:—

As to the relative cost by the two methods, there can be no difference of opinion. The interstate commerce commission reported that the average cost of moving freight by rail in 1906 was 7·48 mills per ton per mile. The statistical report on the lake commerce for 1906 by Colonel Davis, U.S.E.C., shows it cost to move over 51,000,000 tons through the Sault Ste. Marie canal last year ·84 mills of one mill per ton per mile or one-ninth of the average rail rate. . . .

From the best information I can get after a careful study of the subject, I am convinced that waterway transportation in this country, under favourable conditions, costs only about one-sixth as much as the average cost by rail. The above remarks apply to the lakes and rivers and furnish unanswerable arguments for their improvement.

He further states that practically all expenditures on waterways have been profitable investments. They have returned in reduced freight rates to the United States people from 100 to 200 per cent yearly.

The contrast of the estimated cost of transportation via the Ottawa water-way to the present or lowest possible rates by existing routes will demonstrate the certainty of the diversion of the bulk of through traffic to this route on its completion.

The competing routes with which the comparison of cost of carriage must be made and which routes now control the trade are:

From Upper Lake Ports.

1. Via the lakes to Buffalo and thence by rail to New York and New England points.

2. Via the lakes to Georgian bay ports and thence by rail to Montreal and New England points.

3. Via the lakes to Buffalo and thence by Erie canal to New York.

4. Via the St. Lawrence all-water route to Montreal.

The bulk of through traffic from the great lakes to the sea-board has for many years been routed via the lakes to Buffalo and thence by rail to New York (route 1), but the almost prohibitive cost of carriage by rail and the extravagant transfer charges at Buffao have deterred the growth of through traffic and impeded its movement so much so that our American competitors have long been fully alive to the necessity of a through route with greater facilities and economy of carriage and have expended much time and money in their investigations of possible solutions of the problem.

The grain traffic with its prevailing and possible costs of carriage will be employed as a standard in the following comparisons.

During the season 1908 the average cost of carriage of wheat via the lakes from Chicago to Buffalo, a distance of 891 miles, was 1·1 cents per bushel.

The minimum rate during the same year was ¾ cents per bushel.

The same freight was carried to Georgian Bay ports at an average of 1·17 cents per bushel.

The average rate for carriage of wheat from Chicago to New York via lake and rail routes, for the ten years 1898-1908 is 6·15 per cent. These rates do not include the cost of transfer at Buffalo for which an additional ¾ cents must be added making a total including transfer charges of 6·90 cents per bushel.

The lowest rail rate possible, according to high authority, under most favourable conditions, a rate which has never yet been reached, is 2·2 mills per ton mile.

The average rail rate on grain from Buffalo to New York, a distance of 440 miles, during the year 1908 was 5·2 cents per bushel or 4⅛ mills per ton mile.

The lowest rail rate was in 1904 when the rate fell to 4 cents per bushel or 3 mills per ton mile.

Following are the prevailing rates for carriage of wheat during 1908:

1. Chicago to Buffalo by lake.. .. 1·1
   Buffalo to New York by rail.. .. 5·5
   Buffalo transfer.. .. .. ·75
   7·35 cents per bushel.

2. Chicago to Georgian bay by lake. 1·17
   Thence to Montreal by rail.. .. 5·5
   Intermediate transfer.. .. .. .. ·75
   7·42 cents per bushel.

3. Chicago to Buffalo by lake.. .. 1·1
   Buffalo to New York by Erie canal.. .. .. 5·
   Buffalo transfer.. .. .. ·75
   6·85 cents per bushel.

4. Chicago to Montreal via St. Lawrence canal system (quoted rate) average.. .. .. 5·52
maximum 6·75 cents per bushel.

Following is a statement of the movement and distribution of the wheat from several upper lake ports, 1908:

From—	Duluth.	Chicago.	Fort William.
	Bushels.	Bushels.	Bushels.
Route 1 and 3 to Buffalo...	37,530,021	6,733,246	13,952,111
Route 2 to Georgian bay..	1,471,495	.....	20,823,337
Route 4, St. Lawrence, Montreal	4,825,473	.....	6,733,246
	43,826,989	6,733,246	41,508,694

Through Shipments of Wheat, 1908.

	Bushels.
Route 1, from Buffalo..	53,384,866
Route 3, from Buffalo via canal..	4,063,934
	57,448,800
Route 2, Montreal via Georgian bay..	10,353,476
Route 4, Montreal via St. Lawrence..	20,492,797
	30,846,373

For purposes of comparison using the lowest possible rail rates the rates between terminals with which the Ottawa waterway must compete, would be:

1. Chicago to Buffalo by lake.. .. 1·1
Buffalo to New York by rail.. .. 3·33
Buffalo transfer.. .. .. ·75

5·18 cents per bushel.

2. Chicago to Georgian bay ports.. 1·17
Georgian bay ports to Montreal (365m.).. .. .. 2·77
Intermediate transfer.. .. .. .. ·75

4·69 cents per bushel.

Comparing this with the rate via the Ottawa waterway to Montreal, the time in transit of a lake carrier from Chicago to Buffalo is approximately 80 hours. From Fort William to Montreal via the Georgian Bay canal it would be 100 hours. Therefore the estimated rate based on the ratio of time during which a carrier would be employed, would be by the Georgian bay route 1·4 cents per bushel. It is, therefore, evident that the traffic would stand a toll of at least 50 cents a ton, or 1½ cents a bushel, making the total cost of carriage with toll 3 cents per bushel as against 4·69 cents per bushel by the Chicago-Georgian bay-Montreal route and as against 5·181 per bushel via Chicago to Buffalo by lake and Buffalo to New York by rail. Thus there is no question but that the rate via this route would be considerably less than any existing rate.

Mr. G. V. WHITE.

Judging by the report which was laid before parliament last session, I think there is no doubt that the engineers came to the conclusion that this is in every way a feasible route. They point out and lay special stress on the fact that if the canal is to be constructed, it should be at least a 22-foot canal for the simple reason that in order to compete with the lake freighters of the present day the canal must be of such dimensions as to permit of these freighters travelling over this course. Mr. J. J. Hill, who is an authority on railway transportation, pointed out before the Rivers and Harbours Congress of 1907 that no vessel of 1,000 tons burden can compete with a box car; with 10,000 tons burden the problem is mastered. Therefore, we can understand why we should make this canal at least 22 feet on the sills.

May I read a few extracts in support of this waterway project, both by men of the present day and by men who have gone hence. Sir John A. Macdonald in 1865 said that:

Just as sure as Ottawa will be the capital of British North America, just as surely as it will be the capital of all the British possessions in America, just as sure as the legislature is settled here, just as surely will be carried out the great scheme of connecting Lake Huron and the Ottawa river.

Sir George Etienne Cartier, another great Canadian, declared that the route from Ottawa to the great lakes would of necessity be constructed sooner or later.

The right hon. the Prime Minister of this country has on several occasions declared himself in favour of this great project. Speaking in Ottawa within the last few weeks in the course of the by-election campaign, he made particular allusion to this great work. He said:

If I were to tell you my own thought, I would say that the financial condition of this country would warrant the commencement of the building of the Georgian Bay canal this very year. But we must above all things, be careful of our credit, and it would be prudent to complete the immense undertaking that we have now under way before starting out on this other giant work. But I hope the day is not far distant when we will begin. I will make a little confession. I am anxious to take it up. I would like to have my name and the name of the Laurier government connected with this enterprise. You know I am getting to be an old man. I have not many years to live and I want to make the best possible use of them.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals is quoted as follows:

I hope to live long enough, yes, long enough to see the Georgian Bay canal constructed.

The Hon. Charles Murphy, Secretary of State, is also quoted as favouring this scheme. At a meeting held in Montreal

last spring, he paid particular attention to it. He then said:

The deepening of the Welland canal and the construction of the Georgian Bay canal were two national works which would be accomplished at the moment when Canada was creating her navy.

I have many other extracts here, not only from Canadian but also from American sources, but I shall not take the time of the House in reading any further. I submit that if the government be not in a position at present to go ahead with this work, they should allow some company to take it up. I do not mean that I would be in favour of a company controlling and owning the canal in the future, but I understand that a company, called the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, has made certain proposals to this government. This company is, I think, financially in a position to carry through this great work, I would judge so by the fact that the name of Sir Robert Perks, who is at the head of this company, is connected with some of the greatest works of this description ever undertaken. Let me just mention a few of them:

Severn tunnel under the river Severn, connecting the railway systems of south and west England with those of South Wales. This tunnel is 4½ miles long and involved an expenditure of $12,000,000.

Barry docks, South Wales, built chiefly to accommodate the coal export and lumber import trades, equipped with the latest appliances for handling this traffic, and cost $10,000,000. These docks handle some 8,000,000 tons of coal per annum and the population of the town has risen, since their construction, from 100 to 40,000.

Buenos Ayres harbour works constructed for the Argentine government. These works were constructed at a cost of $50,000,000.

The Manchester ship canal, extending from the Estuary of the Mersey to Manchester, 25½ miles. This has reduced the freight rates between Liverpool and Manchester one-half. It has 26 feet depth of water and is 120 feet wide at the bottom, and cost $78,000,000.

The Rio Janeiro works, now under construction for the Brazilian government, consisting of several miles of quay walls in Rio Janeiro harbour, with attendant dock facilities, such as shed, electric cranes, &c., and involving an expenditure of $35,000,000.

And there are many other works with which the name of Sir Robert Perks and those of his associates are connected. Therefore I think that if Canada is to take advantage of the position she occupies geographically with regard to transportation it is time she undertook to improve this great water-way with which nature has endowed us. Along this water-way, many industries could be built up, and along it are to be found many of the most valuable resources of this country. I do not know that there is anything further I can say except to urge on the government the necessity of undertaking this work at the earliest possible moment or of allowing some private company to undertake it. The construction of this canal would not only help the territory through which it runs but be of the greatest national importance to the whole Dominion.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound). In view of the very able speech, Mr. Speaker, made by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) and the many exhaustive speeches which have been delivered upon this subject in other parliaments as well as this, and which have demonstrated clearly the great importance of building this canal, I shall not take up the time of the House by going into details. I simply wish to call attention again to a few of the reasons why this canal should be built at once and to reply to a few of the objections made against its construction. The first survey for the canal up the Ottawa and down the French river was made in 1837, 73 years ago, by direction of the parliament of Upper Canada. In 1859, a report was made of a survey on a nine foot basis to the parliament of Canada, and since then many surveys have been made over this route. In each and every case we find that the engineers reported that the scheme was entirely feasible and recommended it as one which would be highly beneficial to Canada. The fact that these reports were so unanimous in favour of the building of this canal is the more remarkable when we consider that when these surveys were made, the great northwest was almost entirely unknown, and in fact the buffalo were about the only inhabitants of those regions in which are to be found to-day the finest towns in western Canada. The coal mines of Nova Scotia also were then very little worked and the manufacturing establishments of Ontario were practically unknown. We know what great changes have since taken place and we look forward to seeing our shipments of grain from the west continue to multiply. We believe also that our mines in Ontario, great as they are at present, will continue to develop and furnish, through the operation of our railways, a home market for our coal from Nova Scotia and provide return cargoes for vessels from the maritime provinces using this canal.

It is not necessary that I should prove that this canal will give the shortest route between Fort William and Montreal—shorter by 280 miles than any other—as this will be admitted by any one who has made a study of the facts. It is also admitted, even by American authorities, that its completion would place the grain carry

ing trade from the west to the east almost entirely in the hands of Canada, and thus build up our great ocean ports on which we have spent so many millions. It has also been repeatedly proven that this canal would reduce the cost of carrying grain 3 to 4 cents a bushel, which would mean millions to the farmers of our northwest. To every farmer shipping 3,000 bushels of grain, that would mean about $100 per year, and in a great many cases, the difference of 3 or 4 cents per bushel is the actual difference between profit and loss. Coal from eastern Canada could be carried to Ontario at from 45 cents to 65 cents per ton less than it can be brought from Pennsylvania.

In addition to this, the consumer would save the duty of fifty-three cents per ton. This is not a small item by any means. For, as pointed out by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) our coal importation for Ontario alone amounts to 8,500,000 tons, and there were carried to the port of Port Arthur alone, 1,500,000 tons for use on the various railways. There are large tracts of timber along or near the route of the Georgian Bay canal, which, at present are almost entirely worthless, or are being destroyed by fire or otherwise. This applies to hundreds and probably thousands of millions of feet of hardwood, and thousands of cords of pulpwood and ties. The increase in the value of this timber to Canada would of itself almost justify the building of the canal. Then, we have the matter of the power available and which would be made valuable by the construction of the canal. This is by far the greatest question connected with the opening of this route. This power is estimated at 1,000,000 horse-power, to be developed at an average cost of $50 per horse-power, or, in other words, about $2 per horse-power per year. A great deal of this power will not be required for many years, and I have no doubt, knowing as I do many of the situations, that a number of these powers could be developed for about half this estimated cost. The advantage of developing this power can hardly be over-estimated. Canada should be, and with this power developed would be, in a position to control almost entirely the paper and furniture trade of the world, for we should have the supply of raw material and the power at the same point, and we should have reduced cost for the transportation of the finished article. As an example, we have the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis whose prosperity is entirely owing to the fact that they have cheap power at their door.

We find then, that all reports on this canal have been favourable; that almost all parts of Canada would be directly benefited; that the cost of transportation would be reduced from the west and the use of Canadian coal made possible in Ontario; that timber would be made valuable which is now almost worthless; that power would be developed to afford opportunities for Canadian factories. Any one of these would justify as a business proposition the building of this canal.

The question of building this canal should not be made a party question, and it is a matter of regret that in the past both parties have used it to a certain extent at election times. But I believe that the people interested are united in declaring that the canal should be built at once; they are tired of having canals on paper, and surveys of canals, and they believe that at present the proper course is to build without delay a canal that will float a ship.

However, the question at the present time is whether or not it is advisable to spend the money necessary for so great a work. In this connection, I would call the attention of the House for a moment to a few remarks made by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) on the debate on the Budget. On January 18, as reported at page 2151 of 'Hansard', the hon. gentleman used these words:

> I hold that more can be done to benefit the agriculturist of Canada by reducing to him the cost of getting his goods in the market than by a reduction of the tariff. A reduction in the tariff is all right so far as you can go, but the farmer is vastly more interested in the wise expenditure of all the money that comes into the public treasury, contributed by all classes as well as by himself, in bettering the facilities for transport and cheapening its cost. If by improving our transportation facilities we can reduce by two or three cents a bushel the cost of landing produce in the consuming market, fancy what a benefit that is to the producer in the west, not only on one year's crop but on the crop of every succeeding year. Take, for example, the $3,360,000, contributed to the treasury by all the people of Canada, which this government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build 330 miles of a railway from Lethbridge to Nelson.

Then at page 2152:

> By that means, we obtained a reduction which we could not have got otherwise. Among other reductions in freight rates, was a reduction of three cents per 100 pounds on all grain coming out of that country. What did that amount to? Figure it out, and you will find that the farmers, within four years, got back the whole of the $3,300,000, and they are reaping a proportionate and like benefit until this day and will be for all time to come.

And again, at page 2153:

> What does that mean to the people in the Northwest? While I do not undervalue their request for a lower tariff, what is that in comparison with the benefit they can derive from the wise expenditure of money out of the public treasury to which all the people in the country contribute? It means millions.

Whenever you can lower the insurance or the freight rates by deepening the St. Lawrence, by lighting it, by enlarging the harbours—every time you can take a cent off the cost of the transportation of the produce of this country, that is a benefit to the men who raise the crops. While I give every credit to my hon. colleague the Minister of Agriculture, for the steps he has taken and is still taking, in order to benefit the producers of this country, that is only a minor matter as compared with a wise expenditure of the public money in improving and cheapening the lines of transportation, and in this way giving our farmers money far in excess of what they would get had not these additional facilities been provided out of our public revenue.

And again at page 2154:

That subsidy was given not to build the road alone, but to secure to the people of the west the great boon of having a reduction in freight rates of three cents a hundred pounds for all time to come. In addition to that, lower rates were to be given on goods imported into that country, coal oil, agricultural implements, &c., so that, taking these things into consideration and remembering that the money has been paid back—although of course it went to farmers it was still paid back—and on that one item in four years there has been an immense relief to these people. I give it as an illustration of all the other expenditures. By wise expenditures of that kind you are benefiting the country, you increase your revenue, you have one of the greatest resources of the prosperity of this country.

If that is true of a slight reduction of freight in the Northwest, how much more would it apply to a great work of this kind which would benefit not only the farmer, but the coal producer of the east, the lumbermen of Ontario, the mines of Ontario, and a great many manufactories which would undoubtedly be started along the line of this canal on being furnished with cheap power?

I would also like to call the attention of the House briefly to the fact that, although ten years is supposed to be required for the completion of this canal, the completion of the various parts of it would be of immediate benefit to the country. Several surveys of that section of the canal between French river village and Lake Nipissing have been made. The Canadian Pacific railway made two such surveys and Mr. J. W. Fraser made a survey in 1900 under this government. His estimate of the cost of completing the canal from the mouth of French river to Lake Nipissing was $4,200,000. It is true, later reports have increased this estimate, but this was largely because of the estimate being based on a wider and deeper canal with more spent for elevators, lighting, &c. This section of the canal, if built, would at once be a paying investment, as it would open up a large section of country. The Pickerel river, the Wolf, the Rainy and the South river, the Widow river, the Sturgeon and the Wanipitae are all tributaries of this section. Much of the timber of this region would be made marketable, mines opened up, and coal delivered by boat much nearer to the great mining districts of northern Ontario, which at present bring in coal by rail from Fort Erie.

We have some very fine harbours on Lake Nipissing, and some of the best water-powers in Ontario are on the course of the French river, or what is called the French river, because it is really a succession of beautiful lake expansions. These water-powers could be cheaply developed, and no doubt the power would be very quickly utilized. A good deal is being said at the present time about deepening the Welland canal, and while I believe that both those canals will be necessary in a few years, hence, the deepening of the Welland canal at the present time would only lessen the trouble and not remove it; as a matter of fact, it would only remove the distributing point from Port Colborne to Kingston or Prescott. I was somewhat surprised recently to find a circular being distributed through Ontario by advocates of the deepeing of the Welland canal. These men undertake to show why the Georgian Bay canal should not be built, and I would call the attention of the House to one or two of the reasons they put forward. In the first clause they say:

A canal 442 miles long for a 10,000 ton ship following the bends in the Ottawa river is enough to deter the ordinary lake captain.

Now, regarding the building of this canal, there has been a good deal of misconception on the part of some people in Canada. This canal, instead of being 440 miles long, according to the most recent survey, which is a very complete one, will only be 28 miles long, on the whole course of the water-way, including the locks themselves. We have some 66 miles of water course which has to be deepened or straightened, but the balance, some 346 miles, is entirely free from any obstacle of any kind. The route will really be much safer for navigation than any part of the great lakes. Another objection that was urged is that there would be no return cargoes for vessels using this canal. But as I have already pointed out, there is no logical or any other reason why the province of Ontario should not use Nova Scotia coal when they can get it. As a matter of fact, boats using the St. Lawrence route to-day up to Port Colborne have very little freight back. The return cargo amounts to practically nothing, unless they go across to Lake Erie and load coal at Cleveland. Another point is raised, which also has been touched upon by my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White). This circular says:

That northern country generally freezes up about the 5th to the 10th of November, while

we generally move grain via the St. Lawrence as far as Prescott up to the 15th or 20th December, thus making over a month's longer navigation via the St. Lawrence.

It is quite evident, to my mind, that the gentleman who wrote this did not know what he was talking about. Ever since I have known of that north country, I have never known Lake Nipissing to freeze up before the 15th of December. According to surveyors who have made careful observations, they have found that the shortest season was 210 days long, or rather longer than the open season at the port of Montreal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that during times of depression it is necessary and advisable to cut down all unnecessary expenditure. The live business man at such times seeks all means of reducing the expenses of his business, even if he has to make an investment for new machinery or plant in order to effect such reduction. I contend that on the same principle the expenditure necessary for the building of this canal would be fully justified by the building up of Canadian ports, by the saving of millions to our farmers in the northwest, the opening of new trade for our coal mines in the east, by the increase in the value and output of our forests, by the great saving in coal bills and cost of transportation to our mines, and by the facilities offered through the development of power to our manufacturers, and above all by giving us a safe and all-Canadian route to the sea, a route which will exist for all time.

Mr. THOMAS A. LOW (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the hon. members who have just spoken, and I am glad the subject which is under discussion is one upon which both sides of the House can agree. I fully realize the value of the speeches already made upon this subject, but I would be unfaithful to the trust my constitutents have placed in me, if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to say a few words on behalf of this great national water-way. There was a time when this project was considered one of only local importance to the people of the city of Ottawa and of the Ottawa valley. But opinion has changed a great deal, and now we find gentlemen from Alberta, Saskatchewan and the lower provinces advocating this scheme just as strongly as the people of Ottawa and vicinity. As to the feasibility of this scheme, there can be no possible doubt. For sixty years back engineers acting on behalf of the government have reported from time to time as to its feasibility. In the year 1856, as the previous speaker (Mr. White) has told us, Mr. Walter Shanley was appointed by the then government to make a report upon this water-way. In 1859 Mr. T. C. Clark was appointed to report upon it and he confirmed Mr. Shanley's report. From time to time the Canadian Pacific railway company have procured reports upon it. In 1879 the Canadian Pacific railway employed Mr. E. P. Bender, a civil engineer, to make a report upon a certain portion, and his report was favourable. Again Mr. A. F. McLeod, on behalf of the government, in 1899, made a further report. In 1899 C. R. Coutlee, acting for the Canadian Pacific railway, was requested to make a report, and reported favourably. Again in 1900 Mr. J. W. Fraser made a complete survey of the French river and Lake Nipissing districts. In 1902 Geo. C. Wisner, consulting engineer for the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company, one of the most eminent engineers in the world, was appointed to make a further survey and report; he did so and made a favourable report. In 1904 a board of engineers consisting of Messrs. Lafleur, St. Laurent, Coutlee and Chapleau were instructed by the government to make a thorough examination and survey of the whole route, and their report has been printed and circulated. So the charge can never be made that this work was proceded with too hastily. I am sure that every member of this House who would look over that report must be convinced that the Georgian bay canal is feasible in every respect. From time to time public men on both sides of politics, men preeminent in the industrial world, have advocated this scheme. For instance, such men as Sir John A. Macdonald, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Sir William Van Horne, James J. Hill and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. . . Surely the opinions of these gentlemen are worth something upon a subject of this kind. Sir John A. Macdonald, many years ago, in speaking of the Ottawa and Georgian bay route said:

The Ottawa ship canal and the Canadian Pacific Railway must be constructed.

Hon. Alexander Mackenzie also said:

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any route on this continent for the transportation of the products of the farmers of the Northwest to the Atlantic ocean.

The geographical position of the waterway is also excellent. It will be independent of all international waters, being fed by water well within Canadian territory. As to distance, there can be no doubt of its great advantages. From Fort William to Liverpool by way of the great lakes and Welland canal, the distance is 4,405 miles. The distance to Liverpool by way of the great lakes, Erie canal, Hudson river and New York, is 4,920 miles. The distance to Liverpool by way of the great lakes, Georgian bay and Montreal, is 4,123 miles. It

is evident, therefore, that by the Georgian bay route there would be a saving of 282 miles over the present Canadian route, and over the American route a saving of 806 miles. The saving in mileage over the American route is sufficient to divert a large amount of the traffic which is now going by American channels. In time, there would be a saving of three days in the round trip from the Georgian bay to Montreal and return. I think, Mr. Speaker, many members of this House will be surprised to know that at the present time over 75 per cent of the grain of the Canadian west passes through American channels. This is the trade that the Georgian bay canal will divert; this is the trade that it will capture. It has been argued by some of the opponents of the Georgian bay canal scheme that it is too far north, but I am sure there is very little difference between the possible number of days that this canal can be opened, and the number of days that the other route can be kept open. The number of days, I understand, during which the canal could be opened would be about 210.

We may talk about the tariff, we may talk about building Dreadnoughts, and all the other numerous matters that come before the House, but the thing that is of real importance to the farmers of this country is the transportation problem. Do something to lessen the cost of transporting his grain to the markets of the world, by three cents per bushel, and you will help the farmer more in that way than you can in any other form.

What does that mean? To the farmers of the Northwest this year it would mean about 3 million dollars on a hundred million crop.

It is estimated that it will take ten years to complete the canal; by that time it is safe to say the crop of the Canadian west will have reached 300 million bushels of wheat and at the same rate of 3 cents per bushel would mean 10 million dollars in the farmers pockets.

Also, one of the great advantages of the construction of this canal will be to create practically an unlimited water-power more than as at present developed, and which will be valuable for all kinds of industries. It is estimated that more than an additional million horse-power will be created by this new canal, and I think it is a conservative valuation to say that I think it will be worth $25 per horse-power, or 25 million dollars of value to this country. Another advantage would be that towns and industries would spring up all along the canal because the country through which it would pass is full of wealth and resources of all kinds. This has happened along the Erie canal, and it would happen along the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal. Let us see some of the benefits that would be derived. Large pulp and paper mills would be established with cheap power and the exporting of pulpwood would stop to a great extent. Large flour mills would be established. To my mind, the day will come when we will cease to export wheat, and will grind it into flour and will retain the by-products for the use of our farmers to feed to their cattle, and will export the flour only. I am sure that a large number of men would be employed and this would be a great benefit to Canada. Cement works will spring up, we will have numerous plants like that at Hull and we will be exporting cement in place of importing it. With cheap transportation afforded to the markets of the world, the development of the great natural water-powers along the route, and economical coal supply, a great manufacturing and commercial development will take place.

Deposits of iron are lying dormant to-day because of the lack of transportation facilities. It has been stated by eminent authorities that Canada is destined to be one of the greatest countries in the world for the manufacture of iron and steel. The placef occupied by iron and steel in the industrial world has not been over-estimated; the fact that present reserves, though undoubtedly large, are being steadily invaded, has caused a great uneasiness and has forced far-sighted men to look for new and larger sources of ore supply. On the other hand, Canada posseses large deposits of iron ore which have been allowed to remain untouched just for the want of cheap transportation, to link our coal fields with our iron mines. There is no reason in my mind why these large deposits should not be utilized and why Canada should not become one of the greatest iron producing countries in the world.

Upon the floor of the House, and upon the campaign hustings in these days of party strife, we hear much about the national debt, but one thing I wish to inform the House, whether I am here for four years or twice four, I will never regret having given a vote to increase the national debt so long as I know that the country has a good live asset for the amount of the increase, or that we have improved our position. I ask you, if a great company, if a great corporation, hesitate or shrink at the thought of adding a few dollars to their indebtedness? No, if they are going to improve their position, if they are going to improve their facilities for doing business, they go ahead and borrow the money. Does a private business man hesitate at the thought of borrowing a few dollars from a bank if by that loan he knows he is going to improve his position for doing business? No, Sir, the farmers of this country will

not shrink at the idea of the Finance Minister going into the money market, because the farmers are shrewd people. A farmer will not hesitate to mortgage his farm, to borrow a few dollars, if he knows that by so doing he is going to provide for the erection of larger buildings to store his ever-increasing harvest. And I say that the hon. Finance Minister need not be the least alarmed about increasing the national debt $100,000,000 if he has the Georgian Bay canal as an asset. In some portions of Ontario there seems to be an idea that the Georgian Bay canal will rob the St. Lawrence of its traffic. That is not the case. The Georgian Bay canal would not divert the traffic from the St. Lawrence route or from existing Canadian railways. It would create a traffic of its own, and capture nearly all the Canadian grain that goes through the United States canals, and a large portion of the American traffic from Duluth. To those gentlemen I put the question: Do they know that 75 per cent of the grain exported goes by the United States canals?

Now let me sum up some of the reasons why, in my humble opinion, this work should be proceeded with.

1st. It will be 282 miles shorter than any other known route to the sea.

2nd. It will need less canalling than any other route. According to the latest reports of the engineers appointed by this government, it will need only 28 miles of canal work.

3rd. It will be the quickest and most direct route to the sea-board for the farmers' products.

4th. It would lessen the cost of transporting the farmers' grain to the markets of the world by probably three cents per bushel, thereby increasing the value of his products to that extent.

5th. It would carry Canadian grain through Canadian channels, and the 75 per cent of our grain now going through American channels would pass down the Georgian Bay canal.

6th. It would enable the mine owners of Nova Scotia to deliver coal at Fort William for 60 cents per ton, provided they could secure return cargo. This would extend the base of supply many hundred miles north, and would be of great benefit for all industrial purposes.

7th. It will be the best regulator of freight rates we can secure, notwithstanding the fact that we have a splendid Railway Commission.

That eminent authority on transportation matters, James J. Hill, has time and again stated that the secret of low freight rates lies in the development of our natural water-ways.

And now let me say a word in conclusion to the Prime Minister and his colleagues: of all the great works the government have undertaken, or may undertake, I know of none of greater benefit to the farmers of this country than the development of this great national water-way.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, it is certainly most interesting to find that with the advent of a number of new members to this House we have at the same time many more advocates for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal than we had even in the last parliament. It is also well to note that the idea that advocates of the Georgian Bay canal live only along the Ottawa valley is entirely fallacious. They are to be met in every section of this Dominion. To those who are afraid of canals I would say that this project is but small in comparison with the canals which exist throughout the world. In the British isles there are 8,000 miles of canals, in Germany 3,000 miles, in Canada 3,000 miles, and in view of this, Canada, with its immense and fertile territory, with its ever increasing commerce and wealth, need not fear the building of a few locks on one of the grandest water-ways of the world. I am often asked what is the proposed route of this canal, and I may say that it begins at the mouth of the French river and ends at Montreal, a distance of 425 miles. It follows the French river and Lake Nipissing, passes at the height of land through Trout, Turtle and Talon lakes, follows the Mattawa river to its junction with the Ottawa, thence down the Ottawa river to Montreal, and leaving the bed of the river occasionally where conditions render it advisable to do so. Let me cite to the House the opinions of some eminent men in this and in other countries, in answer to the arguments which are sometimes advanced, especially by railway men, against the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. To begin with, the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has pronounced, himself entirely in favour of the building of the canal, and at the National club banquet in London, England, he used these words:

> Canada's chief item of expenditure is in creating routes for her commerce. She has to complete her railway system and build the Georgian Bay canal.

The right hon. the Prime Minister repeated the same words in other sections of the country and within my own hearing, in the city of Hull, in the county which I have the honour to represent he spoke in the same sense. Sir Wm. Van Horne, who, of course, is an eminent authority on questions of transportation, has said that the building of the Georgian Bay canal would be of great benefit to the trade and commerce of Canada, and Mr. J. J. Hill has pointed out that it will enable vessels of 400,000 bushels capacity to carry grain at a profit for three cents per bushel. Mr. Hill has stated that this canal will not only convey wheat of the Canadian Northwest to the

sea-board, but that it will carry the grain from all parts of the United States north of Kansas city, because traffic will follow the line of least resistance. In quoting such eminent authorities I cannot omit to quote from Mr. Robert Reford, who has made a particular study of transportation, and who has said:

The rates will be cut down to one-third their present cost, every fraction of which should go into the pockets of the wheat producers of the Great West.

Let me add the Erie barge canal, in the state of New York, of which we have heard so much and which will not begin to be of equal utility with the Georgian Bay canal, will cost as much as will the Georgian Bay canal, while the canalizing of the Mississippi to a depth of 12 or 14 feet would cost much more. In an article in the 'Scottish American' it is pointed out that even admitting the great drawback that our rivers are not free from ice, it is not possible that the United States canals can at all compete with the Georgian Bay canal. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves what would be the great advantage of this Georgian Bay canal, the construction of which has been before the people for the last 50 years or more, and hence is not a new question. In 1895 our grain exports amounted to 17,185,582 bushels, valued at $11,537,433, and in 1909 our grain export amounted to 70,526.894 bushels, valued at $63,884,355. These figures show that our trade in grain is constantly increasing, and even with the advent of the National Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Northern it is obvious that our railway systems in Canada will not be able to carry the growing wheat yield from the fields of the Northwest. Not only that, but when the Georgian Bay canal is built a great deal of the grain which now finds its outlet by American ports will be diverted by the Canadian route to our ocean port at Montreal. Sir, I am not opopsed to the deepening of the Welland canal or any other Canadian canal, but I do believe that the moment you deepen the Welland canal the Americans will immediately build a canal from Oswego to Syracuse so as to enable them to carry the western grain right through to their own ships in New York harbour. That is a natural consequence, whereas if you build the Georgian Bay canal the grain that is to-day going by New York, not all of it, but a great deal of the grain that is going via New York, will find its way directly down the Ottawa river.

At the risk of wearying the House, I shall give a few statistics. The total traffic through the several canals of this country for 1908 amounted to 17,502,820 tons. Compare that with the Suez canal. In 1908, 13,633,283 tons of freight passed through the Suez canal, 4,000,000 less than through our canals, and yet the revenue of the Suez canal in 1908 was $20,605,524.

In 1908, 776,374 tons of grain passed down the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal. On the St. Lawrence canals 2,900,102 tons of freight all told were moved. Of this 867,037 tons were agricultural products, 826,177 tons merchandise, and 430,004 tons coal and 180,022 tons were forest products. If I were speaking for the Ottawa district, I would say that 204,490 tons of freight that passed down the Ottawa river canals were the produce of our own forests. On the Sault Ste. Marie canal the total movement of freight was 12,759,216 tons.

They built a Manchester ship canal in England and yet it is only 35½ miles long, but it cost $73,172,000. The revenue is about $300,000. The Englishman is a wise man in business and if he will expend $72,000,000 in order to get a revenue of $300,000, why would we not expend $100,000,000 to get a revenue that may amount to any sum and certainly will be a very large revenue. The building of the Manchester ship canal meant a great deal for Manchester. During its construction 17,000 men and boys were daily engaged. Since its construction new ideas have been started at Manchester and along the banks; warehouses and mills previously empty are now occupied and over 10,000 new houses have been built for the working people of that city.

I know that a number of gentlemen wish to speak this evening upon this subject, they are waiting for an opportunity, in fact I believe they are simply bubbling over with enthusiasm for this canal, and it will be unfair on my part to detain the House at any greater length. I wish I had a thousand voices to go throughout this country from one end to the other and proclaim the great advantages which this canal will have for Canada. To my own good loyal friends of this country, to my military friends, to my naval friends, let me say, that Major-General Gascoyne, when giving evidence before the Senate of this country, said that the imperial authorities were most anxious for the construction of this canal because it would be a splendid route in the way of the defence of this country, Let me quote his words, which I have here in French:

From a military standpoint, I positively state that so far as strategy is concerned I look upon this scheme as a most desirable one.

Of course—and I must say so in order to make myself plain—it depends a good deal upon the depth of the water you intend to have in the canal.

Mr. Chairman.—The depth would be 14 feet.

Major General Gascoigne.—I was going to ask myself for a depth of 14 feet.

If you construct the canal of 14 feet deep, I can say that it would be of the greatest value to the country on a strategical point of view. I

know that the imperial authorities look at this enterprise at this work in that light.

It is not necessary for me to translate that beautiful language because I know that all the members of this House are familiar with the two official languages, but I would call the attention of the hon. gentlemen who are so strongly advocating to-day a naval policy for this country, who are imbued with that sentiment of loyalty towards the British Crown, and who want by every possible means to defend the empire and the country to the desirability of constructing the Georgian Bay canal, and I would ask them to join with us in advocating that work which will be one of the greatest ever undertaken by the government of Canada.

Mr. G. F. HODGINS (Pontiac). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) who introduced this question and also to the hon. members who followed him. On this all-important question of the Georgian Bay canal. I believe that since confederation there has been no question which should so engage the attention of this parliament or the people of Canada as the early construction of the Georgian Bay canal. We have heard so much to-night as to its merits that I do not feel like asking the indulgence of the House in what would be a repetition of the many great things that have been said in its favour; but I feel that I would be remiss in my duty to my constituency, as well in my duty as a member of this House, if I did not take this opportunity of endorsing the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. It is not a new question, it has been before the people of Canada since before confederation, and I do not feel bashful or backward in endorsing the scheme when I find that it has been endorsed by the greatest statesmen of our country, by the railway magnates of Canada, by large shipping interests, by various boards of trade as well as by the press. Consequently I feel quite at liberty in endorsing the scheme as one that should be of the greatest possible benefit to the Dominion of Canada. I have no doubt that the delay in construction has been owing to its enormous cost; but considering that it will take 10 years to construct this great water-way, which is estimated to cost $100,000,000, an expenditure of $10,000,000 per annum will cover the entire cost and I feel satisfied that when this great canal is completed and opened for the great commerce of our Northwest and of the east, it will amply repay the government of Canada for its construction. When you consider the enormous strides the great provinces of the west have made in the last decade and their great prospects for a still further increase, I am not at all optimistic in predicting that when this canal is opened for transportation, the grain production of the great western provinces, will exceed one billion bushels per annum. Considering that in 1900 the total production was 32,000,000 bushels, in 1907, 160,000,000; in 1908, 232,000,000; and in 1909, 314,000,000; I do not think I am over-estimating when I predict that by 1920 the total production of grain of the three western provinces will exceed 1,000,000,000. We may estimate that one-half of that will be for export. Such an eminent authority as Mr. Robert Reford, of Montreal, one of the leading ship owners of Canada, claims that wheat may be transported from Fort William to Montreal at a saving of 2 cents per bushel on the present rate. That would represent $10,000,000 on the export of Northwest grain alone, quite sufficient to pay the interest on the investment of $100,000,000 as well as the maintenance and operation of the canal.

Much has been said with regard to enlarging the Welland canal, but while I believe in the deepening of that canal I am of the opinion that the day will come when both these canals will be required. And as the people of Ontario have been enjoying for many years the advantages of the Welland canal, I think it is in their interests and that of Canada generally that the Georgian Bay canal should be first constructed. The enlargement of the Welland would interfere to a great extent with the present traffic, whereas by building the Georgian Bay canal first, the people of Ontario would have a complete circle of waterways and the province of Quebec would have a water-way along its entire front. Speaking of the county I have the honour to represent, I may say that the natural resources of Pontiac alone would justify the construction of this great water-way. We have in Pontiac county enormous areas of timber, pulpwood, mineral and other resources awaiting easier and cheaper transportation facilities. I was rather surprised to hear, during the debate on the budget, the hon. member for Peterboro (Mr. Stratton) say that pulpwood was worth about $5.75 per cord in the raw, but that, when manufactured into paper, it was worth $38 to $45 per cord for low grade paper, and $50 to $100 for high grade. Last year the export of pulpwood, at a valuation of $5.75, represented something like $4,500,000, whereas had it been manufactured into paper, it would have represented over $40,000,000.

There are many people in this country who believe that protection is the greatest possible factor in building up a country, but in my opinion, transportation will do

more for us than protection ever will. I believe that if this Georgian Bay canal be built it will give our Canadian water routes an advantage over every other on this continent, and do more for the benefit of this country than possibly could any tariff.

So much has been said regarding distance and the cost of transportation, that I do not think it would be wise for me to take up the time of the House in discussing this phase of the question. I might, however, refer to the exports of wheat during the present year from Fort William by way of the great lakes. During the past year, some 77,000,000 bushels of wheat were shipped from Port Arthur and Fort William to the sea-board and intermediate points. Some 54,000,000 bushels were carried in Canadian bottoms and 23,000,000 in American bottoms. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that were the Georgian Bay canal constructed, not only would we carry through that water-way the products of our Canadian northwest, but also to a great extent those of our American neighbours. Our neighbours view with alarm the construction of this great canal, and they rather favour the deepening of the Welland canal. Naturally they would prefer the latter, as we would have to bear the cost of the improvement while they would get the trade. I have before me some very interesting letters on this question, but as there are many other hon. gentlemen who are anxious to speak, I shall not detain the House by reading them.

The Nova Scotia coal question has been dealt with in a very able manner by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Arthurs) so that I need but briefly refer to it. During the year 1908, the total production of Nova Scotia coal represented some 6,300,000 tons, which gave employment to some 13,000 miners. Only about 2,000,000 tons of that coal found its way west of Quebec, while on the other hand the province of Ontario imported from the United States some 8,000,000 tons. Had this coal been purchased instead in Nova Scotia, it would have given employment to 25,000 more men and have also given employment to Canadian shippers, so that I say if we want to build up our country, the first thing we should do is to attend to this transportation question. $100,000,000, which is the estimated cost of the Georgian Bay canal, is no doubt a large amount, but when we consider the resources of Canada, when we consider the fact that there are $735,000,000 of the people's money in our savings bank, when we consider the high credit of Canada in the money markets of the world, I do not see why the cost of the enterprise should make the government hesitate, and I believe that the government will receive the endorsation of the entire people if it should undertake this work. I trust that the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, with his colleagues, has done so much for the upbuilding of this country, will not hesitate in building this canal, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's name may go down to posterity as the creator of this great water-way, as well as of the many other great public utilities which have been inaugurated under his regime. Sir, I shall not take up more of your time on this question, knowing that there are others desirous of speaking, who can deal with the question more capably than I can.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). So far as the resolution is concerned, of course I am not opposed to it, nor, I believe, is any member of the House, for it simply asks for the papers relating to the Georgian Bay canal project. Let me say further, at the outset, that I am not opposed to the building of the Georgian Bay canal, or any other water-way that will develop our great country. I believe that the development of this Georgian bay route must be carried out in the future. That part of our country is being opened up, and the benefit to the section which the canal traverses would justify the opening of the route, especially in view of the great water-powers to be developed which will be of immense benefit to Canada in the future. But, from the discussion I have heard on this question—I am sorry to say I have not been present during the whole debate—I am led to believe that the shortest time within which it is thought possible to build this Georgian Bay canal is ten years. For my part, I believe it will take a much longer time to build this great water-way. Therefore, I think, in the interests of the people of the Northwest and of Canada as a whole, the other part of our great water-way system, the Welland canal, should be improved almost immediately. It has been estimated by the government that the Welland canal could be deepened in five years. I believe that every member of the House will agree that, even though the Georgian Bay canal is to be proceeded with at some future time, the Welland canal must also be deepened. The highest estimate of the cost of this work is $25,000,000, and, as I have said, the work could be finished in five years. If this deepening of the Welland canal were effected, the lowering of rates would be as great as through the construction of the Georgian Bay canal and the work could be done much sooner. Of course, there are great differences of opinion to the possible rates on the Georgian Bay canal and the Welland canal when improved. It has been proven, I believe, to the satisfaction of the government that, if the Welland canal were deepened, grain could be brought from Fort William and Port Ar-

thur to Montreal at 3½ cents per bushel. My reason for making the statement is this: The present rate from Port Arthur and Fort William to Buffalo in the large lake vessels is an average of about 1½ cents per bushel. If the Welland canal were enlarged to allow these large vessels to go down to Kingston or Prescott, or other points at the head of river navigation, the grain could be brought down in these large vessels at 2 cents per bushel. Grain could be taken from Kingston or Prescott to Montreal for 1½ cents per bushel. This would make a total of 3½ cents from Port Arthur or Fort William as I have said. I do not believe that any hon. member will say that the grain could be carried for less than this by the Georgian Bay canal route. For, even if this Georgian Bay canal were opened for traffic, these large vessels would not use it to the best advantage. It would be practically all canal from Georgian bay to Montreal. These large vessels could not make the time mentioned by some of the speakers to-day. In addition there is great danger of these large ships striking on the sides of the canal and sustaining injury. By the Welland canal route, there would be only eighteen miles of canal from Port Arthur to Kingston—the length of the Welland canal. Therefore, I would urge the government to undertake at once the improvement of the Welland canal, and to proceed with the work as fast as possible. There is no reason that I can see why they should not at the same time proceed with the Georgian Bay canal and do work on that route and, when the Welland canal is completed, work all the faster on the Georgian Bay canal. I am strongly of opinion that there are other water-ways that are to be considered. For instance, there has been mentioned in this House a project of having a water-way from Port Arthur through to Edmonton. That may now seem to some hon. members of this House an impossibility. But I can remember the time—and that not many years ago—when this Georgian Bay scheme used to come before the Railway Committee every two years to have the charter renewed, it was simply thought to be a charter that would never amount to anything. But now we see it is likely to prove a success and likely to go through. The same may happen in the case of the water-way from Port Arthur to the west.

Another thing I wish to say is that, if these water-ways are to be developed, it should be by the government; the government should own them and control the traffic absolutely, and not hand these routes over to private corporations. I trust that the Minister of Railways and Canals will urge the members of the government to proceed with the development of the Welland canal so as to allow these large steamers to come down from the upper lakes to the head of river navigation. If this is done, I am satisfied that, in three or four years, the people of the Northwest will save enough in freight to pay the entire cost. And it would bring about this desirable result any where from five to fifteen years sooner than it could be brought about by the development of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval). I have only a few words to say and it is not in criticism of the remarks of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), and my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White). If I understand my hon. friend from Grenville right, it is only a question of opportunity whether the Welland canal should be dredged a little deeper than it is now, though I do not understand that he objects at all to the Georgian Bay canal project. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that it seems refreshing to find ourselves upon a subject relating to water-ways, after we have heard so much about war and Dreadnoughts. In the course of my remarks, I hope I will not wound the susceptibilities of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), if I touch a little upon the military features of this canal.

For the last seven or eight years I have been particularly interested in matters of dredging and navigation. During the campaign of 1902, that was one of the issues in the county of Laval. During the campaign of 1904, one of the issues was the dredging of the Rivière des Prairies and Rivière Jesus. I am glad to see present my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), who I know takes a great interest in this subject. Now, since we have had a survey and report upon this Georgian Bay canal ,nearly everybody in the Dominion takes more and more interest in the subject, and is to a certain extent posted on the project. I am not going to entertain at great length this House about the Georgian Bay canal project. Most everything has been said about it that can be said, and if any hon. member wishes to know more about it he has only to peruse the exhaustive and well framed report made by the four engineers appointed by this government to examine the project. They will find in that report everything they need. I propose to confine my remarks to that section of the proposed route extending from the Lake of Two Mountains down to Varennes, a point 6 or 8 miles from the Bout de I'sle of the islands of Montreal. Now, I would invite the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), in the estimates which he will present to this House in a few days, to include a sum of money for the deepening of that part of the canal projected through the Rivières des Prairies, north of the metropolis of Canada.

On the 15th of February, 1909, I placed a motion on the order paper of this House for a return of information regarding the dredging of the Rivière Jesus, and I was informed that in November, 1863-4, about half a mile below Macdonald's wharf was dredged by the government, and from 1902 to 1908 it was dredged by contractors. The distance dredged was about two miles, the width 100 ft., the depth from six to ten feet, and the work was carried as far as Mascouche river. These works are to reach as far as Terrebonne. Such was the information handed out from the Department of Public Works in the return I mentioned. I desire now to draw the attention to the importance of the locality bounded by these two rivers, and to show the great need there is at present for improving their channels; first, in connection with local navigation; secondly, in regard to the general scheme of Canadian navigation; thirdly, and finally, I intend to demonstrate the need of this work in connection with the Georgian Bay canal project.

According to the census of 1901, the total population of the parishes in the vicinity of these rivers, and which must benefit directly from the execution of this work, was 10,200 souls; the total population of the villages in the same section was 6,779, forming a total of 16,979. I will not detain the House with an enumeration of the number of acres of cultivated land in the surrounding country. I will simply say that, since the last census, the now incorporated village of Cartierville has sprung into existence, and a large number of families have established their homes along the shores of the Rivière des Prairies, and the consequent increase in population over the figures of the last census must amount to fully 5,000. I am sure this is no exaggeration. In fact, in another ten years that section of country will contain a population of at least 50,000 people. There is already, as I have shown, in round figures a population of 22,000. The city of Montreal is now rapidly spreading all over the island. Outlying towns and suburbs are being annexed to the city every year. Its limits already extend within one mile of the Rivière des Prairies, and very soon the municipalities of Cartierville, Bordeaux, Ahuntsic and Sault-au-Recollect will be included within the city. That is to say, the whole section, extending from the River St. Lawrence to the village of the Rivière des Prairies, will form a portion of the city of Montreal.

Along the banks of the river a number of houses of education, all of a high order, and to which many of the city children are sent, have been established. The waterworks system of the city extends to Rivière des Prairies. The new prison of Montreal is now being built within a few acres of the banks of the river and in the heart of the municipality of Bordeaux. Land is being sold in building lots, and of late, as if by enchantment, unincorporated villages have sprung up on all sides throughout that region—one of the finest in all Canada. In vain will you look through the blue-books of the past ten years for such names of places as Youville, Parc Laval, Bas du Sault, Pont Viau, Saraguay, Cartierville, Abord à Plouffe, &c., &c., all of which are considerable villages, and which but a short time ago were but land marks, or stopping places, along the route. These, thanks to the wonderful progress and expansion of the city, are to-day places of sufficient importance to entitle them to charters of towns from the provinial legislature.

Stone, wood, coal and other like commodities are in great demand there, but owing to the lack of a system of navigation, it would be difficult to obtain exact statistics as to the cost and the amount needed, both for domestic consumption and for industrial purposes. I really believe that a system of navigation circling the Island of Montreal would be of the utmost utility and benefit to all that large population along the shores, and I look ahead to such a system in the near future.

The very first question one might ask is this: Is navigation possible in that river? The answer is simple. I must draw your attention immediately to Rivières des Prairies which I am referring to as one of the two alternative routes of the Georgian Bay canal. According to the report of the engineer it would save $9,000,000 or $10,000,000 if the Georgian Bay canal were built by the route of Rivière des Prairies instead of by the St. Lawrence, where there is already the Lachine canal. It would be much shorter.

Mr. HUGHES. Better for the navy, too.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Better for the navy, and I am glad that my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) takes that view. I will come to a point that will please him very much in a few minutes. I will refer to military and naval defence. Our cruisers, rather small perhaps, that tin-pot navy to which somebody has referred in the House, will be more protected on the Back river in those good constituencies of Laval, Jacques Cartier, Terrebonne and Two Mountains than on the border or on the south side of the St. Lawrence river and that is one of the reasons why I am in favour of that route. I was about to answer the question: Is navigation possible in that river? It is possible, for it has existed in the past, and it still exists during the high-water season. The route now under consideration has been, since the first pine tree in the valley of the Ottawa was felled by the shanty-

man's axe, the grand water-way for the immense rafts of square timber, taken down to the St. Lawrence, to the timber market in Montreal, Three Rivers and Quebec. Each year, until within about two or three years, the steamers 'Vermont,' 'Hope,' 'Aurora' and 'Monarch,' as well as others the names of which escape me, have towed rafts, barges and pontoons almost to the village of Ste. Geneviève, to a place called L'Anse du Pont de Pierre. In 1882 or 1883, Mr. Girouard, then member for Jacques Cartier, now a judge of the Supreme Court, organized at Lachine a political excursion, by steamboat, to Ste. Geneviève, and on that occasion, for a first time the rather large steamboat 'Beauharnois' was seen moored to an emergency wharf at that town. Often since, smaller boats than those above mentioned have gone down below Ile Bizard, and have turned near the foot of Rapide l'Allemand. As to the north side of the Ile Bizard, it is washed by the Lake of Two Mountains, which has a depth of water sufficient for the class of navigation under present consideration. So much for that part of the Rivière des Prairies, which covers an extent of about six miles. Navigation is both possible and practicable in that part of it.

As to the part of that river extending from Bout de l'Ile of Montreal on the east side of the level above the village of St. Vincent de Paul, we find that about 1860, and even before that the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, I think, known then under another name, had for about fifteen years a steamboat service between Montreal, St. Vincent de Paul and Terrebonne The old wharf is still there; the steamer 'Terrebonne' did the service. When the reformatory of St. Vincent de Paul was changed into a penitentiary, prisoners were brought there from Kingston and elsewhere on board the steamer 'l'Aigle.'

The distance between Bout de l'Ile and St. Vincent de Paul is about twelve miles.

The only work that would be needed on that section of river would be the clearing up or dredging of the channel of the Rapide de la Passe, in front of the village of Rivière des Prairies. Every spring time the Marine Department places about a dozen buoys in that rapid for the guidance of the rafts and for general purposes of navigation.

You may reasonably ask me: What caused the cessation of navigation in that part? I may point out two, amongst other reasons: 1st, the building of the Quebec, Montreal and Occidental railway, now a part of the Canadian Pacific. This line made it then impossible for any line of vessels to compete with it in trade. The second cause is the gradual yearly lowering of the water level for a quarter of a century back, and the working of the ice on the banks and bed of the river. The ice tore up the bottom of the river and rolled here and there the heavy boulders that got into the deeper channels and broke up the navigation. I do not believe that in the last twenty-five years the government ever spent one cent to remedy that unfortunate state of affairs.

As to the fifteen miles of river above St. Vincent de Paul and up the Ile Bizard, it never was utilized for purposes of navigation although it was always a passage way for timber and rafts. It is a part that would require more work to improve it; but once that work is done it would be of the greatest importance as a water-way and will make navigation around the Island of Montreal practicable. At that place there is located a felt mill, and the electric power-house of the Saraguay Light, Heat and Power Company, as also a knitting mill, the Ile Bizard grist mill, several manufactories, and the far-famed limestone quarries of St. François de Sales, St. Martin and Bordeaux, since navigation has ceased, the population has augmented, needs have increased, business has extended; and yet the only means of transportation is the Canadian Pacific railway, which has stations only at Bordeaux, Parc Laval, St. Martin, St. Vincent de Paul and François de Sales. Their charges are burdensome and the company, so far as transportation is concerned, has a monopoly over the entire territory. For instance, on the single article of coal consumed by the penitentiary according to a statement given in 1902 or 1903 the Department of Justice would save about $5,000 each year were the retransportation by water instead of by rail. I think there is a difference of about $1 per ton between the water and the rail rates. Consider, then, the immense benefits that would accrue if a sum sufficient were voted to improve the navigation of that river to such a degree that boats drawing five or six feet of water might ply upon it. I have dwelt on this point to considerable extent in the hope of seeing a sufficient sum voted to permit of the dredging and clearing up of the rivers des Prairies and Jésus, and the rendering of them more useful to the entire city of Montreal and its neighbourhood.

I will now turn to the larger and national side of the question. I desire to show how this very section may become a strong link in that magnificent chain of water-way, to be known as the Georgian Bay canal—a project that now challenges the attention of two continents and of the two great sections of this continent—the United States and Canada.

Turning now to the grand national project of the future, of which the work suggested must form a not inconsiderable part, I shall ask your attention for but a few moments. The primary idea that inspired

the governments and engineers of the first period of this century to dig the Carillon and Rideau canals was military defence. The Georgian Bay canal report gives us the following information:

In 1828 McPherson, Crane & Company put the steamer 'Shannon,' Captain Grant, on this route. Meanwhile a great improvement was pending. The American war (1812-14) had emphasized the need of an interior route to Kingston, and in 1827 the imperial government began the construction of the Carillon and the Grenville canals, and also the Rideau canal between Ottawa and Kingston. These were finished in 1833.

In 1806, Mr. Wright, of Hull, was the first person to take down a raft of square timber from Ottawa to Quebec. His idea of running the Long Sault and the Carillon rapids with his raft was looked upon as fool-hardy and madness at the time. But he succeeded and reached the Island of Montreal in 28 days. When he had got as far as the Lake of Two Mountains he found himself in a dilemma. Which of the two coures was he to take? Possibly, warned by the fury of the Sault St. Louis, he decided to take the handier and less boisterous route of the Rivières des Prairies. So that as early as 1806 the navigation of the river with rafts (if I can so call it) was recognized as possible and the route north of the Island of Montreal seemed to guarantee safety and all that could be desired. In 1841 Captain Shepherd started from Ste. Anne and ascended, for the first time, the Carillon canal. The day before he did this he accomplished the feat of steering the steamer 'St. David' from Brockville to Lachine, running the Gallops, Long Sault, Cornwall, Coteau, Les Cedres, the Chutes à Blondeau and the Split Rock rapids, as well as the famous Sault St. Louis, thus showing the possibility of navigating those dangerous rapids which are to-day a favourite route for trade and for tourists. That same year he towed a raft of square timber, with his steamboat, from Carillon to the Rapide L'Allemand, at the end of Ile Bizard. All this forms a connecting link between what I have already said regarding the possibility of navigation in those waters and the idea of a permanent route from the sea to the great lakes. The intention of the military authorities in 1827 was to have the military system of canals run by way of Rivière des Prairies instead of by Ste. Anne.

Keeping in sight the evident purpose of the military engineers of the past and the project of the great canal that looms up on the horizon of the future, I would ask attention, for a few moments, to the 'Back River Line' as this route is called in the report of the surveys in connection with the Georgian Bay canal. And before so doing I wish to recall the opinion of Herbert Quick, author and expert writer on American water-ways, expressed in an interview prior to the Water-ways convention at New Orleans. Mr. Quick said:

Canada has already more commerce through her Soo canal than we have through ours. When she has completed the Georgian Bay ship canal she will destroy American commerce from the lakes to the sea, and the death-knell of our merchant marine on the lakes will have been sounded.

At this stage, and in presence of all that has been written of late on this subject, it is needless for me to dwell upon its importance in every sense and to point out the vital necessity it will become within the very near future, if not immediately. All are agreed on that score, and the only thing we await is the possibility of that work being commenced in earnest. Keeping, then, all this in mind, I return to the urgency and necessity of the government providing a suitable vote of moneys for the operations of dredging and improving the water courses in question. The cost will be proportionately small to the local benefits and the future national importance of the work.

I do not deem it necessary to read for this House the entire portions of the report that deal with the rivers, lakes, streams, watercourses, islands and adjacent lands to which I refer and that comprise the region in favour of which I ask the assistance of a vote. Pages 99, 100 and 101, as well as pages 512 and 513 of that voluminous report contain statistics of a most interesting and convincing character, which, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me, I will hand over to the reporters. They show exactly what amount of work may be required to make that course perfectly navigable, as well as the time that may be required in completing such works.

BACK RIVER LINE.

St. Lawrence Ship Channel to Prairies Lock.

The line leaves the Montreal-Quebec ship channel near Varennes and proceeds due west through the soft river bed for 8 miles to Prairies lock, opposite the small village of Rivière des Prairies, which is 5 miles higher up than Bout de l'Ile.

Channels are provided to allow of either up or down bound traffic from the ship channel entering Ottawa.

The surface of the St. Lawrence at Bout de l'Ile is elevation 16 at low water, and this surface continues up to the Prairies lock; therefore the channel bottom is elevation 6. The width of the channel is 300 feet, widened at curves. This necessitates the excavation and disposal of four million cubic yards of material, which is generally a soft clay that can be excavated by suction dredges and pumped away through pipes. It can be deposited upon the islands at Bout de l'Ile, and the upper portion of the channel excavation may be disposed of on Macheu island without

incurring the risk of its running back into the channel.

The excavation could be done in three seasons. The Canadian hydraulic dredge, 'J. I. Tarte,' excavated during working season of 1907, and removed by pipe line, two million yards of material in the St. Lawrence below Montreal.

The line passes through Ile Bourdon in 35 feet cut, and this material will prove harder excavation than the channel below and above, although a good part of it can be done dry.

At this point the Chateauguay and Northern railway (Great Northern) is crossed, and a bascule double track bridge has been estimated for, leaving a clear water-way of 160 feet. About mile 8 the excavation becomes rock and continues so for the next half mile up to Prairies lock.

The line is generally direct, but bends, none of which are sharp, are necessary at four places to get between the numerous islands. Each leg is provided with range lights and mark piers so as to render navigation fully as easy as in the ship channel.

At mile 5 the St. Eustache branch of Mille Iles river joins the Back river, but without appreciable current. The manufacturing town of Terrebonne is situated 11 miles up this branch.

The end of Montreal island (Bout de l'Ile) is a triangular flat, elevated about 35 feet above the sea for a distance of two miles. The ground then runs up quickly to elevation 75, and continues to rise toward Mount Royal. Examination failed to discover any practical crossing between Bout de l'Ile and Ste Anne —the west end of Montreal island.

To cut through the island and join the St. Lawrence ship channel at the head of Ile Ste. Therese would be somewhat more expensive than the route as estimated. The saving in distance between the short cut and the adopted line, Montreal customs house would be about 6 miles in distance, but nothing in time of transit owing to reduced speed through canal cutting.

Prairies Reach.

The lock or step up to this reach is located on the north shore opposite des Prairies village, its lift being 24 feet from surface elevation 16 to surface elevation 40. A greater rise than this would flood the village property, and the damage might be considerably increased by the erosion of the soft earth banks along the south side.

The Prairies lock is founded on rock, the surface of which is elevated 20 feet, so that the walls for 26 feet in height are formed in the natural bed-rock. The remaining 25 feet in height of wall are built of concrete in a similar manner to all the other locks. About 3,000 cubic yards of concrete will be required for this, and part of the lock-pit excavation can be used.

The usual guide piers are provided above and below the lock. The upper guide pier forms a side wall to a short canal along the river bank.

There is a rock-fill dam between the lock and the south shore, which will require 100,000 cubic yards of loose rock.

The rock excavation immediately below the lock can be dammed off the excavated dry at the same time as the lock-pit, and will furnish ample material for the filling of guide piers and the dam.

Stop-log sluiceways are provided in the dam to pass the flow of the river. There are 14 openings, each 20 feet wide, and capable of passing 20 feet depth of water, and even 24 feet depth if the reach above should rise by accident. The regulated flow through Back river is 65,000 c.f.s., and 25 per cent additional is provided.

About a mile above the lock a straight channel will require the excavation of about 21,000 cubic yards of rock, which can be taken out dry.

Further up the channel, about two miles above St. Vincent de Paul, nearly 850,000 cubic yards of rock excavation is required extending right to the foot of Recollet lock-mile 17.

This heavy rock excavation is necessary so as to enlarge the river bed and prevent a current swifter than four feet per second for the total flow of 65,000 c.f.s.

The river now flows with considerable current, but with little depth, a rough limestone bed-rock. The proposed raised surface or working level will just obliterate the sloping fall of the river past Visitation island, and so destroy the current, without increasing the depth. It will, therefore, be necessary to increase the size of the river. To accomplish this a channel 700 feet wide will be taken out south of Visitation island to allow a flow of 10 feet in depth. This can be excavated dry. Part will be earth 54,000 cubic yards, and part rock, 202,000 cubic yards. The village property destroyed is often flooded, and so no great damage will be done. This channel could be excavated by three shovels in two seasons, working winter and summer.

The navigation channel north of Visitation island is full 300 feet wide, and excavated 7 feet into the rock river bed for a distance of about 1½ miles below Recollet lock. This can be closed off by dams from shore and excavated dry, especially as most of the river flow will be passed south of Visitation island. Three seasons will be required to complete this channel, that is one season after the channel south of Visitation island is finished. The water surface at Prairies lock will be raised about 15 feet and extend level to Recollet lock, where the surface will be as at present. There will be 368 acres of land inundated. The north bank from St. Vincent de Paul upwards is very steep and the south shore is fairly high but it may be necessary to protect parts of it by a stone slope, ample rock for which is available from the excavation.

A small water-power at Prairies lock will be extinguished and also that between Ile Visitation and the south shore where a small cardboard factory is now in existence.

Recollet Reach.

Recollet lock is on the north side, a mile below Pont Viau, the lift being 35 feet, which attains the level of Oka reach. It will be noted that only two locks are required to rise to Oka level by the Back river, while the front line requires three locks, as a small lift seems absolutely necessary at Ste. Anne.

Recollet lock is founded on solid rock, the

surface of which is elevation 40, so that the bottom being elevation 18.22 feet of wall is in solid rock, leaving 40 feet to be built up in concrete.

Below the lock is the usual cribwork approach, and above is the lock cribwork pier. This is backed by earth from the canal excavation to create a dam across the small gullet just above the lock, which then forms an entrance basin about a mile long.

This expansion of the surface will diminish the bore or ware which travels down a narrow canal during and after the filling of a lock, tending to slam the upper gates shut just when they are in progress of opening.

Above the lock—mile 17 to mile 28—are 11 miles of canal, and the question of a guard lock at the head and a guard gate just above the Recollet lock, comes up.

A guard lock at the head of the canal, where it enters Oka lake would be subject to the drive of the waves down the lake, which would prevent the opening of the upper gates as has been experienced on the Soulanges canal at Coteau under similar conditions.

On the other hand, without a guard lock, winds are apt to pile the water in the narrow canal towards the foot. This action nearly resulted in overflowing the banks of the Welland canal and Thorold during a gale down Lake Erie. The gates of the Port Colborne guard lock had been left open, and could not be shut owing to the heavy waves that ran in from the lake.

Again, the carrying away of the lock gates at Recollet lock or a break in the canal bank would create a swift current through the canal, and a lowering of the surface that would wreck steamers navigating the reach.

The sides of the canal have been designed 5 feet above Oka lake, which is sufficient to obviate any danger from the piling action of the water toward the lower end of the canal.

Recollet lock, like all others, on the route, has four pairs of steel gates. Both the lower pairs are always shut against a descending boat, and is beyond all human probability that a thin steel boat cutting into the 4 foot wide girders of these steel lock gates would completely carry away the pair 57 feet below. The bows of the boat would be cut in, and she would remain hanging in the wreck of the first pair of gates, forming a very effective dam.

Near the head of the canal at Bigras island a large area of sluices is provided, that empty directly into the river channel, which at this place is rock. If then the canal bank should give way at any point, these sluices will be opened and the greater part of the flow from Oka lake will discharge through them. Only a small quantity would tend to continue down the canal, and, therefore, a temporary dam could easily be constructed across the channel below the sluices till the break in the bank was repaired.

In this connection it must be remembered that, even with a guard lock, the whole contents of the canal would tear out through any break in the bank and do practically all the damage that could be done.

I have, therefore, made no provision for guard lock nor guard gates, but have preferred to place full confidence in the Bigras island sluices.

The Recollet canal necessitates over five million cubic yards of dry earth, excavation, and half a million cubic yards of rock. The standard size of embankments amounts to three million cubic yards, so that a good margin is left to widen and strengthen the usual cross section.

There are several bridges to be dealt with. Viau bridge traffic will be carried across at Recollet lock.

For the Canadian Pacific Railway, a bascule bridge is provided at Parc Laval—mile 19.

The Cartierville road traffic will be crossed by a bascule bridge in the same line as the present road.

The highway traffic to Ile Bizard can pass along the south bank as a roadway is provided over the Bigras sluices.

Along the whole 11 miles of canal it will be necessary to protect both sides by broken stone against the wash of boats, etc.

Above the canal, the channel toward Oka village will be dredged, 7 feet deep, through the shallow sand flats at the east end of Oka lake—mile 28 to mile 37—a total excavation of 4½ millions cubic yards, most of which can be handled by suction dredge.

Silting in of this channel, with sand by wind storms, is liable to occur, but the powerful suction dredges now in use are capable of rapidly and cheaply clearing it away.

The time required for the construction of the Recollet reach and Oka lake section would probably be five seasons if 12 steam shovels, or their equivalent, were employed in the canal section itself—mile 17 to 28. The dredging in Oka lake can be completed in advance of this.

It may be argued that, in view of the recent expressions on the part of the right hon. leader of the government, the commencement of the Georgian Bay canal project is somewhere yet in the near future. The desire is to see it begun at once; but the extensiveness of the other great and important public works that demand immediate attention, and the means at the disposal of the government for such gigantic enterprises, compel the relegation of this national undertaking to the time to come. Consequently, it may be said, that there is not an immediate necessity for the dredging and improvements that I have so persistently asked for. But, in reply to this, I say that the immediate necessity is of a most important local character, and that it affects the interests of the great metropolitan city of Montreal and all the immediate surroundings. And while that work is being done, and that navigation is being not only restored, but made permanent for the future, you will be 'killing two birds with one stone' and preparing so much of the route that most assuredly will be adopted whenever the government of Canada finds itself in a position to freely launch the magnificent national enterprise of building the Georgian bay canal.

I will not detain the House any further on this point; but I will sum up in a few words my request. It is the same as that made to the government on the occasion of

the interview with the hon. Minister of Public Works, when, on the 15th of December last, the subject was clearly explained and all due and careful consideration was promised. I thank the Minister of Public Works for the kindly interest he has expressed in this matter.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to add a word or two to this interesting debate. I think the House is very much indebted to the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) for having given such an extensive review of all that has been already said and adding to it what has lately been done in respect to this great national work. Of course we, down in the district of Montreal, are extremely interested in the prompt execution of this work, but although we are greatly interested, although that intended canal, whatever route may be adopted, passes through my own constituency, which will no doubt derive some benefit from it, still it is a work of such nature that I am more disposed to look at it as a general national work destined to benefit the whole country than to take the view which my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. C. A. Wilson) has taken of that work. He seems to consider it more as a local work.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Does my hon. friend remember that when a delegation was received by the Minister of Public Works he was present for a few moments, although he was busy in a committee, and that he did not object to the work that was to be done in that part of the country, on the other hand the work would have his best support.

Mr. MONK. I attended that delegation, and I am greatly in favour of the performance of that particular work of cleaning up the river and deepening its navigation. I attended that delegation and I entirely supported my hon. friend in respect to that particular work. Although I was placed under the disadvantage of addressing the Minister of Public Works in French, I was pleased to perceive that he thoroughly understood me, and I even noticed from certain signs that he made that he approved of my remarks and that the work should be done at once. But I am now referring to the whole gigantic project of the Georgian Bay canal. We have had debates of this very instructive character almost every session since I have had a seat in the House. In fact, I think the public discussion of the project of the Georgian Bay canal began in some legislature, which I could not at the present moment properly designate, in 1832, and has been continued almost every year since then, and has invariably ended with an assurance by the then government that the work was one of public interest, that its utility was incontrovertible, and that the government would take up the matter with the least possible delay. It seems to me that if I had any fault, and I have no fault indeed, to find with the form of the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. G. V. White) it is that it does not conclude sufficiently towards an immediate beginning of this work. We have had before us, since 1832, what has already been designated in this House much less happily as mountains of information, and the government since I came into this House to find myself on your left, has invariably endeavoured to delay the beginning of this work which is now recognized as one absolutely necessary. I once heard our colleague of that day (Mr. Poupore), who then represented Pontiac and who was well informed on this question, fully explain to the House the necessity of the immediate execution of this work, and I heard the government at that time say that they were on the point of putting that project into execution. Later when the late Mr. Tarte sat in this House he became extremely interested in the question of transportation, and at times he caused his colleagues on the treasury benches considerable embarrassment about the subject, and in the year 1903 the government, in order to shelve the question at least for some time, decided to name a commission to study this question of transportation about which Mr. Tarte was then causing the government trouble and embarrassment which, with other causes, ended in his having to leave the government. The government named a commission, and I am bound to say they could not possibly in the estimation of everybody have chosen better men. At first, Sir William Van Horne was named, but he was unable to act and Mr. Bertram took the presidency. He died in the midst of his work and finally the presidency fell to Mr. Robert Reford of Montreal, a great authority on matters of transportation, and he sat with Mr. Ashdown of Winnipeg, representing the west, and Mr. Fry of Quebec representing the Quebec district. I have no hesitation in saying that that report in my humble estimation covers the whole ground of transportation. It was an admirable report and the work of the commission was done largely through a pure spirit of patriotism, because they were very busy men and the expense incurred was extremely small. They went fully into the question of transportation from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and made their report in December, 1905, but since that time that report has remained absolutely, to my mind, a dead letter. None of their suggestions were ever heard of since. It becomes a difficult matter to get hold of that report, and it has never been referred to, to my knowledge, by any member of the present administration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The most important suggestions are being rapidly and steadily acted upon.

Mr. MONK. I do not take it that way. Perhaps if my hon. friend——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take Fort William, Port Arthur, Victoria, Tiffin, St. John, Vancouver, the Georgian Bay survey——

Mr. MONK—not one single suggestion of any importance in that report has been carried out.

Mr. RIVET. What about the improvements carried on in Montreal?

Mr. MONK. Not one single suggestion in the report of any importance. What do we find in that report? It lays down as a fundamental principle that five or six or seven of our ports, which the commissioners have examined carefully, must be made national and free ports, Prince Rupert, Vancouver, ports on the Pacific ocean, some of the lake ports and they gave the reasons for these suggestions. My hon. friend speaks of Montreal, as being an example of the carrying out of those suggestions. Will my hon. friend say that Montreal has been made a free and national port?

Mr. RIVET. I will.

Mr. MONK. And that the improvements suggested by the commission have been carried out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been made a national port.

Mr. MONK. What money do we owe the government, what money have we received for the improvement of the port of Montreal or carrying out a single suggestion? We have improved the port, we have obtained the credit of the government, borrowed money and carried out improvements, admirably carried out under the present commission of the port of Montreal. But in what way is it a free port? The charge is increasing every year as it must increase necessarily if the suggestion of this commission is not carried out and it is not made a free port. What is the amount taken out of the port of Montreal every year? Is that a free port? It is neither a national port nor a free port. A couple of years ago, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that day maintained in this House that the commission had not advised that this port should be made free, and I had to hunt up the report of the commission and show that part to the minister in which that recommendation was made, and thus made him acquainted with the fact that the commission had suggested that Montreal should be made a free port. Neither has their suggestion been carried out with regard to the port of Quebec. Improvements have been made in that port, some of them with government money, but is it a free port? Is St. John a free port, as the commission advised, or Halifax?

What the commission advised as urgent and important, namely, the making of our ports free, the proper equipment of our ports on the great lakes, has not been carried out; and we shall require to spend at least $100,000,000 to carry out the suggestions of the commission, even if you confine yourselves merely to the freeing and nationalization of our ports.

The commission advised the building of the Georgian Bay canal as an urgent matter. After Mr. Reford had sent in his report, he wrote a special, additional report to the government, which must be in the hands of the Minister of Public Works. That additional report, or letter, was written to impress on the government the extreme urgency and necessity of building that canal at once. In view of what has been done in the United States, Mr. Reford thought it necessary to write an additional letter to the government urging that the work should be gone on with at once, and that letter was published in the March following in the Montreal 'Herald.' What do the commission say about the Georgian Bay canal, and I mention this because my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) seems to doubt what their choice was between any other means and a direct or through water-way from the lakes to the head of ocean navigation. They say:

> Your commission unhesitatingly affirm their belief in the desirability of a thorough waterway from the head of Lake Superior to ocean navigation, to aid in the carriage of the grain and the regulation of rates of a standard not less than that above set forth, so that the largest vessels navigating the great lakes can continue their voyage to ocean navigation or as near thereto as possible. But in view of the fact that the government has undertaken the survey of a proposed route by way of the Fraser river to Lake Nipissing, and thence by way of the Ottawa river to Montreal, and as the feasibility of this route from a commercial as well as an engineering point of view, and if feasible its cost, has not been ascertained, and further in view of the fact that the government has also undertaken a survey of the Welland canal and its vicinity, looking to its possible enlargement and diversion, your commission do not see their way clear to any recommendation as to route, but would recommend that, in case the Ottawa river scheme because of want of feasibility from a commercial or engineering point of view, or on account of its cost or for other reason be not adopted, then the Welland canal be enlarged and deepened to the standard of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, with a view of enabling vessels of the largest size to continue their voyage to Kingston or Prescott, thus bringing their cargo to within say 180 miles or less of Montreal before discharging same.

I am not in any way opposing the deepening of the Welland canal, but I say it appears from this recommendation that the commission preferred, as an immediate solution of the difficulty, the carrying of grain from the great lakes, not to Kingston or 180 miles from Montreal, but clean down to the head of navigation, and that by a canal projected down the St. Lawrence reaching as far as the maritime provinces which, although remote from the canal itself, would derive immense benefit from the carriage of their coal and other goods through the water-way, from the maritime provinces, without transhipment, clean beyond Duluth to the end of the great lakes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood my hon. friend to say that the government had not carried out one single suggestion made by this transportation commission. Let me ask him whether he would suggest that there has been the slightest delay in carrying forward and completing the survey for the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. MONK. I did not say that the government had not carried out a single suggestion, but I said an important suggestion, and I gave as a first instance the question of free ports. I singled out that one because it must be perfectly evident to every hon. member that until that suggestion is carried out, we stand in a position of absolute inferiority to the United States. Take only the great lakes ports, Superior and Duluth, and see how these are equipped. Their equipment is something marvellous; people come from the old world to see it. Compare these American ports with ours. In ours there is by comparison practically no equipment. That suggestion, therefore, of the commission has not been carried out to any extent by this government. In Montreal we have an admirable commission which deserves better encouragement. It has, by borrowing money on its own credit, carried out very important improvements, but the work is by no means finished. Any one who takes the trouble to read the splendid report of the chairman of that commission, Major Stephens, made after his return from Europe, must come to the conclusion that we shall have to spend at least $80,000,000 if we want to place Montreal on a footing at all equal to that of the great ports of Europe which he visited, the least important of which had expended on it at least $30,000,000. If we want to put Montreal on the same footing as Boston and New York and other American ports, and European ports as well, we must be prepared to spend $100,000,000.

There were suggestions less important carried out, because the shipping interests stood behind them and insisted on their being carried out. Take the St. Lawrence ship channel, the better lighting of the route between Montreal and Quebec, that has been attended to, although I am informed that a number of the lighthouses put up between those two ports have already tumbled into the water, as most government works do. But there has been an attempt in that direction, and probably also on the great lakes, because the shipping interests were there and insisted on this report being carried out which the government wanted to pigeon-hole. But these are minor points. What have they done in respect of the more important matters? Have they enlarged the Welland canal? Have they made a single start towards constructing the Georgian Bay canal? My hon. friend will say that surveys have been made. This matter has been brought up every year for the last fifteen years, and I have every year heard from the ministers the same generalities and the same replies. True, partial surveys were made before. But this last report is an admirable one. It was finished some time ago and distributed. Has the government shown any haste to make known its policy? We know that statements are made in the United States that if we should build this Georgian Bay canal, it will take the whole trade of the west, both American and Canadian, and our people are beginning to clamour for it. But when the government is urged to build it, they reply, as the right hon. the Prime Minister did a short while ago in an interview: We will attend to this work as soon as we have the money. But nothing is done. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Wilson) insisted, and insisted very properly, a moment ago, that work should be done on a section of that canal. Why, we have lost about $10,000,000 from the fact that we did not begin that section 10 years ago. And we are losing every year about thirty per cent on the cost of that section—about $10,000,000—by that increase in value. If the government had constructed the French river end a few years ago at an estimated cost of $5,000,000, we should now have the advantage of the development and increase of population which have been spoken of in this debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which section?

Mr. MONK. The French river section.

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $13,000,000.

Mr. MONK. I understood that it was much less. But what about the section in the vicinity of Montreal, which should have been begun ten years ago and on which, had it been finished, there would have been an immense saving in the cost of labour as well as the saving of the frightful increase every day in the cost of expropriation?

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), but perhaps he will allow me to ask him

if he remembers the campaign of 1902, when he was in the county, and I asked very plainly why he opposed this project which was my issue, and he stated that it was for political reasons I proposed it?

Mr. MONK. I never heard of that.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I heard that from the hon. member's own lips.

Mr. MONK. The first vote I gave in this House was in favour of it. And any man who has followed the debates on this subject—by no means so long as debates we have had on some other subjects not so important—or who has read anything of this discussion must know that the project is a useful one in the saving of cost and time in transportation and in every other way. Why, one only needs to know of the fear entertained by the American experts that we will open this route, to know that it will be a good thing for Canada. I do not know that I ever had my hon. friend (Mr. C. A. Wilson) as an adversary. But this I do know—that I never opposed this project.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. The hon. member said I advocated it for political reasons.

Mr. MONK. I do not think it a political matter—certainly, I am not trying to make capital out of it. What I would like to know is: what are we going to do. All that we have heard is, of course, very interesting. To some members of this House, younger than I am, no doubt it is a piece of valuable information when the government say they will give the matter their earnest consideration. But I have heard this often before. Now that the survey is long finished, is nothing going to be done? What is the difficulty? Is it the absence of money? We have a great deal of money for useless, senseless and silly things, such as the navy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. C. A. Wilson) laugh at that? Does he think that the navy is a more urgent and pressing matter than this?

Mr. CONMEE. It is a matter of emergency.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I am in favour of both.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the navy is nearly so urgent as this. The hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) asked what suggestions had not been carried out. Well, this canal idea is one idea of some importance. And the national and free ports that we must have in order to give us a proper place among the nations and that were proposed by the Transportation Commission are of some importance. Another suggestion was the acquiring of running rights for the Intercolonial to the great lakes in order to give increased facilities and regulate present rates. Has that been attended to? Has anything been done in connection with that matter? Nothing whatever.

Under these circumstances, I rose for the purpose of asking whether this is going to be merely an academic discussion. What new method can the government adopt in order to shelve the matter once more? Is there to be a committee or a commission that is going to pass upon the work—the invaluable work—of the Transportation Commission which has never been disowned by the government, but has been kept in the background? Is there any thing further to be done now that we have the report of a special survey party, the cost of which I think amounts to $700,000—certainly over $500,000?—and, as pointed out by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) and others, a complete and thorough report giving the cost and every thing else. What are we going to do? Are we going to allow the Americans to take all this vast commerce away from us, or are we to do that which they dread so much—make an improvement which every one agrees to be urgent and necessary? If the work is to be carried out, when is it to begin? I am sure that my hon. friend from Laval will bear me out when I say that the appropriation cost around Montreal is increasing in fearful proportion yearly. Why should we not begin on that end now? The increase of cost while the work is postponed is going on by hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. The canal may be built in sections, and if the Montreal section is finished soon a great deal of money will be saved. If there is any thing true in this valuable report of the Transportation Commission, it is that, when one-quarter of the cultivatable land of the Northwest is under cultivation and producing wheat, we shall have 800,000,000 bushels a year. The trade of the west will be brought down in ships that can go across the ocean if necessary. They will have return traffic ample for their needs. What is the reason for undue delay? Are we going to have to-day an announcement of the policy of the government and what action it intends to take immediately, or is the question to be shelved again by suggestions such as we have heard, that it is desirable to put it off still further? I say this is a most urgent matter, and I repeat that the suggestion of this Transportation Commission, except in some minor matters, have not been carried out. We must at the present moment spend $100,000,000 if we intend carrying out the suggestions of this commission in respect to the ports, their freedom and their nationalization. We must absolutely spend $100,000,000 on this canal; nobody believes that

it is going to cost less, though my own belief is that it will give a large return in the increased prosperity, not only for that part of the country, but for the whole Dominion, and that the cost may really be called insignificant in the face of that return. And must we not pay for the Transcontinental railway? And is it too much to say that we require $200,000,000 for that? Here we have $400,000,000 of urgent, necessary expenses, if we are going to carry out the policy of economic expansion which is absolutely necessary for us if we are to fulfil our destiny.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga). I had no intention of speaking, and should not have done so had not I been prompted by the very partisan speech just delivered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). In the first place, I desire to congratulate most heartily the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) upon the comprehensive, broadminded and nonpartisan manner in which he has explained the resolution which he has placed in your hands. As he has well said, the question under consideration is not in any way a party question, any more than it is a local or sectional question to be treated or considered from a local standpoint It is in that view that I rise to give my hearty endorsation to the views which have been so ably presented by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) this afternoon. This is indeed a national question, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) himself, in his opening remarks, admitted it to be so. Unfortunately, however, in the next breath he put forth arguments which controverted entirely what he had just advanced previously. Why are we confronted to-night with the report of the Transportation Commission, and with the statement that this government has done nothing to carry out any of the suggestions of that commission? Why, the hon. gentleman himself was forced to the conclusion that some of the works which have been carried out by this government were wholly along the lines suggested by this very commission. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked what this government had done to advance the great national scheme of the Georgian Bay canal? The answer, Sir, is very plain; this government is the only government which has done any thing to give effect to the ideas which have been advocated for fifty years in favour of the Georgian Bay canal. It is true that this question has been before the public for over half a century. A few days ago I happened to read some of the speeches delivered on this very question by Sir George E. Cartier, and I was pleased to observe that that great statesman, during the whole course of his public career, was one of the greatest champions of this project; and hon. members of this House will remember that Sir George Cartier was a member for Montreal and for Hochelaga. Now, what was done under the late Conservative regime?

Mr. MONK. I did not pretend that the previous government had not been remiss in its duty, but that the question has not become more urgent.

Mr. RIVET. But that is no reason why the hon. gentleman should charge the present government with neglecting its duty, in view of all it has done, as every well informed man knows. When this government came into power in 1896 one of the very first projects it dealt with was the Georgian Bay canal scheme; and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has admitted that Mr. Tarte was an energetic champion of the execution of this undertaking. Later on, the Transportation Commission was appointed, and I am sure my hon. friend will be willing to give this government the credit for having appointed that commission, and if the recommendations of that commission are now before the country it is due to a certain extent to the initiative of the government in appointing that commission, a commission of eminent men such as the late Robert Reford, Mr. Fry, and others. Surely this is a very important step towards carrying out the great transportation system of Canada.

Now, the hon. gentleman has said that none of the suggestions or conclusions of that commission have been carried out. When I asked him what he thought of the improvements which had been carried out in the port of Montreal he was very indignant and denied that this government was in any way responsible for those improvements, for those great permanent works which may be seen in Montreal to-day, and which have contributed to place it on a first-class footing as compared with other great ocean ports on this continent. The hon. gentleman deplored the state of inferiority of the port of Montreal at present. I differ with him in that respect. I live in Montreal, as does the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Although he is an older man than I am, and I willingly defer to his grey hair, at the same time I cannot agree with his conclusions as to the state of the port of Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend is misrepresenting me. I admitted that great and creditable improvements had been made in Montreal, but I attributed them to the work of the commission and to local effort. But I am not aware that the government has carried out the suggestions made in the report of the commission.

Mr. RIVET. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, and I think other gentlemen around me understood him as I did,

he said that notwithstanding the great improvements which had been effected in the port of Montreal, that harbour was still in a state of inferiority as compared with the port of New York and others.

Mr. MONK. I never said that; I said that although it had been much improved, still a great many other improvements needed to be made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said it was much inferior to New York.

Mr. MONK. I do not think I said that. I said the Americans were ahead of us in respect to port facilities. The gravamen of my charge was this, that the suggestion of a free national port had not been carried out by the government.

Mr. RIVET. I deny altogether that today the port of Montreal is in a state of inferiority as compared with the port of New York. Why, Sir, it is only recently that the citizens of Canada read in some of the leading organs of the United States, such as the New York 'Herald' and the New York 'Sun,' admissions that the port of Montreal had become a formidable rival to the port of New York and other American ports, not only because of its geographical position, but mainly on account of the permanent works of improvement which had been effected during the last few years.

Mr. MONK. May I ask my hon. friend if he has read Major Stephen's report since his visit to Europe?

Mr. RIVET. I have read every thing that Major Stephens has written, every report concerning the port of Montreal, and every statement that has been published in the Canadian press.

Mr. MONK. Then my hon. friend must admit that his suggestions are numerous enough to show that there is still room for improvement.

Mr. RIVET. If my hon. friend will have a little patience I will show him that notwithstanding the fact that the port of New York may be in a better position, and though there are still many improvements required at the port of Montreal, it is not because of the inferiority of the port, but in order to ensure the supremacy of Canadian trade. Any one who goes to the trouble to read the reports published by the American press will come to the conclusion that because of the improvements carried on at the port of Montreal the American business men have become alarmed, and it is this situation that has prompted them to expend large sums of money upon the extension and deepening of the Erie canal in the hope that we shall never succeed in diverting from their channels the trade which is destined to follow our Canadian route.

Mr. MONK. Why have we not a free port?

Mr. RIVET. I am coming to that if my hon. friend will have a little patience. I am sure he is not referring only to the port of Montreal, because notwithstanding the fact that the port of Montreal is admittedly the most important port in Canada from the strategical and national standpoint, there are other ports which require consideration and which have to be dealt with on the same footing and with the same measure of justice.

Mr. MONK. They are indicated in the report.

Mr. RIVET. Did my hon. friend ever dream of the expenditure which would be entailed if this government undertook to follow the policy laid down by the members of the Transportation Commission and to declare that all our ports, at least all of the ports mentioned in the report, should be immediately made free and national?

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. RIVET. Does the hon. gentleman realize what it would cost this country?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

Mr. RIVET. I am prepared to say immediately that I am an advocate of the nationalization of our ports. I think that is the policy of the future. If we want to place these ports on the best footing possible and secure the supremacy of our national system of transportation, as soon as the resources of this country will permit, we are in duty bound to carry into practice the conclusions of the Transportation Commission. But the hon. gentleman must remember that Rome was not built in a day, that it is utterly impossible, with the best will in the world, to carry into practice every good policy which may be initiated by this government or it may be —because some good sometimes comes from the other side—by the loyal opposition of His Majesty. I say it is utterly impossible to carry into practice these conclusions all at the same time. But, we have started to do something. What about the big dredging works that are now being performed in the ports of the Georgian bay and Lake Huron? What about the dredging work that is being carried on at Halifax, St. John and other ports?

Mr. MONK. Batiscan.

Mr. RIVET. Even Batiscan. What about the River Jesus? If I am not mistaken, in the county of Jacques Cartier?

Mr. MONK. They are making islands there.

Mr. RIVET. What about the improvements which are being carried on in the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec? Does the hon. gentleman think that it is no part of the scheme outlined by the transportation commission? He referred to the testimonials of the shipping federation. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that in the course of one year the shipping federation passed resolutions in commendation of the policy carried out by the government and particularly by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the Minister of Public Works? If these testimonials mean anything they mean that in this regard the government have not been derelict in their duty and they have done what they were advised to do by the transportation commission. That is all embodied in the report of the transportation commission. The hon. gentleman says that we have not done anything to improve the port of Montreal. I readily admit that the port of Montreal should be made national and free as soon as possible, and I am pleased that the government is able to announce to the country that when the finances of Canada permit such a policy will be carried out. But, I asked: Is the government in a position to carry out such a policy? I am sure the Finance Minister will tell us that he cannot presently do so, but that at some future date, at an early date, I hope, he will be able to announce such a policy. But, is there nothing in the policy of lending money to the port of Montreal? Whenever the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal have come to Ottawa to ask for money they have been well received by the present government and by the Minister of Finance. If I am not mistaken, during the current year, some moneys will be advanced to the commission in order to enable them to carry on some improvements urgently needed in the port of Montreal. Besides, is no credit to be given to the government for the change effected three years ago in the administration of that port. If at the present time, the port is managed by three able business men acting directly under the control of this government, and doing a splendid work, it is due to the initiative taken by the government in making the change and making a judicious selection of the commissioners. We contemplate the building of the Georgian Bay canal, and the question that one might reasonably ask is where the traffic passing through that canal will eventually go? The only answer to that question, I think, is that the port of Montreal will be in a position to handle, notwithstanding what may be said by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, any traffic that may be carried by the boats passing through the Georgian Bay canal. During the last few years we have carried out a number of improvements in the port of Montreal and we contemplate some other improvements. I persist in maintaining that the position of the port of Montreal as compared with that of American ports, on the admission of American business people, is not one of inferiority, a proof of which is the fact that we are able to compete successfully with New York as far as the carriage of grain is concerned. I have spoken perhaps too long but I wanted to lay before this House some facts which are not in accord with those mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I may say that there should be no difference of opinion in this House or in the country at large as far as the principle of building the Georgian Bay canal is concerned. Now, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has put his ultimatum to the government. What are you going to do about it? Are you going to build that canal immediately? If I remember correctly, hon. members opposite are not over zealous when they come to speak about the expenditure of this country and not long ago we saw them, one after the other, standing up in this House and criticising the bulk of the expenditure, saying that an expenditure of $100,000,000 was something outrageous, was perfectly scandalous and should not be tolerated any longer by the people of this country. My hon. friend is not consistent, and he will let me tell him that consistency is not on this question a part of his policy. The hon. gentleman is ready to advocate a larger expenditure. I believe that all of us are anxious to spend more money along those lines when the finances of Canada permit to do so. But that does not justify the hon. gentleman to stand up and make the partisan speech which he has delivered this evening. In fact, I believe his is the only speech from a party standpoint which has been delivered to-day, and it is a bad example for an old member like my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to set to the younger members who, like myself, are endeavouring to approach every question from a national standpoint and to solve them in the way which the national interest demands. I venture to express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal will be begun as soon as possible by the government. As I have said this Liberal government is the only government which ever did anything towards the solution of this question, and the report of the engineers now before parliament and the country is a practical step towards the execution of that project. It is true the undertaking will involve a large expenditure, and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has ventured to express the idea that the building of a navy will be an obstacle to the building of the Georgian Bay canal.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. RIVET. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is certainly a very patriotic statesman, but if he will kindly carry his patriotism to a little broader extent he will admit that it is perfectly useless to equip ports, develop water-ways and dig canals if you do not provide the necessary protection for these national works, because in the emergency of war our national ports of Montreal, Halifax, Quebec and St. John, or any of the great channels of trade which we are constructing at such large cost would be at the mercy of any hostile fleet and would become perfectly useless. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) must admit that these two things go together, and that if Canada requires public works, it requires protection for these works.

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend in favour of the building of the Georgian Bay canal before the navy, or after?

Mr. RIVET. I am in favour of building both, and I would like to hope that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) could make the same statement. Besides, we will have an opportunity of discussing the navy in its proper place, but in the meantime I express the hope that if the Georgian Bay canal is built, instead of having Dreadnoughts coming through its locks, we will have large vessels carrying the products of the west and adding to the prosperity of the country.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I wish to make a few remarks, not with a view of speaking for the government, because as everybody seems to be of the opinion that the construction of this canal would be not alone in the interests of the Ottawa valley, but in the best interets of the whole of Canada, the question is as the Prime Minister said not long ago, one specially of finance, and it would rather be for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to speak for the government upon such a question. As to the desirability of constructing this canal at as early a date as possible, I think there are no two views entertained by members of this House; at all events no two views have been expressed by those who have spoken on the question. It seems to be agreed on all hands that at as an early a date as possible it is desirable in the interest of the country that this important undertaking should be commenced. But, what I rose to speak of was in reference to the surveys which have been made through the engineering staff of the Department of Public Works, over which I have the honour to preside. I desire to bear testimony to the very great care and very great ability which have been shown, not only in the engineering work itself, but in the preparation of the reports and the plans which have been submitted for the consideration of this House. I am sure that every one will agree that the engineers have performed their duties in the most praiseworthy manner. They have shown they are men of ability who were well qualified to undertake work of this character. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has intimated that there has been delay. Now, Mr. Speaker, I entirely repudiate that idea. In considering the question of undertaking a work of this enormous magnitude, which will involve an expenditure of at least $100,000,000, it was but the part of prudence that the government should engage the services of the very best engineers available. It was the part of prudence that the most careful examination should be made of the route, that in the first place it should be determined with the utmost care that the canal was feasible, that it would be possible to feed the locks upon the higher summit levels dividing the Ottawa river system from the French river system, and also having determined upon the feasibility of the canal system, that then the question of the cost should be got at with the very greatest possible accuracy. All this takes time, and I do not believe there has been a day wasted in the performance of the engineering work that has been entrusted to the Department of Public Works. It would have been impossible for the government to have undertaken this work before the present time, but we have now the report before us, and it will be the duty of the government, I would suppose, to give all reasonable and all fair consideration to the question as to when it would be proper that this work should be undertaken. One hon. gentleman has made the remark that he is of the opinion that this work ought to be undertaken by the government as a government work, the canal to be owned by the government, and I suppose to be free for the use of the public. Now, if I were to express my own individual opinion I would say that I think there are two sides to this question. I think there is a very great deal to be said in favour of company ownership of this canal, and that if we were to discuss the question perhaps strong arguments from the standpoint of the public might be urged in favour of company construction and company ownership as can be urged in favour of government ownership. So far as I am personally concerned, I do not wish to be understood, at this time at all events, as committing myself in favour of government ownership of the canal. One reason which has caused me very much to hold that a great deal can be said in favour of company ownership is that this canal is going to shorten enormously the distance by water between the ports on the western shores of the great lakes and the city of Montreal, and if the farmers of the

Northwest are going to derive that benefit which they ought to derive and which we hope they will derive from the construction and operation of this canal, it seems to me that it is desirable that the government should in some way have control of the tariff which is to be imposed by the owners of steamships upon the farmers of the Northwest, who would be sending their produce by vessels which pass through this canal. If there is company ownership, if the government will have as it would have, the right to control the rates which would be charged by the company, and if the government were to insist that the company which builds the canal shall also operate lines of steamers and barges between Fort William and Port Arthur and Montreal, and will control the tariff of these steamship lines and these barge lines which will be operated by the company, I think the government would be able to exercise an influence and a control in the interest of the producers of the west which it would not be possible to exercise if the canals were owned by the government, and if there was no control over the steamship lines and the barge lines which would be operating the canal system. That is one argument in favour, it seems to me, of company ownership. There is another argument in favour of company ownership, and it is that the building of this canal is going to develop an enormous amount of water-power. You will find at page XX of the report that the engineers are of the opinion:

> That with a storage system as planned, and the tributary basins thereto required for the navigation project, a reliable water-power supply is secured at various dams amounting to 1,000,000 horse-power, which can be developed for about $50 per horse-power.

If this canal were to be constructed by a company and the government were to assist the company by the guarantee of bonds or otherwise, it could be provided that the company must own and control the electric power which would be developed. The government would be able to exercise control over the company so far as the transmission and the utilization of that power would be concerned; they would be able to control the charges which the company would make for that power and that available water-power alone, one million horse-power, which would at least be worth $5 per year when it was fully utilized, would in the future more than pay all the interest charges upon the bonds which would have to be issued for the purpose of securing the construction of the canal. I think if it were built by a private company it would be possible to control and keep within the control of the company and through the company under the control of the government, this enormous water-power to such an extent as would materially lessen the tolls which would be charged in respect to the use of the canal, and as would go very far towards meeting the annual interest burden on the bonds of the company. I do not say that I have made up my mind upon this question, but I simply desire to express the view that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the government securing the building of this canal, when the work is undertaken, by means of a strong company. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) who made a most admirable speech in submitting the resolution, intimated that if the government is not prepared to at once undertake the construction of this canal as a government work it ought to allow a company to undertake the work. If there were a company prepared to undertake the work without government assistance I would heartily concur in the view presented by my hon. friend. But do not let him be deceived, do not let the country be deceived in regard to that. The papers will show that there is no proposition from any company to-day offering to construct this work without government assistance; the proposals which have been made involve assistance by the government to a very large amount. Therefore the government, when it decides the time is ripe for the undertaking of this work, so far as regards any proposals which we have before us at present, will have to decide between engaging upon this work as a government work at a very large expenditure or incurring a very large obligation in order to induce a company to undertake the work. In either case the country will be involved in a very large liability, although I do not for a single moment undertake to say that the work is not of such magnitude and importance and that the work will not mean so much for the development of the Ottawa valley and our western country as to entirely justify the government in assuming the obligations which they will be called upon to assume, large though they may be.

Would my hon. friend intimate what papers he wishes to have brought down, as this project dates back for many years and very few papers have been brought down?

Mr. G. V. WHITE. My motion calls for papers not already brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend might send me a memorandum.

Mr. MONK. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that the Minister of Finance would announce the policy of the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said if the policy of the government was to be announced it would not properly rest with me but rather with the Minister of Finance.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), has on more than one occasion expressed the view of the government in regard to this great work and I can hardly think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is serious in asking the Minister of Finance to make any new announcement of policy. I cannot claim I have given as close personal attention to the matter as my hon. friend and others who have addressed the House, but I frankly say that the project of a deep waterway from the great lakes to Montreal, an all-British, all Canadian canal, has always seemed to me to be a most attractive proposition. It is attractive, commercially, it is attractive from the point of view of military tactics and naval defence, which has been half seriously referred to. I think from every point of view the whole project is a fascinating one, and far from throwing cold water on it, it is my desire to be counted among the supporters of that great enterprise.

While the Minister of Finance is obliged sometimes to take a rather cold-blooded view of some of these fascinating projects, we have had great enterprises to handle in the past. Hon. gentlemen opposite have sometimes told us we were spending too much and straining the credit of Canada to the danger point. I am glad to know that they did not mean that very seriously, because if they felt that we had been straining our credit to the danger point in the past the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would hardly ask us to undertake a new expenditure of three hundred or four hundred millions of dollars. The fact that he is ready to speak of this two or three or four hundred million dollars so lightly is in one sense gratifying, because it enables us to know that he has an abiding faith in the credit of Canada. However, the best way to maintain one's credit is not to make too many demands upon it. We have had very great success in our enterprises that called for money in the way of loans and guarantees, &c., and I have no doubt that with the tremendous expansion of business, which we are all now so pleased to observe, this great growth of Canada, we shall be able to handle these great enterprises in the future just as we have been able to handle great enterprises in the past. At the present moment we have rather heavy burdens upon us, and I am perhaps more anxious than some hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-night to think of the financial side. And so, while I would give, on behalf of the government, my cordial sympathy and support to this movement and look forward to no distant day when it shall be seriously taken up, I say frankly I do not think it should be pressed to a decision at the present moment. It is one of the big things of Canada which we must do and do at an early date, but if we are asked to undertake it immediately, I frankly say that I do not think it is good finance, I do not think it is good politics, I do not think it is a wise project. I am sure my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. G. V. White) who has given us so much valuable information on this subject, not only to-day, but in former sessions, will appreciate the position we take when we say that, desirable as this enterprise is, grand as it is, fascinating as it is to us all from these many points of view, no harm will come if we have to go a little slowly in the matter and see that our financial position is strong before we undertake this new and heavy burden.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister has suggested that the hon. member (Mr. G. V. White) should give him a memorandum of the papers he desires. I do not see how the member can be expected to know what papers he wants. He certainly, I presume, desires to have all not already brought down. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that very few were brought down. My impression is a good many were because these papers have been moved for frequently in this House. There may be many which the hon. gentleman desires, but of which he knows nothing, because they are papers passed between the government and certain parties interested, and these I presume he desires to have.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Unless he and I disagree, everything will be brought down, but I am sure we shall be able to agree.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be much better, because I am sure the hon. member could not give a list of just what he wanted.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, February 15, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the

second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker; we are to-day resuming the debate upon one of the most important questions that the parliament of Canada has had to deal with in recent years. After forty years of national life, and after a century and a half of connection with the motherland, Canada is considering seriously what part she will play in the history of naval development. And, in deciding what Canada's position should be at this time we are naturally confronted with the problem as to whether we should do anything, or nothing. If we follow the policy of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) Canada would do nothing, Canada would stand absolutely with her hands tied, unwilling to go forward and powerless to recede. But that is not a position which a great country like ours should take. After forty years of ever widening commerce, forty years of ever increasing development, on the northern half of this continent we have reached a period in our history when we are compelled as a matter of self respect to assume those responsibilities which come to every young and growing nation. It would be just as impossible for Canada to refuse to take her position to-day in regard to naval defence, as it would be for any of our great cities to decline to provide a police force for the maintenance of peace and order within their borders. And, Sir, as we owe a duty to our country in relation to its internal affairs, so also do we owe a duty to the empire in this respect. We know that a few years ago Britain withdrew from the North Atlantic the squadron that had guarded her interests and protected her supremacy, and for four years past neither on the Atlantic nor on the Pacific coast is there to be found a naval squadron for our protection. The mother country left to Canada the duty of supplying that vacancy, and, Sir, that is the duty which we are assuming to-day when the government submitted this measure to parliament and asked parliament to adopt it.

I suppose it is hardly a matter which needs to be argued that Canada ought to do something, although the hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) rather intimated that it was not necessary that Canada should do anything at all. There may be throughout the Dominion some men who think that because we have had no trouble in the past, and because England has been a protecting mother through all the years of our natural career, it is neither necessary nor desirable that we should make expenditure on a navy. That however, is an ignoble plea in the eyes of British freemen; it is entirely out of touch with the advancement and development which Canada has achieved. Recognizing our status among the empire's nations, our government has come to parliament with a proposal to make a beginning in the direction of naval development by providing for the erection of a Canadian naval college in which our young men can be trained in those arts which fit them to become naval officers, and for the construction of 11 ships of different types in Canada—in Canada—in which will be enlisted and trained young Canadians who will be able to go forth and fight, not only the battles of this Dominion, but the battles of the empire as well, if time of stress should require it. This, Mr. Speaker, is essentially a policy of Canada for the Canadians. There was a time in the olden days when our brethern opposite arrogated to themselves the claim of being the only political party that ever propounded anything that was good for Canada. Away back in 1878, when they formulated the national policy and put on a high tariff which they said was intended to make this nation develop industrially and in every other way, when some one suggested that possibly such a policy might interfere with our connection with Great Britain, these doughty so-called loyalists at once replied: So much the worse for British connection. And, Sir, when Canada in her march onward and upward, says that after forty years of industrial life, forty years of the greatest development that any colony or dependency has ever seen, she proposes to inaugurate a shipbuilding industry: does it lie in the mouths of these gentlemen who in 1878 declared: so much the worse for British connection, to now set up a hue and cry about loyalty. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the object of this government in proposing this policy is that this navy is to be constructed in Canada, by Canadian workmen, in Canadian workshops, and that it is to be a Canadian navy primarily for the defence of Canada's interests. We have had quotations from gentlemen opposite in regard to what went on at the different imperial conferences. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who distorted and misrepresented almost every quotation he cited, forgot to tell the House what Lord Selborne said in 1902. Speaking at the conference of that year, discussing the various phases of the spirit which the colonies should display in their relations to Great Britain, he said—and I notice that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) quoted from this statement of Lord Selbourne, but failed

to inculcate the lesson which Lord Selbourne desired to teach:

The British empire owes its existence to the sea and it can only continue to exist if all parts of it regard the sea as their natural source of existence and strength. If our brethren beyond the seas will undertake a large share of naval burden, well and good. But I regard it as of even more importance that they should cultivate the maritime spirit.

That is the lesson Lord Selbourne wished to inculcate in speaking of the colonies: Give us whatever contributions you like, in whatever form you like, but go on and develop the maritime spirit and teach your young men how to navigate ships, so that in times of stress and storms, they will be of use, not only to the colonies, but to the British empire. In the olden days when wooden ship-building was in vogue, the English flag was found floating over Canadian bottoms in every sea, officered by sons of Canada, but with the decadence of wooden ships all that has disappeared; and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, coming from the maritime provinces, knows the decadence that has occurred in these provinces in maritime interest and spirit, and he knows, if no one else on the other side does, the force and aptness of Lord Selbourne's advice, that what we want in Canada above all else is to cultivate the maritime spirit. But how much of that spirit are you going to cultivate by sending $25,000,000 Canadian money to the home government? A splendid way that would be of inculcating maritime spirit in the hearts of our young men who have aspirations for a sea-faring life. We would be practically telling them: We do not want you to sail Canadian vessels, but we want to send our money to be spent in British shipyards among British workingmen and British sailors and not a dollar to be spent in Canada among Canadian workingmen and Canadian sailors. That is the policy of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

But some hon. gentleman will tell you that this business of building steel ships is one which Canada is utterly unable to deal with. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) last year, who usually has a splendid fund of information on almost every subject, said in this House:

Now, carrying out the idea first involved in naval defence for Canada, I do not see any reasons why we should not immediately institute some system of naval defence along the lines of torpedo boats, or torpedo destroyers, and destroyer cruisers, which would be invaluable to us in case of war.

My hon. friends opposite, who talk about this tin pot navy, had better go and reason with this gentleman from North Simcoe:

A great many members suggest or imply that it would be impossible for us to build these at home. Now I do not wish to be considered local in any way, I have always taken a national or Canadian view of every subject; nevertheless, I may be permitted to say that within the riding which I have the honour to represent there is a shipyard wherein they have launched ships over 500 feet in length, which is said to be the length of the 'Dreadnought.'

Then he went on to say:

Ship-building is a splendid enterpise, an enterprise that gives employment to a great number of men, and it is the greatest national enterprise that a country can have.

That, Sir, is true doctrine and that is what this government wants this country to do:

We should undertake the work of building carriers because the money that is paid to foreign carrier to convey our products from Canada to Great Britain and other countries is a large sum which we should retain in our own country.

Good doctrine; splendid doctrine! I am sorry to see so many of my hon. friends opposite dissent from it, but as the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowkes) has pointed out, they have forgotten every tradition their old chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald, taught them. Their motto no longer is: 'Canada for the Canadians,' but it is: Do not spend Canadian money in Canada but spend it in any other place by preference. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) went on to say:

As I pointed out we should immediately assume the position of establishing a local defence of our own. Our local defence should consist of torpedo boats and destroyers, and they would convoy our merchant ships, in case of war, to England and save them from the attacks of cruisers.

I think, said the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. J. A. Currie) we are all presumed to be at one on that question. Why did every one presume that? If our hon. friends opposite were not at one on that question, if they were not in accord in believing that the time had come for Canada to begin her own navy and build it at home, then all they said was empty vapour. In that case the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was a mere figment of the imagination, it was nothing but sound and fury, it had no particular significance; and as for my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who can argue just as well on the one side as on the other, of course no one holds him responsible.

Why cannot we begin in Canada to build ships? Why, Germany, which these gentlemen hold up as the great menace to British supremacy to-day, only began to build steel ships some twelve years ago. If Ger-

man can build steel ships, if she can bring her naval power to such a height in twelve years that she is able, according to these hon. gentlemen, to menace the whole of the British empire, surely in five or six years, we can fall into line and build a Canadian navy. Previous to that Germany had her ships built in England, but she afterwards set to work and began to build the navy which we are told is now threatening the supremacy of England. Thirty years ago the steel process was first introduced. In 1877 not a single ship of steel was built in England's shipyards, but in ten years, over a million tons were built, under Lloyd's survey, in the different shipyards in England. Can we not make a beginning in Canada? Are we to be told that Canadian brain and Canadian industry are not equal to those of other nations? That is what hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think. Why, the whole business of making plates suitable for the construction of steel vessels is a science which has been developed in the last thirty years. Previous to that, iron plates were used; and by the various processes since developed, a saving in the cost of building a ship by the construction of steel plates, has been effected to the extent that you can now build a ship of 3,000 to 4,000 tons burden much cheaper than you could an iron ship of the same tonnage formerly. Steel plates to-day cost one-quarter what they did in 1878. There is nothing to prevent our starting shipyards in Canada in which to build these ships. It is a confession of weakness, a lack of patriotism, an indication of want of confidence in the possibilities of this country, to pretend the contrary, and the stand taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in that connection indicates how low the Conservative party have fallen from the high position they once claimed. I hold in my hand information furnished me by a responsible authority in Nova Scotia to the effect that right in the county I have the honour to represent a vessel has been built of steel plates which is navigating all over the world to-day—a vessel of 700 or 800 tons. And to the authority to which I refer, a request came for information from a business firm in the old country, desiring to know what were our possibilities in that direction, whether machinery castings could be made in this country, and they were told that these could be procured, not only in eastern Canada, but in the west. As to hydraulic and electric fittings, Canadian workshops could supply these. As regards labour, we have in Nova Scotia alone 4,500 skilled workmen in iron and steel connected with Nova Scotia industries. All you want is skilled mechanics, carpenters and blacksmiths, who are to be found in the various industrial centres throughout the country. And if there be anything which we require to import, it can be brought here at the rate of from five to seven shillings per ton. We have, in the maritime provinces, coal illimitable in its extent, which is essential to the establishment of any industry of this kind. We can make Canadian maple, oak, and pine, and use it in the construction of our vessels, and if we want pitch pine, green heart and other products of that kind we can get them either in western Canada or in the southern states. In iron and steel we have in the Dominion Steel Company an industry which at this moment is prepared to enter on the manufacture of steel plates one hundred and twenty inches in width, which is quite sufficient, according to all statistics, for all requirements in the construction of a vessel. Then we have the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and the Sault Iron Works, which are capable of diverting their energies in the direction of providing material of this kind. There is one other material factor in the construction of war vessels. Where do England and Germany get the nickel in order to make the nickel and armour plate which is essential? There is practically only one place in the world, and that is right here in Canada. At Sudbury to-day, the works are producing Morrel metal which is being used in the construction of the United States navy, and if England, Germany, or any other country wants material of that kind in order to develop their industries, they have to come to Canada to get it, and yet these gentlemen tell us that the construction of ship-building works in Canada is an impossibility, that we ought not to undertake any of these things, that everything should be thrown aside and we should send $25,000,000 across the ocean, out of Canada and borrow it, because that is the only way in which these gentlemen can get it, when we could spend every dollar in the next ten years among Canadian workmen and for Canadian labour. But, Sir, the inauguration of the ship-building industry would mean the doing away with the necessity for bounties for ship-building which have been advocated for such a long time. The inauguration of the construction of Canadian ships would mean the development of an industry which would mean eventually the employment of Canadian men in Canadian shops; it would mean in addition to that, and above that, the cultivation and development of that naval spirit, that maritime spirit, which a navy creates the world over, and which is absolutely essential if you are going to have anything successful in the way of a navy.

Then, we want to have a naval college. I wonder if the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is opposed to a naval college? By his resolution he did not

want any Canadian navy or Canadian anything. That is his position, and yet this government are proposing to construct a naval college in his own county. I suppose he will go to Halifax and venture to tell the people there that he will oppose the construction of such a college. I wonder if he will. Why should we not have a naval college? In Canada, thirty years ago, there was inaugurated the Royal Military College at Kingston, and what splendid service it has done for this country. The young men who have gone through that college and equipped themselves in military science have done credit to Canada wherever they have served under the British flag and wherever they have fought the battles of the empire. Do you mean to tell me that the distinction that is brought to Canada by the achievements of Sir Percy Girouard, a graduate of that college, is not something of which Canada should be proud? Is it not something that Canada taught the other numerous young men who are identified with the various forces of the empire? When these people talk about Canada doing nothing for the empire, they forget the boys and young men of Canada who have died on the battle fields of India and South Africa, who have been educated by Canadian money at the Royal Military College. These are the men who have done something for the empire, and whose death gives back to these critics the answer to the complaint which they make, solely and wholly on account of their partisanship. Do you mean to tell me that the policy of these gentlemen is a correct policy? Should we have sent to Sandhurst and the military schools of the old country the boys and men who went from Canada to fight the battles of the empire, or should we have trained them, as we did, in Canada? I wonder if the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is opposed to that naval college. I would like to see him go to his constituency, I would like to see him so anxious to have a plebiscite that he would resign his seat and go to Halifax and ask the electors if they will vote for him if he is opposed to a naval college. Then we want to have dockyards in Canada, probably at Halifax. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) does not want them either, and I would like the people of Halifax to understand right here and now that their representative in this House has moved a resolution declaring that we shall not have a Canadian navy or a Canadian naval college or Canadian dockyards, and that that is the policy of that hon. gentleman.

Is the policy of this government a correct one for Canada and the empire and has it been considered and approved during the years that have gone? There is the history of events in regard to that. In 1902 Sir Wilfrid Laurier at a conference in London intimated what the policy of Canada was and let me remark that my loyal and enthusiastic friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who bubbled over with enthusiasm and patriotism the other night, as he does at all times when it suits the interests of the Tory party to do so, was present at a conference at Ottawa in 1894 and judging from the records of that conference he seemed to make a speech every day on some subject and yet my hon. friend, when his government was in power and he was the direct representative of that government at that conference, never mentioned a single word about helping the weary old Titan across the sea. Not a word said he. The matter never came up until the Liberal party came into power and it was not until Sir Wilfrid Laurier went home in 1902, and the question came before the Imperial Conference, that he intimated there in the presence of the empire that Canada was going to adopt the policy he is putting in force to-day, the policy of the establishment of a naval force in Canada. That is the policy he then announced, that is the time it was inaugurated. Have we heard nothing about it since? To hear hon. gentlemen opposite you would think no one had heard anything about that policy since 1902, until the premier spoke in the House a few weeks ago. There was a meeting of the Chambers of Commerce for the empire in Montreal in 1903. The question was discussed there, a resolution was moved, an amendment was moved, and there were certain utterances. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows Mr. George E. Drummond. We all know him pretty well. Mr. Drummond made a speech upon that occasion. Did he stand up and say that the correct policy for Canada was to send a contribution to borrow $25,000,000 upon the credit of Canada, not take it out of revenue, but borrow it, there was no other way of getting it, send it across the sea, leaving Canadian industry, Canadian maritime spirit, Canadian development, and all that, to lie quiescent? Was that the policy of that gentleman? Let my friends hear what he said:

> I am convinced, sir, that our contribution to imperial defence should be based upon the idea of relieving the central authority of all cost of defending Canada, and I hold that in undertaking this duty a magnificent opportunity will be afforded our government and people to establish in Canada the enterprise of ship-building to foster the production of armour plate (for which, with our wealth of nickel and iron, we are equipped by nature in a very exceptional way, to encourage, for instance, among other new industries the production of acetone (base for cordite) which we can, on account of our forest wealth, produce probably more cheaply at our Canadian charcoal by-products plants than

it can be produced anywhere else in the civilized world.

In establishing and developing such enterprises we will at the same time be making Canada, in the matter of appliances and ammunitions of war, a base of supplies on this North American continent, which in time of war on either the Atlantic or Pacific would be of incalculable value to the whole empire.

These are the words of Mr. Drummond, who, if I mistake not, is an enthusiastic supporter of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) speaking in Montreal in the Chambers of Commerce of the empire, in 1903. And he quoted in support of his views Sir John C. R. Colomb, the distinguished naval authority. Well, Sir John C. R. Colomb, on the occasion to which I refer, said:

The truth is our present policy of centralizing the manufacture and supply of appliances and munitions of war to meet not merely naval but military requirements of a world state, is wholly indefensible and fraught with peril.

And what was the resolution adopted? Some of the gentlemen there desired to pass a resolution in favour of contribution, but the collective wisdom of the business world of the empire discarded the contribution theory, and all concurred in the following, which was moved by Col. Denison of Toronto and seconded by Mr. Masson of Montreal—both, I believe, political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite:

The word 'contribute' was struck out.

That this Congress hereby affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the empire—but the colonies claim the privilege of keeping their own initiative as to the nature and help which they agree to offer.

That was the policy agreed upon by the Chambers of Commerce of the empire in 1903. Is not that a proper and sound policy?

What was the next step? In 1907, the conference took place. Now, one would think to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk that the official wisdom of the admiralty was all directed in the line of telling Canada: If you do not send a contribution, do not send anything. What is the good, they ask, of providing a 'tin-pot navy'?—money is what we must send—tribute. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) revolts at the tribute idea, but what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) wants to give is tribute. And that is what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wants to give—tribute. But that does not appear to be the policy of the British naval authorities. This is what Lord Tweedmouth said in 1907:

He states that he did not desire to press for further contributions of men or money but cordially welcomed the co-operation of the colonies in the form most agreeable to themselves.

To-day, when my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) quibbles and twists and worries his soul in order to try to get himself into an attitude of opposition to the government measure, he tries to convey the impression that the policy of the government is not in accordance with the resolutions of 1907. And the last word of Lord Tweedmouth on the subject was as follows:

It was entirely a matter for the colonies how far they would assist by subsidy and how far by local defence, and that what His Majesty's government desired was the cordial help of the colonies in the most effective manner and in the form most acceptable to the several dominions beyond the seas.

There is no intimation there that a contribution of money was the only thing the British government wanted or that the people of Great Britain thought the colonies ought to give. On the contrary, the colonies were left absolutely free to do as they pleased, having regard to their different conditions.

My hon. friend, last year, in an eloquent speech cordially supported the resolution which was, let me say, the mandate which my hon. friends the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) took with them when they went to England. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) talked the other night about these representatives of ours refusing to offer a fleet unit in the Pacific and about their failing to do this, that and the other. But these representatives of Canada were there with strict instructions—absolute, fast instructions. The first instruction which they had to convey to the home authorities was one given by my hon. friends opposite—that the first thing they should argue for and the last thing they should say was that Canada was going to provide her own navy and that Canada would not give contributions because they were bad things. It was the unanimous resolution of this House that Canada should provide her own navy. What, then, could these gentlemen do? They could simply ask the imperial authorities to indicate how best a Canadian navy could be provided that would work in sympathy with the imperial authorities.

There have been occasions when a charge of lack of consistency would necessarily have very little force. For instance, in the old days, in regard to Gladstone, who entered parliament as a Conservative and came to the end of his journey as probably one of the greatest Radicals of his time, a charge of inconsistency would have been out of place. But when a public man performs somersaults of opinion; when a public man who is supposed to have a sense of responsibility deliberately stands before

parliament and before his country and declares a certain policy to be the wise policy, when he keeps on reiterating the same opinion on every possible occasion on which he appears in public, either in this country or in England, and sticks to the same story when he first comes back at the opening of parliament,—and then suddenly changes, the charge of inconsistency becomes a serious one, and that public man must show some good cause if he is not to be condemned as guilty. What did the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) say last session?

I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own.

That was last year. This year he moved a resolution which declares that he does not want a Canadian navy:

It was pointed out in discussing this question that Australia in providing a force of that kind would provide a force which it would be difficult, if not impossible, for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that in thus protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the empire. So I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also, that I think that an——

And let us mark what he said.

—that I think that the expenditure of money designed for that purpose ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own parliament, and that by making an appropriation of that kind and attending to the defence of our own coasts, by co-operation and co-ordination with the imperial naval forces, we would be rendering a real service in the defence of the empire, and we would be doing our duty not only to Canada but to the empire as a whole.

These are splendid sentiments. Did he mean them? I would like to know whether he meant them or not. Was he trying to fool his own party and the people of Canada when he uttered these words? Why did he take that position declaring that he was in favour of a Canadian navy, first, last and all the time? Later on, in the same speech he said:

I do not desire to say anything more on this subject. I believe that the defence of our own shores and the protection of our own commerce is due to the self-respect which should fill the heart of every man in this country——

I ask my hon. friends on the other side who have any Canadian ambition, who are proud of the fact that they are Canadians —can these words of their leader fall without response upon their ears?——

—that the defence of our own shores and the protection of our own commerce is due to the self-respect which would fill the heart of every man in this country. You say that we may rest contented to depend for our naval defence on Great Britain. Well, if we have assumed the status of a nation in one respect, shall we adhere to the status of a Crown colony in other and still more important respects?

I wondered, when my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was talking of the 'rag baby of autonomy' the other night, what he thought of the expression of his leader that this country might be reduced to the status of a Crown colony. And the fact that we failed to undertake these duties in regard to naval development and merely give a contribution would mean that Canada would sink to the status of a Crown colony. Yet that policy to-day is the policy of my hon friend, the policy that Canada should be demeaned, that Canada should sink away below the other colonies of the empire from the premier position which she now occupies, away back to the standard of a Crown colony. Well, my hon. friend went down to Halifax to his own constituents, and told them that he was in favour of a Canadian navy, and his newspaper in Halifax reports him as follows:

Mr. Borden lifts the question of national defence above petty partisanship.

Wasn't it splendid?—lifting the question above petty partisanship. Well, if that phrase means anything, it only means that my hon. friend at the present time has got it down to the level of party politics. I think, and I desire to say this again, if my hon. friend is a stickler for constitutional usage he ought to resign his seat and go back to his constituents and tell them that he has changed his mind, that what he regarded, when he was in England, as the worst form for Canada, he now regards as all right; after making such a volte-face as he has done on this question, going down to his constituents and telling them that he was for a Canadian navy, and six months afterwards discarding the whole thing and saying: We don't want a navy, we want to send $25,000,000 to England, and borrow the money to do it. This is what he said last summer:

The House of Commons last session laid down a certain policy touching naval defence in which both political parties united. It may not have suited the aspirations of all Conservatives.

So, then there were some gentlemen on the other side last year who did not want a Canadian navy, These gentlemen were not powerful enough to throttle him last year, but they have become powerful enough in the meantime to drown the voice with which he spoke last year.

But it seemed our bounden duty to place, if possible, above the limits of partisan strife, a question so vital and far reaching, and to attain the standard which has for many years

governed both political parties of Great Britain with respect to foreign relations.

That is a splendid sentence.

How the present administration will work it out, the policy which was outlined by the resolution to which I have alluded, remains to be seen. One governing principle at least should control, namely, that out of our own materials, by our own labour, and by the instructed skill of our own people any necessary provision for our naval defence should be made so far as may be reasonably possible.

Then he went on to flatter the aspirations of his constituents.

In this connection may we not hope that there shall be given a stimulus and encouragement to the ship-building industry of Canada which has long been lacking.

Then this friendly newspaper says:

To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity.

Carried away by the enthusiasm of my hon. friend, and by the prospect of a navy of which Halifax is to be the centre. Then this enthusiastic paper says that my hon. friend went on to tell them:

To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity in that regard.

My hon. friend now does not propose to let Nova Scotia have an opportunity, he proposes to remove any chance whatever of Nova Scotia building ships.

Providence has endowed this province with the material——

My hon. friends opposite, who do not think that we can build ships in Canada, see what your leader tells you:

With the men and with the maritime situation which are essential not only for developing a scheme of naval defence and protection but also for the resuscitation of that shipbuilding industry which once made Nova Scotia famous throughout the world.

Splendid words, were they not? I leave it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is not the bounden duty of the leader of the opposition to go back to his constituents and tell them that he has turned his back on the whole thing, that Nova Scotia's opportunity has passed away, that he will not do anything to retain it, that they shall never build ships in Nova Scotia, if he can prevent them from doing it. My hon. friend kept the faith until January 12 of this year, when he said:

Canada could not be a hermit nation. Canadian interests will exist and must be protected not only upon the high seas, but in every quarter of the globe. The great empire of China attempted to isolate herself from the rest of the world and did so with some measure of success, but the result was not encouraging. To conceive that Canada could play any such part in these days of steam and electricity, when the oceans of the world have ceased to be an impassable barrier and have become magnificent highways, is but an idle dream.

Then my hon. friend does not want any permanent co-operation. If Canada can only be defended by the use of her own material, then my hon. friend's policy is not a policy of permanent co-operation. He goes on to say:

By the use of our own material, the employment of our own people, the development and utilization of our own skill and resourcefulness, and above all by impressing upon the people a sense of responsibility for their share in international affairs. I regard the resolution of March last as the most important step towards co-operation that has been made in this country for 25 years.

That is the view of my hon. friend in January, and he stuck to that view in a half-hearted way down to February 3, when he began to try to escape from his position, when the thumb screw, and the rack, and the composing room the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told us about, got in their fell work; and the people of Canada were treated to the humiliating spectacle of a leader of a great party absolutely going back on every principle he had laid before them inside of a year. But even then he hung on, to some extent, to the old faith when he said on February 3:

As far as I am concerned, while the system of annual contributions might be best, and, no doubt, would be best from the purely strategical standpoint, I firmly believe that no such system could be adopted, but that eventually and permanently the basis upon which Canada must contribute to the defence of the empire will be by employing our own material, our own men, our own resources and the skill of our own people.

Well, now, when we have been able to call a witness like my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and get such strong testimony from him, you would think it was scarcely necessary to go on and amplify our case. If we were trying this matter before a jury the testimony of the leader of the opposition would be sufficient in the minds of any reasonable men to convince them that the proper thing for this country to do was to start out with the construction of a Canadian navy, the employment of our own men and material, to build the ships in Canadian shipyards, and thereby we would be giving the best assistance to the empire. Don't you think that would be right? Well, I have ample testimony here upon the subject. It is not often that counsel in arguing a case is able to go to the ranks of the opposing counsel and to their witnesses and to prove every step of his case out of the mouths of the men who are opposing him. Yet that is the position in which the government finds itself

to-day before the jury of the people of this country. Every step in advance they have taken upon this matter has received the full endorsation of every man on the other side of the House who is supposed to have anything to do with directing the policy of the party. Now, I am going to call a witness who is not so reputable, whose judgment upon questions of this sort does not inspire the same confidence as does the judgment of my hon. friend; still he is witness, he belongs to the enemy's camp, I refer to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). This gentleman says, not upon his oath, but upon his honour as a public man in parliament:

So far I have been dealing with the stated normal policy that I think Canada ought to adopt.

Mark you, 'Canada ought to adopt.'

General lines of defence by a coast line and harbour defence of small vessels——

That is the tin pot navy the hon. gentleman sneers at.

—at first we would make the attack of the rambling, raiding cruiser a doubtful and dangerous one, and which would ward off the first brunt until more sufficient aid could be brought if the force were a menacing one.

Then my hon. friend went on and said:

It is said also that there are physical and mechanical difficulties to be overcome. I have mentioned these—they can be overcome. Time and the application of a reasonable amount of resource will overcome those difficulties and place us where we have had to place ourselves with reference to every other great line of development; we must begin at the beginning and work up gradually until we gain the skill, the plant, the machinery and the power to make for ourselves what at first it was physically impossible for us to make.

That is pretty good testimony to start with. Then my hon. friend grew more eloquent. My hon. friend went on to say that he did not believe in the policy of a country hiring some one else to do these things for it, any more than be believed in a thoroughly good healthy man hiring some one else to look after his family. Then the hon. gentleman came to another consideration and he said:

Then would come the dockyards, which would be of sufficient size to enable us to repair the smaller vessels, and in time build the smaller vessels that we need at first, to be implemented by co-operation between Canada and Great Britain in the shape of a dockyard sufficient to dock any lame vessel of the British navy that might happen to limp to our coast and require refitting and repairs. And so, in that progressive, gradual way working up to the fulfilment of this idea, a defensive force in Canada which would be an auxiliary in the case of an outbreak of actual hostilities, which would be sufficient for the ordinary suveillance of our coasts, and which would be, in time of war, sufficient to work in conjunction with the main portion of the fleet that would be sent to the part of our country that was menaced.

Hon. gentleman opposite are trying to run away from the splendid policy with which they had become impregnated, and even in the harangue we had last Thursday, my hon. friend, in trying to save his face, dropped this remark which was probably his true sentiment with regard to the matter:

Having seaports on the Pacific and seaports on the Atlantic at the present time, entirely at the mercy of the smallest armed gunboat of a hostile power, we thought that was an unworthy position, an unsafe position, and that what Canada ought to do was her own proper work, and make some provision, some adequate provision, for the defence of her seaports and her exposed harbours and coasts.

Will the proposition to borrow $25,000,000 and send it across the ocean to be spent by the British admiralty, without restriction or condition that they should ever spend a dollar in or for Canada, meet the aspiration which this hon. gentleman set forth there? But, witnesses are prolific they are numerous, they are to be had from every quarter, and we have only to go to a former leader of the Conservative party, to the grand old chieftain whom these gentlemen were proud to follow, next after Sir John Macdonald himself, to the man who led them in 1896 and 1900. He has told his successor what he should do and he has told the people of Canada on more than one occasion what their duty was and where their interest lay in dealing with this question. Now, Mr. Speaker, of course, the hon. member for North Toronto told us that it was only lately that the Liberal party had gone to Sir Charles Tupper for an authority. I have noticed that my hon. friends on the other side have not been going to Sir Charles Tupper of late for very much inspiration. It hardly lies in the mouth of the hon. member for North Toronto to talk about our interest in Sir Charles Tupper. I think there are a good many gentlemen on the other side of the House who have lost interest in that gentleman, and I am afraid from all I hear, that Sir Charles Tupper has lost interest in a good many of them. If that is so then we start fair. Sir Charles Tupper, who has retired from political life, after the longest experience of any public man in this country, writes to his successor this admonition:

I am glad to learn that you have resolved to maintain the patriotic attitude that the Conservative party assumed last session.

There is a ring of the old man about those words.

A few years ago, when Canada was struggling to open up for British settlement the

great granary of the world, a few gentlemen here raised the question of a Canadian contribution to the imperial navy, I joined issue with them and was sustained by the press and public opinion.

Thus he joins issue with the proposition which my hon. friend is now making, and the old man says that he was sustained by the press and public opinion, that my hon. friend was wrong and that he was right.

The demand will soon be made by some that Canada should contribute to the imperial navy in proportion to population, I regard as preposterous and dangerous. I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons which pledged parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of the Canadian navy and to support England in every emergency. . . . I cannot understand the demand for Dreadnoughts in the face of the fact that the admiralty and the British government have determined that it was not the best mode of maintaining the security of the empire, and arranged with Canada and Australia (the latter of whom had offered one or two Dreadnoughts) for the construction of local navies to keep open the trade routes in case of war.

But with an interest in the Conservative party, whose leader he had been and which, in his time, he had adorned with his splendid abilities, he gives it this warning:

I cannot avoid thinking that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question.

Yet, the hon. leader of the opposition, flouts his predecessor. He cares not for the experience of this man of Dominion fame, yes of imperial fame, and who comes from the same province as the hon. leader of the opposition and myself. My hon. friend knows that Sir Charles Tupper, during all his long life, has taken the position which he reiterated in that letter and which has been his attitude all along. If we were to believe my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the sentiments expressed by Sir Charles Tupper were the sentiments shared by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier. Yet, my hon. friend, under the pressure of the composing room, the rack and the thumb screw, about which the hon. member for North Toronto knows so much, climbs down, departs from the traditions of his party, and turns right away from its policy and the position which he has taken from the very time when responsibility began. Now, this is part of the case. I do not want to exhaust all the material. My hon. friends who will speak upon this subject can summon witnesses, numerous and influential, and I think also witnesses of character whose judgment will carry weight. My hon. friends joined in the resolution. They told the delegates that went over to England last year that they must take the position that Canada must build her own navy; and secondly, above everything, do not give them a contribution. That has been reiterated everywhere—do not give them a contribution, but let us work out a plan in co-operation with the imperial authorities, and let us build a Canadian navy that will stand for Canada in time of peace and stand by Canada and the empire in time of war. That was the policy which they asked for, that is the policy which has been developed, and that is the policy which the premier of this country asks the people and the members of this House to ratify here to-day. Now, some of our hon. friends say: Oh, this is a tinpot navy, and that kind of thing is something that Canada does not want. She wants Dreadnoughts. They talk about Lord Charles Beresford. Every one knows how certain gentlemen in Canada tried to dragoon Lord Charles Beresford into making some statement last fall in support of this innocent policy of theirs, but they could not succeed. He would not do it. What is the history of Lord Charles Beresford? For the last five years he has been contending against Sir John Fisher on this very question of Dreadnoughts as against cruisers, and holding that smaller vessels necessary for coast defence and to protect commerce were more important than were large vessels of war. Let me read an extract from the Portsmouth 'Evening News,' where Lord Charles Beresford recently ran an election:

The 'News' learns from a trustworthy source that provision will be made in the navy estimates for four battleships, two armoured cruisers, eight small cruisers, twenty-four destroyers, and ten submarines. The shipbuilding programme will be a further admission of the accuracy of Lord Charles Beresford's contention that more small cruisers and destroyers are needed.

The policy of Lord Charles Beresford has been and is to-day—and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot conceal the fact—in favour of the theory that the trade routes of this country and the trade routes of the empire should be protected by the smaller cruisers, and that has been the cause of the bitter quarrel between him and Sir John Fisher. I could quote also the opinion of Sir Wm. White, but that has been referred to by the Minister of Militia. Now, I want to call attention to a statement of the various schemes for the commonwealth of Australian naval defence from 1902 to the present time, and this statement which I have before me shows that not until 1909, when the proposition of building an armoured cruiser—not a Dreadnought, mind you, the people of Australia are not giving a Dreadnought, they are putting an ar-

moured cruiser at the head of their fleet—not until 1909 was there a single proposition in Australia to build a vessel larger than 3,000 tons. But, in the Canadian naval programme we have one vessel of 4,300 tons, one vessel larger, and destroyers of the improved river type, which are all along the line of the sound and wise judgment of the men both inside and outside the admiralty whose opinion is worth having on this matter. That is our policy, Mr. Speaker, and I do not need to amplify it at greater length.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to understand the hon. gentleman; does he say that the Australian fleet unit does not include any vessel larger than 3,000 tons?

Mr. MACDONALD. With the exception of the one vessel included in the Australian programme of this year. In all the naval programme of Australia, from 1902 down to that date, not a single one of these programmes included a vessel over that tonnage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the programme of 1909.

Mr. MACDONALD. The armoured cruiser of this year exceeds that tonnage, but in the various other programmes not one of the vessels exceeded 3,000 tons.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That armoured cruiser is of the Dreadnought type?

Mr. MACDONALD. I do not know about that. The Hon. Mr. Fisher, of Australia, who ought to know took issue on that question, and he declared it was not of the Dreadnought type, and his judgment ought to be worth more than that of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not know what took place in Australia; I am referring to the paper which has been brought down to us and laid on the table of the House.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Fisher, of Australia, took the position that the programme has been changed and that instead of a Dreadnought it was an armoured cruiser.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know anything about any change having taken place in Australia, and my hon. friend may be right about that, but the paper laid on the table of the House certainly does refer to an armoured cruiser of that type.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am speaking of the programme laid before the Australian parliament by the Hon. Mr. Fisher in October last, and he starts out with one armoured cruiser of the Indomitable class.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the exact date in October?

Mr. MACDONALD. I have not got the date at hand, but I will endeavour to get it for my hon. friend. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured, probably at too great length, to outline what our policy is, and why we have adopted that policy. I believe, Sir, that all parties in this country will agree that our policy is a wise one. As I have shown, that policy has the approbation of the admiralty. I believe that Canada is acting wisely in to-day laying the foundation of a greater navy, making the beginning of a navy which will grow with our growth and expand with our development. I believe, Sir, that is the wise and sensible course for Canada to take, and I am confident it will be vindicated by the people of this country.

But, let us see where our friends opposite are on this question. We have no less than three or four policies from the opposition. The leader of the opposition starts out by saying: No Canadian navy; in the dire necessity of Great Britain, at the present time we will give her $25,000,000 to do what she pleases with it. It is not to build Dreadnoughts mind you, because the word Dreadnought was introduced into that resolution simply and solely for the purpose of misleading the people, and helping out the men who wanted to take the stump in the back concession lines, to talk about Dreadnoughts. It was a good sounding phrase! And so they put it in the amendment. What the hon. leader of the opposition says is: Give England $25,000,000 because there is a tremendous naval necessity at the present day, give them a cash contribution and dont bother about a Canadian navy. And, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says: Wipe out this Canadian navy business, we dont want it. I dont care whether there is necessity or not, I dont care whether the weary Titan is groaning under the burden or not, give them $25,000,000, I dont care where you are going to get it, I dont care whether you have to borrow the money or not, find it somewhere and send it over. Then my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has another policy, and I am sorry he is not in his seat now because there are one or two things I would like to say to him. His policy is to do nothing at all; his policy is a policy of attempting to set in flame the embers of discord in this country. Imagine the hon. member from Jacques Cartier undertaking to appeal to the spirit of the men of 1837. A lot he knows about the men of '37. Why, he belongs to a class who spoke of the men who fought at that date for responsible government as the smooth faced, insidious instigators of the doctrine of rebellion. That is the school from which my hon.

friend from Jacques Cartier comes, and together with the new light of the Conservative party, Mr. Bourassa, in the province of Quebec, they are playing the game of the leader of the opposition down there. That is his policy. Does he want a plebiscite? Not a bit of it. Any one who reads the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) will see there is no connection at all between the words he uttered and the demand in his resolution for a plebiscite; there is no logical connection between the two at all. Plebiscite indeed? Why, the game that the member for Jacques Cartier is playing is the old game the Conservative party has been playing ever since Canada has been ruled by the Liberal party led by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They have been telling the people of Quebec that he was too English for the French, and in the English provinces they have been saying: Surely you are not going to have a Frenchman rule over you? I have read the amendment of the leader of the opposition with the greatest possible care. It is drawn with a great deal of astuteness. In our province of Nova Scotia the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has always been recognized as a very shrewd lawyer, and he will pardon me for saying that that resolution was drafted as some counsel would draft the defence in a bad case, in which counsel did not know exactly how to answer the complaint. The hon. gentleman always had the reputation of being an astute lawyer, and when the opposition wanted to declare their policy they committed to his hands the task of quibbling, and drawing up this defence for their bad case. Why, what does the hon. gentleman say? He says that what worries his soul is section 17 and section 18 of the Naval Bill, which sections say: That the Governor in Council may place the navy on active service when it appears there is an emergency, and that in case of emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy, the naval service and so on. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) regards that as very dangerous. And it is because of these clauses in the Bill that the hon. gentleman rushes off and says: I wont have anything to do with the Canadian navy at all, give them a contribution. Now, one would think that the government had undertaken something very revolutionary and something that was never heard of before.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, oh, that smacks of independence. Well, what is the condition of affairs in that regard? Of course, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) regards those sections as most terrible—but from another standpoint. They tie us he says, to the empire in an irrevocable way—taxation without representation and all this kind of thing. The King's prerogative, he told us, will enable His Majesty to decare war at any time without the consent of parliament and Canada would be tied hand and foot. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition was also worried. But what need is there for any anxiety on his part? Look at Todd and see what is done when a question of war comes up. On page 351 of his work I find it laid down:

> The previous consent of parliament, either to the commencement of a war or the conclusion of a peace, is not formally required by the constitution. The necessity of obtaining adequate supplies for the prosecution of a contest with any foreign power, and the control possessed by parliament over the army and navy by means of the annual Mutiny Acts, coupled with the existence of ministerial responsibility, constitute a sufficiently powerful check against the improper use of the prerogative. Nevertheless if the hostilities about to be entered into are likely to involve serious consequences, it would be the duty of the ministers before engaging therein to summon parliament to communicate to it the reason for resorting to arms and to ask for its advice and co-operation in carrying on the war.

That is what has to be done in England in the case of a war of any serious character, and in this Bill provision is made that before the Canadian forces may engage in war, the Canadian parliament must be called together just as the English parliament is in the old country. Yet my hon. friend's soul is worried and he is shocked tremendously Is this anything new? Why it has been in the Militia Act for years. How can a navy run without money and how can the navy get money without the government comes to parliament and asks for it? Is it a new departure taken only by Canada? My hon. friend should know that Australia has had it embodied in its Defence Act since 1903. Let me read the Defence Act of Australia of 1903 regarding the disposition of Australian forces in case of war, and there is no country which the hon. gentleman has held up to us as so signal an example of everything loyal, patriotic and splendid. Section 53 of the Australian Defence Act is as follows:

> Section 53. In time of war the Governor General may subject to the provisions of this Act, place the defence force or any part thereof under the orders of the commander of any portion of the King's regular forces or the King's regular naval force as the case may be.
>
> Section 54. The Governor General may in time of war—for the defence and protection of the Commonwealth and of the several states thereof—place the naval forces or any part thereof on board any ship of the King's navy on the Australian station, and during the time they are so placed they shall be under the command of the officer commanding the ship upon which they are placed and be subject to

all laws and regulations to which the King's naval forces are subject.

Almost the same words as are in our Act. My hon. friend knows that in the province of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa is going up and down declaring that 'may' means 'shall,' and that the moment there is any war, automatically our forces are at the disposition of the mother country. And he quotes my hon. friend's opinion upon the construction of a statute in another case to show that 'may' means 'shall,' and in order to convince the people, whose passions he is endeavouring to inflame against this government's proposal, Mr. Bourassa quotes my hon. friend as a lawyer, to that effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the case he quotes?

Mr. MACDONALD. I cannot give the exact case, but I would advise my hon. friend, least Mr. Bourassa may be using his name improperly, to find out what he is saying and contradict him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the reason I am asking for information now.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend can ask his friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and he will tell him all about it. Let us see where Australia stands on this question. Look at what Mr. Fisher, formerly premier of Australia, said in the Australian parliament last autumn. In discussing this navy question last October he said, regarding the position which Australia should occupy:

The late government while declining to have anything to do with the Dreadnought proposal, took occasion to communicate to the imperial authorities their view regarding Australia's connection with the empire, and stated what they were prepared to recommend the Commonwealth parliament to do. So far from refusing to take part in the protection of the best interests of the empire, we said that, whilst our policy was designed primarily and almost wholly for the protection of the shores of Australia, yet in time of war or national energency, not only should we risk the promise of a Dreadnought, but would offer the mother country the whole of the resources of Australia to support her. That is the real position that we took up, and it is the view that I hold to-day.

That is practically the position of this government, and it is the view I hold:

In moving the second reading of this Bill, the Minister of Defence did not make quite clear his view as to the extent to which the imperial authorities by reason of their contribution of £250,000 per annum towards the upkeep of the Australian navy, will have any real control over it while it is in these waters or when it goes beyond them. That is a delicate question. There must be a link between the imperial and the commonwealth authority. The last government had a definite idea upon the subject and we put it into writing. We held that the sole control of the fleet must be with the Commonwealth. I can speak more freely on this question because I have never favoured the view that the fleet should not fight outside Australian waters. But there should be a clear and definite understanding. I wish to know whether the contribution of £250,000 provides for Commonwealth control?

Mr. Joseph Cook,—I can make that clear later.

Mr. Fisher,—There may be emergencies and the telegram read by the minister to Admiral Kingsmill shows that Australia made her postion clear and that it is exactly the same as Canada has taken which will require our ships to fight elsewhere but generally speaking they should not be taken to remote seas without the express authority of the commonwealth. The strength of the empire will depend upon the ability——

And this is a pregnant remark for my hon. friend to remember—

—of the five self-governing nations which compose it to provide for their own defence.

That is the kernel of the whole question. The Australian statesmen gave at once the crux of the whole problem. The strength of the British empire, he said, will depend in the future upon the ability of the five self-governing nations which compose it, to provide for their own defence. If they can do that, the empire would be better protected than by the assembling of a fleet at any one point. Then he says:

The opposition will not make this a party measure, our desire being to promote the defence of the country with a view to the protection of the best interests of the empire and the securing of the continued peace of the world.

A splendid example, which I commend to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. It is in strong contrast to the attitude he has taken in leading up his dividing forces with one wing in the province of Quebec making a flank attack on the government, and he himself leading another line of attack entirely inconsistent with the position he took a year ago. My hon. friend should have revised his utterances. He should have been a little more careful before submitting his resolution. On January 12 he said we need not worry about wars in Canada, that the empire would never go to war again without consulting Canada first. He said:

It has been urged, and with some force, that we in Canada cannot properly take a permanent part in the naval defence of the whole empire unless we are to have some voice as to the wars in which Great Britain may engage. Let me say in the first place, that I do not believe Great Britain will in the future engage in any great war—except indeed it may be a war forced upon her without a moment's notice—before consulting the great dominions of the empire.

But if Great Britain is going to consult the dominions of the empire, and if the dominions require to be consulted before there is going to be war, what fault can my hon. friend find with this clause in the Navy Act which simply anticipates consultation and conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend went on to say—I want to emphasize that point:

And, Sir, I venture to believe that in the future the self-governing nations of the empire will have something to say about the wars of the empire.

But how is Canada to have a word to say about the wars of the empire unless she reserves the right to say it as she does in this Navy Bill? Then my hon. friend proceeds:

It is not wise to prophesy what the future may bring forth, but I would venture to hope that a defence committee or an imperial conference having special jurisdiction over defence matters, composed of men from both parties in Great Britain itself as well as in the self-governing nations of the empire, would have some control over the organization of imperial defence, and as an outcome of such a committee or such a conference I would expect that in future Great Britain would engage in no great war without knowing beforehand that she would have the support and the sympathy of every one of the great self-governing nations of the empire. This would give to these dominions a voice in the control of war, because I thoroughly agree that if we are to take part in the permanent defence of this great empire we must have some control and some voice in such matters.

How in the name of common sense can my hon. friend seriously complain about these sections in the Naval Act when he declared and reiterated that there would be no quarrels of the empire in the future unless Canada was consulted, and how would Canada be consulted, except by some such provision as is contained in this Act? I think we can very fairly leave my hon. friend in the fond hope that when he examines the precedents in England, when he looks over the conditions of affairs in Australia and reviews his own utterances, he can feel confident that no harm can come through Canada reserving to herself the very right which he says she ought to reserve. He criticised the Naval Bill on the ground that men would only be trained three years. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) punctured that by pointing out that he had misread the provision of the Act, that the Act laid down methods by which men would be trained for six years. Then my hon. friend with these misgivings rushed impetuously, and with utter disregard of everything he had said before on this question, to the extreme limit of the objectionable position which he had before said should not be taken. Give them $25,000,000—nothing for the defence of Canada, do not hamper these people with any conditions, do not say that the Dreadnoughts when built or the money when expended, is to come to Canada to be used in defence. As the Minister of Militia points out it need not be Dreadnoughts at all. The leader of the opposition simply says: Here is $25,000,000, do what you like with it, do not care anything about Canada, do not provide for local defence, do anything you like but take it, take it, without any condition, without any restriction, Canada's interests being utterly disregarded in every way and without a single step forward being taken in the direction of Canadian defence or in any way in which Canada's interests would be advanced. If that is the way in which Canada is to maintain herself in the empire, it is a very miserable way. What would our friends have thought if in 1900, instead of sending the boys to South Africa, we had said: Here, take $10,000,000, we do not care anything about the empire, we do not want to fight for it, we do not want to share in its future or its defence or its glories, or anything of that kind; here is the money, take it. A splendid answer to my hon. friend was afforded in the letter from Captain Stairs, of Halifax, which I read the other day, in which he spoke of the importance of giving to the empire that real service which could only be rendered by the sympathy and influence of men all over the country who, whether on sea or land, will have that interest in the welfare of the empire, which would lead to its preservation and its extension.

I need not detain the House to place on record the statements of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) about contributions. I shall read only one of them. On January 12, of this very year, hardly a month ago, the hon. gentleman made this statement:

It has been suggested that instead of the organization of a Canadian naval force, there should be a system of annual contributions from this country to the mother country; and I am free to admit that, from the strategical point of view, that I would be inclined to agree with the view of the admiralty that that would be the best way for the great self-governing dominions of the empire to make their contributions.

And mark this:

But, sir, from a constitutional and political standpoint, I am opposed to it, for many reasons. In the first place, I do not believe that it would endure. In the second place, it would be a source of friction. It would become a bone of partisan contention. It would be subject to criticism.

Of course it would be:

As to the character and the amount of the contribution in both parliaments. It would not be permanent or continuous.

But last of all—and I want you gentlemen who sit behind you leader to follow this—this is what he said on January 12, as to the effect of a contribution:

It would conduce to severing the present connection between Canada and the empire.

Of course, my hon. friend may have been simply talking without any deliberation, without any responsibility. I assume the leader of the opposition has the right to talk without responsibility sometimes. I do not know whether he was here talking to his Quebec wing when he proposed to give a contribution with the idea that it is going to tend to sever our connection with the empire; perhaps it was to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who said just before concluding his speech that there was something in the resolution of the leader of the opposition with which he agreed, perhaps it was that part of it.

Mr. MONK. I would ask my hon. friend where he finds in any utterance of mine or of anybody on this side of the House a desire or an intent to sever the connection with the British empire? Where does he find it, and if he does not find it anywhere, what right has he to insinuate here?

Mr. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend will possess his soul in patience I will give him evidence in a few minutes as to statements made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) which will satisfy him that the hon. member for North Toronto regards him as a gentleman who would like to do that. I do not propose to call the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as a witness on the question of contribution, I do not have to; I think the leader of the opposition has proved my case. But as we hear a great deal about Australia, about the virtue of contribution and all that, let me call attention to what Mr. Deakin, the premier of Australia, says about contribution. Speaking at Melbourne in 1902, he said:

The policy of centralization restricted the colonies to contributions in coin while the policy of decentralization would substitute trained men and basis of supply with place of subsidies. Australia strongly favoured the decentralization advocated by Sir Edward Barton as contrasted with the centralization sought by the proposals of Mr. Broderick and the admiralty which in no way appealed to the patriotic sentiment and self-reliant spirit of Australians. No colonial force under war office control could have furnished such effective soldiers for South Africa as the volunteer contingents had furnished to show loyalty to the empire, let us send money; the Liberal party says: Let us train up men interested in the defence of Canada who will stand by Canada and the empire both in peace and war.

But what does the Sydney 'Bulletin,' that influentical Australian paper say:

From what ever point of view—imperial or anti-imperial—the scheme is considered, its only logical defence lies in the theory that Australia is a poor, forsaken country.

They are speaking of the Australian agreement of 1902.

Without administrative brains, courage, enterprise or intelligence, not fit to have any dignified part in its own naval defence, not to be trusted with any weapons lest it should misuse them, worthy only to drudge for the money which a higher and more capable power shall spend.

All of which is true about my hon. friend's position to-day.

And to provide the loblolly boys the slushes, and the deck swabbers, whose efforts a higher power shall direct and control.

A splendid policy for young Canadians, is it not?

The alternative to the naval tribute, proposed by Mr. Barton, is the expenditure of a like sum of money, or if necessary a much larger sum of money, on an Australian navy, which would be organized on the same lines as the Australian army, and would probably be, for some time at least, commanded by a British admiral, and to a very considerable extent officered by Britishers.

This navy would, in times of peace, be used as a training squadron for Australian naval men. In times of war it would be available for the defence of Australia, and there is no doubt, for the assistance of Britain in other waters, if that were called for.

That is what Australia thinks about contributions. I need not go over in detail the points in which that which Australia is doing differs from what is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is enough to say that Australia is providing a navy for the defence of its own coasts, and New Zealand is making it a condition—an absolute condition—that the ship which she is providing shall be stationed at New Zealand and shall be for the protection of New Zealand; and the money she gives is not given to the admiralty but is given solely and only for the purpose of paying extra wages to the New Zealand men who go into that establishment. And yet these hon. gentlemen want to give $25,000,000 not for anything that is going to come back to Canada, not for anything that will guard our coasts or that will contribute to our own progress and advancement, but simply to throw it away without restriction or condition.

But my hon. friend says that a great panic is on, that the power of Great Britain is menaced, and all that kind of thing, and therefore we must send this money. Why, this story of naval panic is an old

story to one who has studied British naval history. Not long ago I had the opportunity of reading a book entitled 'The Naval Progress of the Nineteenth Century', in which a whole chapter was taken up with pointing out the fact that for the last seventy-five years a naval panic had occurred about every five years. In 1850, Sir Francis Head published a book called 'The Defenceless State of Britain', in which he gave a description of the capture of London by a French fleet. In 1859, under the government of Lord Derby, a committee sat to consider the state of the navy, it being represented that the naval force of the country was far inferior to what it ought to be in comparison with other powers. In the old days, France was the bugaboo; in our times Germany is the scare. In 1874, the navy was said to be in a shameful condition. Sir Edward Reid said that the government had practically abandoned the naval position of the country in Europe. In 1886 another panic was on, and the charge was made that the navy was allowed to fall away below that of France. In 1901, only nine years ago, the London 'Times', the Thunderer—which is not averse to playing politics when necessary—published an article entitled 'The National Danger' in which it used the time-honored expression about Nero fiddling while Rome burned. That was the last scare before the present one. From time to time we have had panics on this subject. There was a panic because England's wooden sailing ships were of an inferior type; another because the sailing ships had become useless and steam vessels were required; another because vessels were built of wood and should be armour-plated; then these were not good enough and should be built of iron; then, there was the change from iron to steel. 'The 'Blue-sea School', of which my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) spoke the other day, are liable to get up a scare on this subject at any time. And how did this feeling arise? In 1904, when the Unionist government went out of power, Great Britain had a budget of £13,000,000 for the navy, Germany's budget naval at that time being £4,000,000. The Radical government let that budget drop year by year, until, in 1908, it had gone down to £8,000,000, while Germany's had been going up, so that in that year, Germany's naval expenditure was as much as that of Great Britain. The result was that what might be called the Conservative wing—or, rather, the old Whig wing—of the Radical party, men like Mr Haldane, Mr. Asquith, and Sir Edward Grey, realized that something would have to be done to bring their followers up to the point of supporting a strong naval policy and enabling them to get a budget out of which they could spend on the navy the amount that England had been accustomed to spend and they spoke strongly and sternly about the effect of a reduced contribution. These are the facts; any one who reads English politics knows them to be the facts. And what was the position of Mr. Balfour in the last campaign. Mr. Balfour did not say that England's prestige was menaced. What he said was that this Radical government had neglected the defence of the country, and had not kept the naval expenditure up to the figure at which it should be kept, and his object was to condemn them for that neglect and to compel them to change their course or retire. Mr. Balfour absolutely disclaimed, upon many platforms in the last campaign, the idea that Germany had any notion of going to war with England. These are facts known to every student of current English politics.

The secretary of the admiralty, speaking on January 13, last, pointed out that:

> In April, 1912, the so-called point of danger, we should have 20 Dreadnoughts to Germany's 13; 40 pre-Dreadnoughts to Germany's 20; 35 cruisers to Germany's 8; 16 docks for Dreadnoughts to Germany's 9.

In other words, in 1912, Britain would have a fighting force of 95 vessels against Germany's 41. So, when these hon. gentlemen attempt to raise a scare in this country about Britain's naval position, they are simply imposing on people who do not sit down and study the facts as they actually are in England. I venture to say that any one who would attempt to raise a scare about the empire being in peril from this cause would be laughed off any platform in Great Britain. Let us see what the British ministers say about the situation. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about a 'tin pot navy'. Well, Mr. Haldane, the secretary for war, speaks about the contribution which Canada is making as 'a splendid scheme of imperial co-ordination for imperial defence'. Speaking three weeks ago in Scotland:

> He said he had served on the confidential committee of the cabinet on imperial defence. They had inquired into the question whether the admiralty had kept up the navy to the proper standard or whether, as was alleged by Lord Charles Beresford, they had let it down.

That is, whether Sir John Fisher was building too many Dreadnoughts and too few cruisers.

> They went into every detail, had everything before them, and they were satisfied, not only that the fleet had not been let down, but that it was stronger than it had ever been before. (Cheers.) If any of them would take the trouble to look at the navy list, and if they compared what was called the home fleet with what the home fleet used to be, they would see

that to-day they had got together during the course of the last year a fleet more powerful, both in quality of ships and in their numbers, in the divisions of which consisted in its organization, than any fleet this country ever possessed before during the whole of its time. It was a fleet twice as powerful as the German fleet in the North Sea—(cheers)—and when he said that, he wished emphatically to disassociate himself from the suggestion that there was, or ought to be, any unfriendly rivalry between this country and that great nation over the German ocean with which we did a great trade, and with which we desired to be on the most friendly footing. (Cheers.) Our duty and their duty was to see that defences were perfect, not in the interests of war, but in the interests of peace, and the most foolish thing that anybody could do was to make the kind of speeches that had been made recently by their opponents suggesting that there was some rivalry between us and Germany which must end in war. After all, it was the Liberal government, with the work it did of co-ordinating the forces of the empire last summer, with the work it did of organizing the foundations of an imperial navy——

That is how Mr. Haldane, the secretary for war—characterizes the part that Canada is playing in this matter.

—it was the Liberal government that had translated imperial federation into something like the beginnings of reality, instead of leaving it to rest either in vain declamation, or any proposal to impose taxes——

That is what my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) wishes to do—impose taxes.

—could in the end only have the result of irritation between the various parts of the empire.

Here is about what Mr. Asquith, the premier of England, said a month ago at Liverpool:

Let me say once for all and I speak with full deliberation and after careful inquiry—that the navy to-day is able to maintain not only this year but in the years that lie before us our supremacy at sea and should the necessity arise—which God forbid—to guarantee the integrity of our commerce and the inviolability of our empire.

Then, look at what Sir Edward Grey has said—and everybody who studies English politics looks upon Sir Edward Grey as in the very forefront of big men, the responsible men, of the empire. No matter to what political party a man may belong either in England or here, there is not a man, not even the most extreme Unionist of the old country, who will not tell you that Sir Edward Grey is a splendid man. He has been quoted in this House. But let us hear what he said in January last, referring to his speech of March, 1909:

We said that the situation would be serious if proper efforts were not made to maintain the navy, precisely because we wanted to impress the country with the need for making those efforts, and with our intention to make them.

Just what I said. These men took the position they did in order to make their followers stand up for the proposition of a large expenditure for the navy. That shows why the English navy to-day occupies such a position of impregnable superiority that no man who is interested in the empire's future need worry about England's supremacy on the sea. That shows why the British budget to-day proposes an increase of £7,000,000 for naval expenditure over 1908. The apathy which seemed to have settled down over British people has now entirely disappeared as the result of the efforts of those English statesmen who have been able to bring their radical followers up to the position of supporting them in a policy of a strong navy. Now, if there is nothing in the objection of my hon. friend to sections 14 and 15, if contributions are not necessary, if there is no panic, then the result is that his resolution falls to the ground, and my hon. friend ought to return to the ground on which we all stood together last year, that we should relieve the British taxpayer of the responsibility of Canadian defence, that we should build up in Canada a fleet for inshore defence, to act in concert with the British navy in time of war. I hope my hon. friend will see his way to come back to that position. I am afraid, however, that if the influences with which the hon. member for North Toronto is so familiar, the thumb screw, the rack and the composing room, are still to prevail, there is little hope that my hon. friend will see the error of his way and retrace his steps.

Now, let me consider the policy of the hon. member for North Toronto. He does not care whether there is any necessity or not for a Canadian navy. Let us send over $25,000,000 to the British government. Sir, that is an evidence of the utterly reckless character of my hon. friend, and shows him to possess those qualities which have rendered it impossible for the men who sit behind him to regard him as a serious factor as a leader in Canadian politics. The position taken by the hon. member for North Toronto on this question, far exceeding even the reckless character of the resolution of his leader, shows that he has become so partisan in his judgment of men and affairs that he is utterly unable to have a clear vision, such as we had reason to expect he was naturally endowed with. His whole speech was the speech of a partisan, not of a man who wished to approach big questions in a big way, of a man who was anxious to proceed on right lines in national politics. That has not been his position, and he appealed to heaven to witness his consistency. Well, I was struck with his attitude upon that question. Consistency is a virtue which he

abandoned long years ago; he has little acquaintance with it, at least since I have been in the House. He gloried in the fact, however, that it was better to have 'diversity with integrity than uniformity with servility,' referring to my hon. friend who sits behind him. He also gloried in the fact that both the member for Jacques Cartier and himself, though they were at the antipodes upon this question, yet they joined harmoniously in condemning the policy of the government, as if anybody expected them to do anything else. He actually talked about the thumb screw, and the rack, and the composing room. Strange words these, and he presumed to attribute the advancement of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to the utilization of those instruments. Does my hon. friend imagine that he belongs to that class of men of whom the poet speaks:

Men whom the spoils of office will not buy,
Men whom the lust of office will not kill?

If he is under any delusion of that kind, he should disabuse his mind at once, because nobody in this country regards him as a man of that character. My hon. friend entered parliament in 1882 as an out-and-out temperance man and prohibitionist, advocating the most extreme legislation; as a man who was elected to parliament as an independent, a high-minded gentleman who was going to enter the arena of Canadian politics and look down from a lofty position, and regard big questions from a high standpoint. That was his position in 1882. I do not know whether the great Sir John Macdonald utilized any of those methods in bringing him to time. But when he told us that it took the Minister of the Interior ten years to get into line with his leader, I could not help thinking that it took my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) only three years to do so. I leave it to the imagination to suggest what were the influences that affected him. And his effort to justify himself in regard to his attitude last year was most amusing. After circling round and declaring that the first resolution meant that we should have a Canadian navy and not contributions, he boldly took the course of veering quite around. He admitted that last year he supported the proposition of a Canadian navy as opposed to contributions, and yet he never attempted to explain his attitude, or to show why he is taking the other position to-day, but he started off on that extreme course without any justification whatever. And didn't he grow eloquent over the terrible lack of judgment on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Militia, because, forsooth, they had not taken Canada's money and given it to the imperial government to supply a fleet unit on the Pacific! I wonder if the judgment of this House is that the proper thing for Canada to do would be to provide a fleet unit on the Pacific, and by so doing leave the Atlantic seaports with all those lines of commerce with the mother country, unprotected? Yet he says they should have done that. Why, I venture to say that if my hon. friends who went over to England had promised to take the people's money and build a unit on the Pacific, he would have been the first man in Canada to raise his voice and denounce them for going beyond their instructions, for betraying the Canadian people, for putting their hands into the people's pockets and taking this money and throwing it away. The first man to have gone after them would have been the hon. member for North Toronto. Then my hon. friend grew facetious. He recalled the old story of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza, and he went on to declare what the leader of the government had done, and said that he had conjured up a fiction of the imagination. Let us see what he said:

Then my hon. friend had a tilt with sundry windmills. He knows the story of the old knight and his doughty squire, filled full of the spirit of battle if not of conquest, bound for adventure, if not for human gore, who went around tilting at windmills. My right hon. friend before this audience and the wider audience of Canada, he did it to perfection, he did it well. What were the windmills with which he tilted? He tilted. Sir, against the windmilll which he took as an enemy to responsible government, and he drove his spear through all the wings of the mill. He then went to the next windmill which represented in his mind's eye a sturdy opponent of Canadian autonomy, and he burst the wings of that mill. He proceeded and he met another enemy, conjured up, the enemy of the autonomy of this country in the shape of centralization of power in Downing street, and he tilted against that, and then filled with a lust for still further battle, he found another windmill which was taxation without representation, and he glutted his desire for warfare until he had demolished that one.

Then he said:

Who made that statement? The British government, the British admiralty, any person in a responsible position in this House or in the country? My hon. friend knows that when he made that statement it was a complete fiction of imagination.

Yet, these statements were made by somebody, and they were made in this House. They were made by a gentleman of some responsibility. Let me read some that were made on January 12 at page 1830 of 'Hansard':

Are we going to be in the position that the whole foreign policy of the empire is going to be framed, and formed, and carried out by a cabinet of men in Downing street, men absolutely controlled and elected by the electorate of the British isles; that we, British subjects like themselves, are going to be placed upon a different footing, that we will not have

a voice in the conduct of that policy, that we are to be responsible for everything while having no voice in the conduct of anything? That was not what on more than one occasion —I have simply mentioned the principal one —was stated at the conference, and stated not by colonials but by men who knew that it would never work with Anglo-Saxon people to have in any sense taxation without representation.

Mr. MONK. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend admits the soft impeachment. But, does it not strike hon. members of this House that if we are going to carry out this policy that is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, we will become responsible generally and severally with the people of the British Isles for the whole foreign policy of the empire without having a voice in the formation of that policy?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend admitted that himself a moment ago, because he said that it would come by-and-by.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am not concerned with my hon. friend about that. I am interested, for the moment, in my hon. friend's relations with the hon. member for North Toronto. I will deal with the other matter directly.

Mr. MONK. You had better attend to your own divisions.

Mr. MACDONALD. Now, the gentleman who made this statement, might I say the windmill against whom the Prime Minister tilted, as described by the hon. member for North Toronto, was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who just sat down.

Mr. MONK. And himself a year ago.

Mr. MACDONALD. And the hon. member for North Toronto had the audacity to say that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had never used any of these words at all. He said that the tilting of the Prime Minister against these words was a pure figment of the imagination, that nobody had every uttered them anyway. I do not know whether the hon. member for North Toronto regards the gentleman who sits behind him as nobody, or whether he regards him only as a windmill. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier goes down to Quebec, and, in conjunction with his ally, Mr. Bourassa, wants to propound all those theories that the hon. member for North Toronto says there is nothing in. Rag baby autonomy! If it is a rag baby, it is a very serious kind of a baby. If the hon. member for Western Ontario who has just interrupted would sit down and read the speech delivered by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, he would not think that it was any rag baby, but he would realize that it was a very live kind of baby. I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto paid his colleague behind him the compliment of listening to his speech. I do not think that he read it, because if he had, I think he would have avoided the utterances which he used in regard to that hon. member. I quite concede that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, if he thinks the autonomy of this country is imperilled in any way, has the right to state his position before the House, but he has no right to be ignored by one of the joint leaders of the party, who turns around and tells him that nobody had ever made use of these arguments in this House. But, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier need not worry; the hon. member for North Toronto was tilting with everybody, and he used language as reckless with regard to several other hon. gentlemen as that which he used in regard to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

We hear something about a plebiscite. I wonder if the hon. member for North Toronto is in favour of having a plebiscite about the question as to whether we should give $25,000,000 to the empire? We have not heard anything about that. Because we propose to spend $11,000,000 among Canadian workmen, in Canadian workshops, and in developing the interests of Canada, forsooth, we must have a plebiscite; but when we take $25,000,000 and let it go there is no need for a plebiscite at all. I notice that even the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not extended his resolution to cover this $25,000,000 that his friend the leader of the opposition proposes to give.

Mr. MONK. It covers everything, as my hon. friend will see if he reads the resolution. It covers the whole scheme.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend say that his amendment proposes that there should be referred to the people of this country the proposition of the leader of the opposition that $25,000,000 should be given to the people of England?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will read it he can understand it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did read it with some care, and, according to the construction I put on the English language, I came to an entirely different conclusion. It is rather news to me if the hon. gentleman's resolution has any such meaning. His proposition is:

That all the words after 'that' be struck out.

He proposes to strike out the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition, and in place of the proposal of the leader of the government he proposes to substitute this:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion, that the Bill now submitted for its consideration change the relations of Canada with the empire and ought, in consequence, to be

submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

There is nothing there about submitting a proposition to give $25,000,000 to the empire, and I think that if my hon. friend has any desire to set himself right on this question he ought to ask the House to have his resolution amended so as to enable him to raise that issue.

Mr. MONK. I will not go for advice to you.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend, in all good humour, might go to a worse place. Now, I think my hon. friend ought not to feel offended with me. He ought rather to feel resentment at his colleague, the hon. member for North Toronto, because he is the gentleman with whom I have been dealing, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has only accidentally got in the way, and if the hon. member for North Toronto chooses to call the hon. member for Jacques Cartier a windmill it is not my fault. But then he went tilting with the leader of the Liberal party. He told us that Sir Wilfrid had taken a position of absolute antagonism to effective help to the British empire as a whole. How did he justify his statement?—by stating that my right hon. leader had defended the right of Canada to make commercial treaties. We heard my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) a couple of years ago assert in this House that they had negotiated a commercial treaty with France and claim that there was some credit or some congratulation which Canada had gathered or was entitled to from the fact because they had practically done the thing direct, although the English ambassador at Paris had been there, and that as a matter of fact the negotiations had been carried on almost exclusively by the representatives of Canada. I remember the hon. member for North Toronto standing up in his place and declaring that they were entirely mistaken, that they had no right to claim any such credit, that Sir Charles Tupper had negotiated the French treaty ten years ago the same way. Yet, forsooth, my right hon. friend the leader of the government is to be charged with being disloyal because he thinks that Canada should do what we have been doing for ten years! Then, the hon. member for North Toronto inveighed against the right hon. leader of the House because he had said that sometimes British diplomacy had not been a success. I regret to have to refer to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier again. But, that hon. gentleman knows very well that in his speech, which was carefully prepared, carefully thought over, and an able deliverance, he traced the whole history of British diplomacy from 1782 down to the present day. He argued that Canada had suffered on every occasion when English diplomats had her case in hand.

Mr. MONK. I agreed absolutely with the Prime Minister until last year; he left me; I did not leave him.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is worrying too much about himself.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is worrying too much about me.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is worrying you, not about you.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is labouring under a delusion. I do not think I could dignify the member for North Toronto by calling him the leader of the member for Jacques Cartier, but at all events last Thursday night the member for North Toronto charged the Prime Minister practically with being disloyal because he had said that British diplomacy was not always what it should be. And when I called the attention of the House to the fact that the member for Jacques Cartier had taken up every treaty from 1782 down to date to prove that British diplomacy was not a success so far as Canada was concerned, surely he must settle his accounts with the member for North Toronto and not with me. Did not the hon. member for Jacques Cartier wind up his remarks on the subject with this statement:

> I merely mention these facts and have no wish to go into detail. There are many other facts that might be cited to prove this claim that any man who says that we owe a debt of gratitude to the mother country in respect to these many transactions under which our territory has been greatly fragmentized, is speaking of what he knows nothing about.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) nods assent, and I am to assume that he agrees with me that when the hon. member for North Toronto was speaking on Thursday night he was talking on something he knew nothing about. However, I merely point out this to show that when the member for North Toronto gave these as his reasons why the House should have no confidence in our great leader, he was in the same breath maligning the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier who sits behind him. But, more than that, Sir, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) indulged in misrepresentation. He quoted from a speech which he alleged the Prime Minister had made in 1888, and he led us to believe that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had said that the time was coming when the present relations between Great Britain and Canada must either become closer or be severed altogether. But, would you believe that a gentleman of such long experience in public life as the mem-

ber for North Toronto would be guilty of absolute misrepresentation. The offence might be pardoned in a man who sat on the back benches and did not know the amenities which should characterize those who sit on the front benches. But would you believe, Sir, that the member for North Toronto suppressed language of the Prime Minister used in the same connection and in the same speech as it is reported in Hansard for that year, which went to show really what the Prime Minister meant? Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in parliament in 1888 used this language:

If you on the other side pretend that our colonial relation curtails and limits our possibilities, that England would allow us to reach a certain altitude and go no higher, I say you slander England, and if any man were to use at the other side and tell us that England would be jealous at whatever we could do to improve our condition, I say that man does not know England, he mistakes the England of to-day for the England of 100 years ago—But what we ask, Sir, is not political independence. We want to keep the flag of England over our heads, but we affirm that we are economically independent as we are legislatively independent.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for North Toronto suppressed language of the Prime Minister which was necessary to a proper understanding of his meaning. Then, he repeated the old story that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was opposed to the contingents going to South Africa. This is the same old game they played in 1900. You will remember that in the elections of 1900 the Conservatives claimed in the English provinces, that the Prime Minister would not move one step in the direction of helping England in the time of trial, until he was compelled to by the Conservative party, and my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) tells me he was defeated on that cry, and I have no doubt of it. But, in the province of Quebec the Conservatives told an entirely different story. They said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was 'Too English' for them and I have in my hand a pamphlet sent out by the Conservative party in Quebec in 1900 and franked from this House of Commons by Conservative members, some of whom are here yet, and this is the kind of story they told in the province of Quebec regarding the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

The first utterances of imperialism were made in London, by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Then it was that he put the Canadian soldiers at the service of the English.

Canada to do honour to the Prime Minister had sent to England the very cream of the troops to act as a body-guard. A splendid detachment of mounted police, a battalion composed of the elite of our militia, were sent to London and aroused the enthusiam of the old metropolis. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, dazzled by the applause of which he was the object, then committed the fatal mistake to give vent to words which were binding us to war destinies of Great Britain.

Then and there was sealed the pact now stained with Canadian blood which flowed at Paardeberg, Belmont, Mafeking, Faber Farm, and in many other encounters.

On the 18th of June, 1897, at a banquet held at the imperial institute, after a military review before Lord Lansdowne, Secretary of War, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in a moment of enthusiasm, put all the Canadian troops at the disposal of the empire. As a worthy descendent of French blood, he choose the anniversary of Waterloo to make the offer.

I hope my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will not indulge in any talk of that kind now:—

According to a cablegram, dated London, June 18, 1897, to the 'Globe,' on Lord Lansdowne, asking if, in a case of just conflicts, the colonies would be willing to help England, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier is said to have replied as follows:—

Lord Lansdowne has mentioned that a day may come when the empire might be threatened. This date, anniversary of the battle of Waterloo, reminds us that at all times England has proved itself able to win its own wars, but should a day come when it should be in danger, then let the bugle blow and rallying fires be lighted on the hills and in the colonies, and though we may not be able to do very much we shall give all the help within our means.

This was a solemn promise and it was kept.

And, Sir, I commend to this parliament that splendid deliverance of our Prime Minister in 1897 uttered in England, which shows his true position and his devotion to British connection. These are the words of the man who, according to the member for North Toronto, stands for independence, the man who, according to the same authority, is not true to Britain; this is the language which the Conservative party scattered broadcast through the province of Quebec in 1900 in order to set race against race and to influence the people against the Liberal party and against its great leader.

Now, while the hon. member from North Toronto has been charging the Prime Minister with moving towards political independence, with antagonism to everything that is British, and with disloyalty, the hon. member from Jacques Cartier is singing an entirely different song. Every word of his utterance on last Thursday night was an arraignment of the government, because he said they were committing Canada to be tied hand and foot, they were casting her in every possible way on the mercies of Downing street, abandoning all principles of responsible government, and depriving us of a free voice in our own affairs. Now, if the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier really believes the views he gave utterance to then, he is in an unfortunate position when he sits behind the gentleman who

railed against this government because this Naval Bill is lacking in all these considerations which ought to be present if the interests of England were to be protected. Now, which of them is right? Is the leader of the opposition right or is the member for Jacques Cartier right? If these gentlemen hold their views honestly and sincerely it is absolutely impossible for them to work in concert. One of them must be wrong; there is no use trying to preach peace, peace, when there is no peace. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier cannot honestly work in harmony with the leader of the opposition, because the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier are absolutely and diametrically opposed to everything which the leader of the opposition said he believed. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier disclaims any desire to make trouble, and he agrees with something in the resolution of the leader of the opposition. What part of that resolution is it with which he agrees? Does he agree with the proposition that we should send over $25,000,000 to the home government?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend is as intelligent as I believe him to be, surely he understands that the part of the resolution which proposes a plebiscite is the part with which I agree.

Mr. MACDONALD. That then is the only part, and we are to understand that he does not agree with the proposition of his leader that we should send $25,000,000 to the mother country?

Mr. MONK. I will give my views at the proper time.

Mr. MACDONALD. Then this great tribune (Mr. Monk) who has been leading his people along certain lines, who has been telling them what their duty is with regard to this question of the navy, is not prepared to tell them whether he is in accord with his leader or not on the question of sending $25,000,000 to the home government. My hon. friend presented a petition this afternoon. I do not know whether that petition was against sending the $25,000,000 or against our building a Canadian navy, but I hope that, after he gets into conference with his friend and ally, Mr. Bourassa, he will be able to tell us just where he does stand on this question. In any event he does not stand behind his leader, and I say that he had no right to invoke in this House the memories of the heroes of 1837. Nor had he any right to charge the men who are supporting the government from the province of Quebec with having voted against his resolution in 1905 in connection with the French language in the northwest. He had no right, on a question such as this, to appeal to any sentiment of that kind.

Mr. MONK. Why had I no right?

Mr. MACDONALD. Because my hon. friend was raising the question of race in this country.

Mr. MONK. I defy my hon. friend to point to a single instance during this controversy in which I have appealed to race or anything of that kind. I defy those who are applauding him to prove it. I have been before my constituents, and I have not spoken anywhere else except here.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has the right, as every free man has, to say what he thinks in this House, but he has no right to conjure up in his address the heroes of 1837 in order to give point to his contention that the autonomy of this country is becoming in any way imperilled by the measure before us. In so doing he declares his dissent from the opinions of his own friends. He puts himself diametrically in opposition to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who has said that this autonomy business is nothing but a rag baby anyway; and when he seeks to import into this discussion the men of 1837, he is simply raising the racial cry.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend knows nothing about it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have the same rights here as my hon. friend. I come from a race of men who, in the little province of Nova Scotia, fought the battle of responsible government, just as did my hon. friend's compatriots in the province of Quebec. Our fathers in Nova Scotia won that battle, and won it a little earlier and without any particular display, but we won it nevertheless, and it is just as dear to us as it can possibly be to the people of any other province in this Dominion. But what I complain of particularly on the part of my hon. friend is this language which he used on February 3 in this House:

> I have seen these gentlemen in this House——
>
> (Referring to Liberal members from the province of Quebec.)
>
> —vote against the maintenance of the rights that were claimed for the minority in the organization of the new provinces of the west, I have seen them vote against the maintenance of the right which all parties in this House admitted to exist with regard to the French language in these provinces when at one time I moved for the maintenance of the strict right of the French Canadian to speak —only to speak—in that language in one of the assemblies of this province.

What possible relevancy has the use of the French language to do with the question as to whether we ought or ought not

to give a contribution to the British navy or build a Canadian navy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD. I say that my hon. friend, in this line of action, was simply seeking to fan the flames of discord. The course taken by the opposition shows simply an endeavour on their part to repeat their tactics of the year 1900, when we had one wing going to the English-speaking people of Canada and saying that this government was doing nothing for the empire but was seeking to bring about independence, and the other raising the cry in the province of Quebec that it was bartering away our autonomy and sacrificing everything to the British connection. These are tactics which it is only right and proper should be exposed. But where does the Liberal party stand in this matter? Have we any such ridiculous divisions in our ranks? No, Sir, the Liberal party stands solid to the only policy that can make Canada great and the empire secure. Our only strength as a nation lies in the fact that while, as a part of the great empire, we shall control our defence in times of peace, in times of stress and danger we may stand by the motherland when necessary. What should be the ambition of those who wish to see the empire as great and strong as it ought to be? Would they desire to see us relapse into the state of a crown colony and be content with paying tribute by way of contribution, or would they not rather have this country follow the policy spoken of by the hon. Mr. Fisher, at one time Premier of Australia, who declared that the five great self-governing colonies should prepare for their own defence the better to assist the empire in time of war. The position in which the Liberal party stands today is the same as that which was enunciated 45 years ago by the late George Brown, then leader of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario:

> The colonies are now in a transition state. Gradually a different colonial system is being developed, and it will become year by year less a case of dependence on our part and of overruling protection on the part of the mother country, and more the case of a hearty and cordial alliance. Instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony England will have in us a friendly nation—a subordinate but still a powerful people to stand by her in North America in peace and war.

That was the policy laid down by George Brown in Ontario in 1865 and that defines the aspirations of the great leader of our party who has guided the destinies of our country during the past sixteen years. The spirit which animates that policy is well set forth by Mr. Jebb, whom I quoted the other night in reply to the hon. member for North Toronto:

> My pages are concerned with the other soul—the embryo consciousness of the younger nations, which the English brother 'does not understand.' His notion of imperial union has been based upon that helpless 'Loyalty.' He has acquired the habit of supercilious condescension, as though he owned the whole empire—new nations and all. His instinct has been that the mere colonial ought to pay his share, and be thankful whilst the superior Englishmen runs the empire on his own lines. The soul of the empire is a perplexing mystery to him; partly because it is only now that even the elder of the new nations are bursting the colonial chrysalis; partly because, in the old country, the simple sense of patriotism has been suppressed beneath delusive cosmopolitanism. Yet he might understand if he tried to change places. Supposing Uncle Sam, in an absent-minded moment, made him a generous offer, namely to take over the British navy and run it for a nominal cash consideration. Would the overtaxed English brother jump at it? No, his dormant national pride rises in revolt. Then how can he expect new nations to pay hire for his navy? He complains that they do not take their share of the chores. It is his own fault, because he will not have them do it in self-respecting manner. For example, he trampled energetically upon the suggestion of national naval squadrons. He looks askance if they propose to do things in the British fashion. He thinks of it as 'disloyalty.' No wonder they are discouraged. The English brother talks pleasantly of alliance, but tries to force his supremacy. So they are constrained to imagine that national independence means cutting the painter. Ungrateful and disloyal colonies, to think that you should assert the temper which made England herself.

We say that the same spirit and the same traditions which have dominated the British race during its long history of 2,000 years should animate the Canadian people on the northern half of this continent. Those of us who are of the dominant race appreciate the fact that we are the inheritors of those institutions which have been the great factors in British supremacy throughout its long history, and those of us who form the minority appreciate in equal degree the liberties and the free institutions which we could not have got from any other nation.

This policy which has been inaugurated by our leader, is the only sound policy for Canada and both races in this country join in supporting it. Those of us who belong to the Liberal party, and many who do not, recognize in our great leader one whose legitimate ambition is the development of the idea of a nation within the empire, acting in concert with the other great self-governing colonies in the preservation of their local defence and autonomy and prompt to come to the assistance of the motherland. In the splendid path along which the great leader of the Liberal party has led this country, his achievements

have been memorable and are the pride of all fair-minded men in this broad land, to-day, no matter from what race they have sprung or at what altar they bow, just as they will be the glory of our children and of all those who come after us in Canada. Our internal affairs have been marked by the greatest period of development in all our history. First of all the colonies under his wise direction we relaxed the antagonism of tariffs towards the mother country and by our preference to Britain's wares and Britain's products we blazed the way which has been followed by the Unionist party in Great Britain in their policy of tariff reform for the empire. For the first time in our history under him, we sent our sons at our own cost and with our own money to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa.

And now, in order to assist in maintaining the supremacy of Britain on the ocean, having reached that stage in our national history when we are in a financial position to do so, we relieve the nation's burdens by inaugurating a fleet that in the days to come will grow and develop with our strength as we develop in population and wealth and stand at all times for the empire in peace and war. And above all, just as in the old land the Angles, the Saxons, the Jutes and the Normans were, by process of time and the wisdom of succeeding statesmen in Britain, welded together into that great race which has dominated the world for the past one thousand years, so here in Canada he has taught us all, whether we are French or English or Irish, or Scotch, to be true to Canada and to Canada firet, last and always. And the accomplishment of the result to be attained by this Bill is but a step in the work he has yet to do. He has not yet finished his work. Much remains to be done in laying the foundations, so that the edifice of after days will be worthy of the formative stage. He has been the master-builder. And not only is it the prayer of the Liberal party, but it is the prayer of every lover of Canada's who reads Canada's history aright, that that Providence which gave him to Canada to bind up the ties that were being loosened, and to cement the varying elements that were breaking away may still preserve him for many years to come to insure the fulfilment of his prophecy that the twentieth century is to be the century in which Canada will prove herself worthy of her traditions and responsibilities and will take her place as the centre from which British traditions of government and influence will radiate throughout the world through all future time.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to take part in this debate with the idea that I can contribute anything of a very original character at this stage, for I recognize that the ground has been already so completely covered that it is now difficult to introduce new material. I wish to explain why I intend to support the amendment introduced by the leader of the opposition in preference to the Bill now before the House. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is a good actor. He was speaking to the galleries to-day. The gentleman who formerly occupied his seat in this House, a former member for North Cape Breton, was usually allotted a certain task in the old parliament. Whenever the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would make a particularly effective speech, usually at a late hour of the night that member would be put up to indulge in personal abuse and vituperation and it would appear as if the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has assumed the role vacated by that hon. gentleman. I must acknowledge that he fills the bill to a nicety. He has been incubating for the last five days in his endeavour to obtain a suitable reply to that splendid address of the hon. member for North Toronto. He accuses that hon. gentleman of misrepresentation. I will admit that he should be a good authority on misrepresentation, because two-thirds of his own speech was made up of misrepresentation, distortion of facts and false premises. He has put words into the mouth of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) which that gentleman never uttered. He has, in order to carry his point, whether deliberately or not, I will not say—although he accused the hon. member for North Toronto of deliberately doing it—misinterpreted the resolution introduced in amendment by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and if you separate the chaff from the wheat in his speech I am afraid there will be very little of No. 1 hard left. He has spoken of the partisan character of the speeches made by hon. members on this side. Whose example are we following? Who made the first partisan speech? His own leader, the Prime Minister, who should have set an example to the younger members, who should have established the debate on a higher plane. Fancy the hon. member for Pictou accusing any one of making a partisan speech after the address we have listened to. He, of course, discussed this on purely national lines, on a broad basis. He did not descend to any partisanship. I repeat that language of a partisan character makes up at least two-thirds of his speech. He has referred to the unanimity that exists among members on this side. What about the unanimity that exists among the members opposite? I know whereof I speak. Take these hon. gentlemen outside of this

House and what will they say in regard to this Bill? I have heard their expressions in regard to it.

Mr. TALBOT. Name them?

Mr. ROCHE. Their name is legion. Some hon. gentlemen came down here and were going to open up the whole question. Oh, if they could only speak their minds, would they not show up the whole thing! It is true they have a certain cohesion and adhesion. You talk of cement having cohesive and adhesive qualities—it is not in it with the spoils of office. There is a post office here, a customs house there, an armoury in another place, a drill hall some where else. A prospective cabinet ministership in some other place—and I hope the hon. member for Pictou has earned his reward by his defence this afternoon. The hon. member places men of straw to show the members with what facility he can knock them down. I have referred to his misrepresentation. He stated that the hon. member for North Toronto misquoted a speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1888. I challenge him to show a word of misquotation. I say he made no reference to that speech except four or five lines.

Mr. MACDONALD. I said he had quoted a part of the speech of the Prime Minister and not quoted the context to show what he did mean.

Mr. ROCHE. The portion of the speech to which he took exception was in a speech delivered in this House in 1892 by the Prime Minister and if he looks up 'Hansard' he will find that.

Mr. MACDONALD. If you look it up you will find it was given as 1888. I went to 'Hansard' and found it.

Mr. ROCHE. He referred to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and said to him: What has the French language to do with the Bill before the House? I would ask that hon. member to discuss this question on broad national lines. What has his reference to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as being a former temperance lecturer got to do with it? I would say to him: Let him first take the beam out of his own eye before he attempts to pluck the mote out of his brother's. He has referred to the leader of the opposition as being in favour of giving 'tribute.' The hon. gentleman is a lawyer; he knows the meaning of the word 'tribute.' Are we proposing to give tribute to the motherland, when we, voluntarily, of our own free will, and in a time of emergency, grant a contribution of money to strengthen the British navy? Do you call that 'tribute'? The hon. gentleman had better re-read his history if he desires to find the true meaning of the word. I have heard arguments put forward by hon. members surrounding the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and these hon. gentlemen have not taken the position that a voluntary grant was anything in the nature of tribute. The hon. gentleman (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has gone so far as to say that the leader of the opposition has had a letter addressed to him by the old leader of the Liberal-Conservative party to task for not supporting that meapolicy of the government, and urging him to support it. That letter was written—and the hon. gentleman knows it—before the proposition of the government was submitted to this House at all. If Sir Charles Tupper had written this letter after seeing the provisions of the Bill now before the House, and had taken the Conservative party to task for not supporting that measure, there might be some force in the hon. gentleman's criticism. That letter, written by the former leader of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper, was against annual, stated, fixed contributions. So, the hon. member for Pictou, in offering his criticisms on that letter, as well as on the policy of the leader of the opposition in regard to these criticisms, does not differentiate between an emergency contribution and a contribution made annually, a fixed, stated sum, to be continued as a permanancy. He was not fair in his representation in that regard.

Now, the hon. member states that the Australian unit and the New Zealand unit are meant for the protection of the coasts of those countries, and he says that that is what we are doing here. And in what manner? By providing, for instance, two 'Bristols' on the Pacific ocean to 'protect' our own shores—two vessels that, according to the leading Liberal journal of the province of Quebec are purposely built to elude the pursuit of the enemy. The hon. member for Pictou has also put words into the mouth of the leader of the opposition when he states that that hon. gentleman does not want docks built in Canada, does not want a naval college, does not want ships constructed in Canada, and so on. I would ask him to point to a single expression of the leader of the opposition to bear out his assertions.

An hon. MEMBER. He can't do it.

Mr. ROCHE. He cannot do it without misrepresenting the facts. And, is it not amusing to hear the hon .member for Pictou give voice to good Conservative doctrine, of giving work to our own home people, of maintaining our own workshops, of keeping our money in our own country—a good protectionist speech; whereas, in the days gone by, these hon. gentlemen, when in opposition, had only one cry and shibboleth, and that was to buy in the cheapest market? Now, the Prime Minister (Sir Wil-

frid Laurier) himself admits that the construction of this navy in Canada—and, if we are to have it constructed at all, we on this side as a party do not object to having it constructed in Canada—will cost thirty per cent more at least than if it were built in Great Britain, the direct opposite of the policy preached by these hon. gentlemen before they found places on the treasury benches.

Now, I mean to refer to some other expressions of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). But I can do so in a more connected manner as I continue my own remarks, and, as the several points arise, deal with what was stated by the hon. member. This question of national defence is one of very great importance; it is one which has engaged the attention of our public men, not only in the overseas dominions but in the motherland, for some years past to a greater or lesser extent. So far as Canada is concerned, in the earlier history of our country, when we were engaged in opening up and developing its resources, when our prairies were lying vacant, when our revenues were of a very limited character, when we were engaged in laying deep the foundations of our future greatness, there was some excuse, some reason, why Canada should not engage in duties of an imperial nature that would have resulted in too great a strain upon the exchequer of the country—greater than Canada could well afford at that time. But, now, when the initial stage of development is passed, when Canada is exporting millions of bushels of grain to other countries, when our hitherto vacant lands are filling up, when we are boasting of our so-called surpluses, and buoyant revenue, when our industries are on a substantial basis, when we take such pride in referring to the fact that Canada is a nation within the empire—and especially when England is groaning under huge financial obligations consequent upon her endeavours to maintain a superior fleet, not only for the protection of her own shores, but for the protection of the empire as a whole, —our self-respect should compel us not to withhold our aid longer, but to give in no niggardly or selfish spirit, to assume a fair proportion of the cost of protection, that protection to be used according to the best opinion of the naval experts of the empire to bring about the desired result. Surely our citizens are sufficiently patriotic, sufficiently loyal to the empire's interests, to cause us to rally to the support of the motherland in time of peril, and to assume our share and the responsibility of that share of maintaining the undoubted supremacy of the British fleet that should protect our status as a nation, and without which we should be at the mercy of every hostile foe. In reading the expressions of opinion on this subject, I have come across the suggestion that, so long as Canada remains a colony of Great Britain, so long she is entitled to and should receive the protection of the British navy. But, to say nothing of the pusillanimous spirit of a people who would expect, nay, demand, protection at the hands of the motherland, while, at the same time, refusing a proportionate share of the cost of that protection, where should we look for protection were the British fleet annihilated? Whose colony would Canada become then? With Germany as the conquering foe, having no colonies of her own in which to locate her surplus population, could we reasonably expect so rich a prize as Canada to escape her clutches, or to be closed against the German desire for expansion or colonization? Are we, as British subjects to complacently view the possibility of being compelled to transfer our allegiance to a foreign nation, and the severing of those ties of kinship and of love that have made us part and parcel of what we have proudly spoken of in years gone by as the greatest empire the world has ever seen? I refuse to believe that there is any great element of our population that would thus repudiate responsibility on our part. Now, where national status exists, national obligations follow as a matter of course. And, were Canada to be involved in serious international complications requiring any assistance, I am sure that the whole power of the British fleet would be at her back to espouse her cause, to defend her, to fight her battles if need be; and it would be a craven spirit that would thus accept and expect this assistance and protection without assuming the responsibility of doing our share towards keeping that means of defence in the highest state of efficiency. The proposition embodied in this Bill for the construction of an independent Canadian navy is one that is not designed to meet, and certainly will not meet, the immediate necessities of the empire. And, as the best guarantee of peace is to be fully prepared for war, and our course should be to show the nations of the world that all her colonies are at the back of the motherland. Viewed even from an economic standpoint, the price of peace, no matter how great it is, would be much less than the price of war, with its immense sacrifices of life and waste of money, Canada's duty, then, is to render immediate, effective assistance to make overwhelming the superiority of the British fleet so that no nation, Germany or any other, would dare to challenge that superiority on the high seas.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have quoted statements of leading Liberal politicians in the mother country, made during the excitement of an election campaign, to create the impression that no emergency exists or is likely to arise within the next few years. But it must be remembered

that these same gentlemen who have been quoted in this House gave voice to similar expressions in the British parliament when they were reducing the estimates for naval expenditure, but who a few months thereafter had to confess that they were in error, that later and more reliable information had come to them, that they had no idea of what extensive preparations were going on in Germany, and practically admitted that those preparations were designed to challenge British supremacy on the seas. Let any one read the statements as to the unpreparedness for war of the British fleet, let any one read the statements of Lord Charles Beresford, who declares that it will require millions of dollars to be spent on the British navy in order to bring her into a state to enable her to cope with Germany; read the statements of leading statesmen of Great Britain on both sides of politics made not during the heat and excitement, all sounding a note of alarm, consider that the thoughtful press of that country has admitted that there is grave danger, read the reports of level-headed business men of England, not politicians, who have visited Germany and who have seen for themselves the extensive preparations that are being carried on, who have sounded German public opinion, and who, on their return, have expressed their conviction that the crisis was imminent. Is it for us who are so far removed from the scene of operations lightly to brush aside those expressions of opinion as idle words? Are we to ignore them? Is it not much better, if we are to err, that we should err on the side of safety, that we should put our House in order to meet the expected attack? For it cannot be denied that in the undoubted supremacy of the British fleet lies, not only the salvation of England, but the salvation of Canada and the salvation of the whole British empire. Should the war cloud pass over without any international complications of a serious danger arising, let us not feel that in giving this contribution proposed by the leader of the opposition we shall have wasted so much money, for that contribution would represent a permanent means of defence and of protection upon which we could rely for all time to come. But I am confident that probably such a contribution might be the means of calling a halt in the enemy's plans.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 142) to incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—Mr. A. Haggart.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, I was about, at six o'clock, to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that Germany, up to eight years ago, had been purchasing her ships in Great Britain, and that she had not previously engaged in steel ship-building. If the hon. gentleman's statements in other portions of his speech are no more reliable than that, the hon. members of this House will know just exactly how much stock to take in them. If the hon. gentleman had refreshed his mind by looking at Brassey's Naval Annual for 1905 he would have found a list of over 100 vessels, armoured and unarmoured, on the effective list of the Germany navy. In every case the place where the vessel was built is mentioned. Every one of these vessels was built in the German yards, some of them as early as 1876. The first German ironclad which originated in Germany was built in 1869, while the last naval vessels built for Germany in England, instead of being launched in 1902, as the hon. member for Pictou stated, were launched in 1874. As a matter of fact, German built liners won the blue ribbon of the Atlantic about eight years ago. I quote that to show how very inaccurate the hon. member for Pictou was in his statement in that regard. The German method is, and always has been to effectively, quietly and very secretly prepare for war, while at the same time professing peace. That has been her history in the past, as evidence her treatment of France and Austria. That is, according to the present indications at least, just what she is doing to-day. See the immense scale that these preparations are being conducted on. What is the particular object in view? Can anybody seriously contend that it is purely for defensive purposes? Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) quoted some authority to that effect the other day, I do not really believe that he would seriously express his own opinion to the same effect. I cannot think that the Minister of Militia, after having visited Great Britain during last summer, after coming in touch with members of the admiralty, with members of both political parties, and after having become acquainted with public opinion in that country, is taking his present position in regard to this Bill from conscientious conviction, for I believe that were he to follow his own feelings in the matter, instead of for party pur-

poses being compelled to support the Bill before the House, he would take an entirely different tack. I stated that no person would seriously contend that these preparations are being carried on, on such a very large scale simply and purely for defensive purposes. What nation on the earth has shown any desire, any determination, to cope with Germany, to attack her for a great many years past, knowing how really impossible it would be to do so successfully? Germany has to-day the largest and best trained army in the world. Germany can place as many as 4,000,000 men in the field if it is desired under system of compulsory military training; Germany's population is almost fifty per cent greater than that of England, and with all these preparations I do not think that anybody would seriously contend that it is purely for defensive purposes. Why would the German taxpayer, submissive as he has been in the past to the heavy national taxation which is imposed on him for the purpose of maintaining a very large standing army for defensive purposes, tamely submit to this largely increased taxation under the pretense that it was merely designed to protect her own shores? Every sensible man knows why these preparations are being carried on on such an immense scale. The German people recognize it, the people of England recognize it, the people of other countries of the world see it, and it is idle for us to shut our eyes to the true situation. When Britain began the Dreadnoughts a few years ago, then it was that Germany began the construction of her navy on such a large scale, realizing that future war vessels would be largely of the Dreadnought type. And, when England, through a mistaken policy, cut down by many millions of dollars their naval estimates, then it was that Germany took advantage of the apathy, and I may say the culpable negligence of certain men in public life in England, and hastened the construction of her increased naval armament.

Let any person read the expressions of public men in Germany, professors in her universities and others occupying high positions of responsibility and trust, and one cannot escape the conviction that these war preparations are for the single purpose of challenging the supremacy of the British navy. Germany has largely increased her capacity for rapid construction during the past eighteen months. By working day and night she can construct one Dreadnought or super-Dreadnought per month, or twleve in a year, and in this respect Germany is not surpassed even by Britain herself. Germany has built during the past eighteen months or has in process of completion 17 naval docks, and she has enlarged her harbours, deepened her canals and constructed her ships with the evident object of utilizing them in the home waters of the North sea. And still there are those who will say there is no danger, and who make their wilful blindness their excuse for refusing to contribute to strengthen the British navy. The policy of the British admiralty in the past has been to distribute the British fleets at strategic points throughout the world for the guardianship of British interests, but that policy has been to a considerable extent reversed in recent years and now the fleet is largely concentrated in home waters to protect the shores of Britain. Does that look as if England desired to engage in a war of aggression or conquest? Is it not the very best evidence that England recognizes that the war she will be called upon to fight in the future will be purely defensive. Is it not significant, especially in view of the war preparations carried on by Germany, that there is this concentration of British fleets to protect the shores of Great Britain? Germany is to-day England's commercial and political rival, and of recent years she has been outstripping England in trade. Germany by her policy of protection has built up great industries, and by her progressive legislation she has done more to advance the efficiency of her labouring classes than has any country in the universe. The products of Germany are admitted to the British markets free of duty, while the products of Britain are met at the German frontier with high tariff duties. Is it surprising under these circumstances that the German people were so anxious to see the defeat of the Unionist party in the recent British elections, with their policy of tariff reform which would strike back at Germany in commercial matters and of their policy of increased naval expenditure which would strike back at Germany in her naval policy as well? England has nothing to gain by aggressive war even if successful, save a possible war indemnity. England has her colonies for her surplus population, and she has her various naval bases at strategical positions throughout the world. England's supremacy is to-day no more a menace to the peaceful development of the German empire than at any time within the past half century. Germany is immune from attack by any other country on account of her immense standing army. England's naval supremacy is absolutely necessary for the salvation of England, so as to prevent a blockade of her ports which would result in shutting off the importation of food products upon which the population of Great Britain is dependent. England is Canada's best market, and with that market jeopardized as it undoubtedly would be in the event of war with Germany should the British fleet be crippled, how long do you suppose our prosperity in Canada would continue without any British protection for our trade routes? Some people in Canada say: We are busy with our

domestic affairs, we are engaged in building another National Transcontinental railway, we are improving our waterways, we are developing our resources, and they think that thus they are discharging their full obligation in the way of national defence. Let me ask, what spirit it is that dominates us in the developing of our own resources? Surely we are doing this solely and wholly for our own advancement and for the prosperity and progress of our own people. If England has incidentally benefited by reason of Canada's development, are we, because of that, to calmly fold our arms and congratulate ourselves on having discharged our full obligation in the way of naval defence? When Canada built the Canadian Pacific railway which joined our various provinces into one mighty nation, true we incidentally provided a new highway between Great Britain, Australasia, China and Japan, but who will claim that any imperial sentiment inspired us in the construction of that railroad? Who will seriously contend that such an idea entered into our calculations at all? If Canada spends her millions of dollars for the purpose of developing her resources, for the purpose of making this an attractive field for immigration and increasing the prosperity of our people, does not that very fact entail on us an additional obligation, for surely a country that is worth developing, is worth defending? The question is: What are the best means of defence? Now, in connection with this question, probably one of the greatest obstacles to overcome is the apathy of the people consequent on a feeling of false security. We have been so prone for years past to look upon the British fleet as being invincible that we possibly have not taken into consideration the great changes that have taken place in recent years in the increased armaments of other countries. Another reason for the apathy of the people is to be found in the sentiment of a large proportion of them against what is called militarism. But, Sir, so long as a hostile country starts out with the avowed object of overcoming the British fleet, which at the present time is our sole and only guarantee of peace and prosperity, much as we may deplore large expenditure for purposes of defence, no monetary considerations should be permitted to prevent us from a continuance of that means of defence which will insure to us that peace and prosperity which is so essential to our national existence. In union there is strength, and this is just as true in connection with naval matters as it is in connection with other matters, and, with a large, powerful, central empire's fleet not merely for the purposes of local defence, not merely for the purpose of defending Canada, Australia and New Zealand, but to be stationed at the most vulnerable points in time of war, that in my opinion is the best means for the security and permanent defence of the empire as a whole. I have referred to the state of public feeling in Germany with regard to England, and I desire to draw attention to a few extracts which have not as yet been quoted to the House—and it is very difficult to get extracts that have not been cited up to the present—in order to show the state of public feeling in Germany against England, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary by the Prime Minister and others on that side of the House. Professor Hans Dilbruck, lecturer on history in the University of Berlin, writing to that well-known periodical, the 'North American Review,' said:

> A nation as well as an individual must seemingly either love or hate. If the multitude had no enemy to be the object of its hatred it would take no part in foreign politics at all. So the German nation, which once celebrated with delight, the memory of the 'belle alliance of Blucher and Wellington at Waterloo,' has now riveted its hate against England.

I am sorry the right hon. the First Minister is not here, because he referred to this. Notwithstanding these people were allies in the past, notwithstanding that they fought together at Waterloo, here we have a German professor stating that the German people to-day are actuated with hatred against the English race. What object would this gentleman have in misrepresenting the state of public feeling in his own country? But he is not the only authority. Another German professor writing to Sydney Whitman, the well known English authority on German affairs—I refer to Professor Theodore Mommsen, of the university of Berlin—regarding the German attitude, said:

> The hate against your countrymen has reached fearful, and I must add, unjust dimensions.

Would these gentlemen write in such a strain unless they had good ground? Later still, Professor Treitsche, the great German historian—and I wish to call the attention of some of the Liberal members who spoke last year on the resolution, to this particular authority:

> If our empire has the courage to follow an independent colonial policy with determination a collision of our interests and those of England are unavoidable.

An hon. gentleman who spoke in this House last session said he knew perfectly well that the enlargement of the German fleet was destined for colonization purposes. But where are they going to get those colonies, and how are they going to get them? By peaceful means? Not according to this German authority, who says they cannot

avoid a collision if they persist in carrying out that policy. This historian goes on to say, and I am sorry the right hon. the Prime Minister is not here to listen to this, in view of the stand he took at the conferences of 1902 and 1907, because the course he followed at these conferences, I believe, laid the foundation for just such a sentiment as exists among the German masses:

In the British colonies very little attention is paid to antagonism between Great Britain and Germany. Never has the fact been more clearly demonstrated that Great Britain is only standing by herself and that her colonies have grown into separate nations with their own separate interests.

I think that if the right hon. gentleman had fallen in line with the representatives of the other colonies at the conference of 1907 and supported the resolution introduced by Dr. Smart, there would not be such a feeling prevailing in Germany as we witness there to-day. The Germans would not have gained the impression that England was standing alone and that her colonies were not at her back. I have also referred to facts stated freely in England, and I desire to quote from a speech by Lord Rosebery—not a political speech, not a speech destined to help the Unionist party, but a speech delivered at the Imperial Press Conference, in which he referred to the British navy, and practically made an appeal to the colonies to rally around the motherland:

We can and we will build Dreadnoughts or whatever nearest type of ship may be as long as we have a shilling to spend on them or a man to put on them. All that we can and will do, but I am not sure that even that will be enough and I think it may be your duty to take back to our young Dominions across the seas this message and this impression—that some personal duty and responsibility for national defence rests upon every man and citizen of the empire. Tell your people, if they can believe it, the deplorable state at which Europe is rattling into barbarism, and the pressure which is put upon this little England to defend itself, its liberties and yours. Take this message also back with you, that the old country is right at heart, that there is no fault or weakness in her. For her own salvation she must look to herself, and that failing her, she must look to you. —

I say that this was an invitation from Lord Rosebery, who was certainly not making a speech for any political effect. Himself a Liberal, he urged on Canada, as well as on the other colonies, the duty of rallying to the support of the motherland and not allowing all this taxation for national defence to be borne by the motherland alone.

I wish to quote another expression of opinion, the opinion of a Liberal, Mr. McKenna, Lord of the Admiralty and member of the Asquith government:

We cannot force our strategetical ideas on you; we should fail if we attempted to do so. If any dominion came to the admiralty at home here and asked us what our view was as to the best assistance for the purpose of common defence which could be rendered, we should be ready with an answer, but we should not necessarily expect you to accept our answer. You will have your own views as to the proper development of defensive forces in your own dominion. It is only by your working out your own problems for yourselves that you can gain experience. Lessons told you by others will never come home to you with the same force as lessons which you have learned for yourselves.

What occurred after that? The colonies did go to the motherland; they did go to the British admiralty. They did ask for advice. Australia took the advice and so did New Zealand. Canada got the advice but refused to follow it. The Chief Lord of the Admiralty said that the admiralty was quite willing to advise the colonies as to the best means of national defence, but did not wish to impose their views on Canada.

Again, Mr. Balfour, speaking at this conference, and not making a political speech, also referred to the fact, that though local defence is necessary it is really subordinate to imperial defence and subordinate from the view point of the colonies themselves.

The German ocean, the channel, the neighbourhood of these islands, possibly the Mediterranean, those are the theatres in which, if there is to be an attempt to dissipate those fleet contingents, so that when the time of an Armegeddon, the Armegeddon will take place, and it is impossible for a crisis to arise which shall not be able to have that concentration on which our whole imperial existence and the defence of each separate portion of the empire really depends. The fate of Australia, the fate of New Zealand, Canada, South Africa, India, is not going to be decided in the Indian ocean; it is going to be decided here.

What does that mean? It means that the fate of Canada is not to be decided off the coast of the Atlantic or the Pacific, but in the North sea or the home waters, by the enemy striking at the central fleet. How easy it would be to despatch the individual fleets, such as the Canadian fleet, if the central fleet were overwhelmed.

Referring to Mr. Balfour, my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that he never took stock in this German scare. My hon. friend has not been reading the newspapers or he would not have made that statement. What has the German press been doing if not holding up Mr. Balfour to execration as a scare monger simply because he had been making reference to the condition of the British fleet and to what the Germans had been doing with the avowed object of attacking England. So that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr.

Macdonald) was entirely erroneous when he said that Mr. Balfour had never admitted there was a German scare.

I can quite well understand why the creation of an independent Canadian navy would be welcomed by those who look forward to the independence of Canada as our future national destiny, for I recognize that in order to maintain a separate national existence a considerable navy would be absolutely necessary. But I deny that there is any large sentiment in Canada in favour of Canadian independence, notwithstanding the fact that some of the right hon. gentleman's supporters, from at least one province in this Dominion, are sedulously cultivating that idea among their followers and are using that as an argument to induce the people to support the government's proposition. Canada is to-day enjoying as great an amount of autonomy as is consistent with its remaining an integral part of the British empire, and I feel that the consensus of opinion and desire in this country, far from being that as the right hon. gentleman said a few years ago, we would in the process of time drift away from the motherland as the ripe fruit falls from the parent tree, is that the overseas dominions and Great Britain will be drawn more closely together in fact as well as in name, under one sovereign, one flag, one navy, each component part having a reasonable voice at least in matters pertaining to the defence of the empire. The history of the Canadian confederation is a notable example of the benefit to be derived from union. The history of the Australian Commonwealth is another and the latest example within the British empire is the confederation of South Africa. In my judgment the time is not far distant when all the overseas dominions and the mother land will be drawn together and confederated for many purposes and to a great extent, each one having an equal say in all important matters in the councils of the empire. Sir, if the actions of the Prime Minister in regard to the future destiny of our country is being viewed with considerable amount of distrust by the people of Canada, he has only himself to blame and well he knows it. The people of this country have not forgotten his past utterances in regard to Canadian independence. They have not forgotten that celebrated Boston speech of his, paragraphs of which have been quoted. I shall quote another paragraph lest we forget. The right hon. gentleman after he became leader of the Liberal party visited Boston and before a great audience gave voice to the following utterance:

> In my opinion the conduct of England, of Canada, towards the United States during the war was a disgrace to the civilization of England, of Canada. The American people could fight their own battles; they required no help, but when they were engaged in a supreme struggle for the life or death of this great nation; when they were fighting for a cause as great, as holy, as ever engaged the devotion of men; when they had reason to expect the outspoken sympathy of those nearest to them, it was galling that southern privateers could be built, manned and equipped in England, with the passive connivance of the British government, to destroy American commerce on the high seas; it was galling that rebel refuges could find shelter in Canada, and there, with impunity and without provoking condemnation, plot abominable crimes to help secession.

This was greeted with applause. Here we have the Prime Minister of Canada, at that time the leader of a great political party, visiting a foreign country and before that large audience, true to his instincts and desire to say something to tickle the ear of the particular audience that happened to be present, holding up to the execration of that foreign audience, old England, the motherland, and Canada, the land of his birth, for which he claims to have such an affection to-day. He says this, forgetful of the fact that in that very same life and death struggle of the civil war, there were admittedly not less than 40,000 Canadian citizens engaged and enrolled in the American army fighting the battle of the American union. Did the Prime Minister dwell on that aspect? Did he say what Canada did for them at the time of that civil war. No he did not say so. Was this the action of a patriot, was this the action of a statesman, a man who desired to see amity, peace, and good will prevail between the peoples of the respective countries, or was it not the act of a man who seemed more impressed with a desire to sow the seeds of strife and discord, to create prejudices if prejudices did not exist? Small wonder under the circumstances that the American papers report that this part of his speech met with great applause, although I very much doubt if the better element of that self-same audience respected the hon. gentleman for thus speaking of his own country. I know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not like to hear these quotations made. Hon. gentlemen opposite throw reflections on members of this side for casting aspersions on the loyalty of the Prime Minister. Have they a word to say in condemnation of these words? They have never been repudiated nor retracted. Why do they blame us for quoting the words of their own leader, why not visit their condemnation on their own leader. The Prime Minister said the other day: I am not an imperialist. These words were entirely superfluous coming from the right hon. gentleman.

Who would expect for a moment that the hon. gentleman who uttered these words:

I am a subject of the British Crown, but whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of——

What?

—the United States of America.

Who would ever accuse any gentleman uttering those expressions of being an imperialist? So, I say that his expression the other day on the second reading of the Bill was entirely superfluous. Again:

The present position of Canada cannot last for ever. Even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart, and the time will come when in the very nature of things separation must take place.

If the right hon. gentleman had stated that he was a separatist, it would have more nearly conformed to his past utterances on this subject. But, to say: I am not an imperialist, was superfluous. Again:

It is a great mistake, a fundamental mistake, to make allegiance, British allegiance——

With the emphasis on the British.

—the basis of trade.

Yet we have the right hon. gentleman's supporters rising in parliament and telling us: we gave a preference to the motherland and to-day we are enjoying a sentimental preference in her market, but notwithstanding that we should not make allegiance the basis of trade, especially British allegiance. Again said the premier:

I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation, in the course of time.

No man in this or any other country would have to state that these words were not likely to emanate from an imperialist.

I notice that the member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), referring to and reflecting on the member for Jacques Cartier today for his utterances in regard to British diplomacy, had not one word of condemnation to offer to his own leader for giving voice to similar or even stronger expressions. I am not here to defend the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I will frankly say that in this regard I do not agree with him. Will the hon. member for Pictou and other gentlemen opposite be equally frank and say that they condemn the Prime Minister's statements? What the hon. gentleman stated is reported in 'Hansard' of April 7, 1892. Speaking about the making of treaties, and referring to the present hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), he said:

The hon. gentleman has told us in a casual way, however, that if we adopted the power which is now claimed, we would be relieved of the services of British diplomacy.

This is his answer:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy? What has been British diplomacy to us, Sir. British diplomacy, so far as Canada is concerned, has been a record of failure, and of surrender and sacrifice.

And the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald), apparently, is approving of his leader's course while condemning hon. gentlemen on this side for statements very much milder in effect.

Now, it may be stated that the speech delivered in Boston was delivered at a time prior to an election in this country. That is true. But it was repeated in effect after that election was over, after the defeat of the Liberal party at the polls, when the present Prime Minister had plenty of time to weigh his words and the effect of them upon himself, his party and his country. Yet he rose in this House and repeated the declarations and absolutely gloried in them. And I state that, up to the present time, these expressions have never been repudiated or retracted. The hon. member for Pictou began his speech the other evening with a reflection upon a past leader of the Conservative party as being an annexationist. He had not the manliness to state whom he had in mind. Had he stated the name, then we should have known that the gentleman referred to was one who, as a young man and, long prior to his entering upon public life, had signed an annextion manifesto at a time when the relations between Canada and Downing Street were most strained and when there was great irritation in this country. Had the hon. member for Pictou desired to be fair, he would have gone on to tell us that, in another chamber of this parliament, that gentleman, after becoming a leader in public life, had risen in his place and frankly confessed his error, and stated that he and others had acted 'like a lot of angry school children,' but that he thought his life since then had surely more than counteracted that youthful indiscretion. Sir, the people of Canada can honour a man like that, who can acknowledge a fault. But the Prime Minister has never retracted his words. And we have a right to say that he could not retract them, because they express his sentiments to-day. He had it put up to him by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other night: 'Are these your sentiments still, Sir?' And, by his silence, the Prime Minister gave assent. Why are we accused and attacked by hon. gentlemen on the other side when we recall to the attention

of the House and the country, expressions which the Prime Minister openly made and which he has never retracted? The quarrel of these hon. gentlemen is with their leader, and not with the members of the Conservative party.

Why did not the Prime Minister himself attend the conference in Great Britain last year to which his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) went? Was it because he had already placed himself on record at the conference of 1907 as being entirely opposed to Canada contributing in any way, shape or form, towards the defence of the empire? Was it by reason of the fact that he had opposed the resolution introduced by the representative in that conference of Cape Colony, Dr. Smartt? That resolution has been referred to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), but I shall again recall it to the attention of the House in order to show that there was nothing in this resolution which the Prime Minister should have objected to, and more especially in view of what he is doing by this Bill for the construction of an independent Canadian navy. This was the resolution moved by Dr. Smartt:

That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures——

No infringement of autonomy.

—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

What was there in that resolution that the Prime Minister of Canada, the representative of Canada at that conference, should object to? Does it infringe on self-government in this country? Does it infringe upon that blessed 'autonomy' of which he is the only guardian according to his own expressions? It plainly states by 'local naval defence or such other services.' But the Prime Minister opposed that resolution. And it is by reason of that, I verily believe, that Germany has been going forward, in the belief that the colonies were not at the back of the motherland, carrying on her naval preparations, thinking that Great Britain stood alone. Dr. Smart, after discussing the question for some time, expressed great disappointment that the representative of Canada, the premier colony of the empire, should have taken such a strong stand in opposition to the resolution. He argued for it, and pleaded that it was nearly time we did something. He said:

I thought the wording of this resolution would have specially met your views, because towards the up-keep of the navy it may take the form either of a grant of money or the establishment of a local defence force or other services.

The reply was no argument. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

I have said all I have to say on the subject.

This was the curt reply. 'Well,' said Dr. Smartt, 'I think it is a great pity we do not pass something. We have done so much in the way of pious affirmation'—and we can see whom he had in his mind's eye when he used these words—'that I am anxious we should do something of a practical character.'

Was it because he was on record in that conference that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) refused to attend in person the conference of last year? In view of the stand he then took, and of the stand he has taken here, is it surprising that people view with suspicion and distrust the introduction of this Bill, fearing that it is designed, as some of his followers state, as another step towards the independence of Canada? The people may well be forgiven for their distrust in view of the Prime Minister's own statements.

We have been taunted with having diverse views on this question on this side. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have stated that they are going to hang together —instead of hanging individually, I presume. There is as much diversity of opinion on that side as there is on this; more correctly, there is as much opposition to the construction of a Canadian navy amongst members on the government side as there is on our side. But, of course, they will support the Bill. Oh, you may be sure they will support the government. They dare not do otherwise.

Mr. TOLMIE. Why not?

Mr. ROCHE. Why, because you have before you such examples as Mr. Bourassa, who, a few years ago, was the pride of the French Canadian Liberal wing in the province of Quebec, a man to whom they were looking forward as a great leader, but who, because he asserted his independence and read some well deserved lectures to his own party, has been politically ostracised. And there was Mr. Lavergne, the independent young member from Montmagny, who, before he took his place in this House, found on his desk a document he was asked to sign, to support the government, to be tied hand and foot before he even knew what measures he would be called upon to sup-

port; and, because he would not sign away his independence, he was driven from the ranks of hon. members opposite.

Mr. E. ROY. Will the hon. member (Mr. Roche) allow me a question? Does not he know that Mr. Lavergne chose not to run in the last Dominion election, but sought a seat in the local house?

Mr. ROCHE. I did not say it was in the last election. Mr. Lavergne himself is the authority for what I have just said. He used these expressions in this House and before his colleagues, and none of them denied the truth of what he said.

Mr. E. ROY. It was before he left the federal political arena.

Mr. ROCHE. Certainly, and how is he being treated by his friends? Are they giving him the glad hand? Is it not rather a back-handed way of treating an old political friend? But he is not the only one. There is Mr. Richardson, of Winnipeg, who was elected a member of this House in 1896, and who refused to support this government because they had gone back on their pledges to the people; he also has been driven into outer darkness, and is no more recognized amongst them. Then there was the late Mr. Tarte, a gentleman who, for speaking his own opinions, and holding his own convictions, for preaching what other gentlemen in the cabinet had been practising, was read out of the party; and others who had dared to assert their independence have been treated in the same way, as the serpent was hung up in the wilderness, as a warning to others who dare assert their independence in opposing this Bill. They know the punishment that will be meted out to them. Therefore, I say that the spoils of office have stronger cementing qualities than anything else. I do not think it lies in the mouth of those hon. gentlemen to reproach the members of this side of the House for having the manliness to give a free and untrammelled expression to their opinions, because our leader does not put into operation any gag law on this side of the House, there is room for a diversity of opinion on a great public question like this. But is there that harmony of views amongst our friends opposite that they wish us to believe exists? I think not. We have all read the published interview of Senator Domville, a Liberal, who has condemned in unmeasured terms the government proposition for the construction of a Canadian navy. Of course it may be said that he is beyond the reach of the hand of the Prime Minister. It does happen occasionally that when men get beyond this Chamber they assert their independence. Then we have read the published interview of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) who, if he has been correctly reported, and I presume he has been, has made declarations which show that he cannot be claimed as an enthusiastic supporter of the government's navy proposals. Why, Sir, read the speeches delivered in this House last session on the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto; especially read the speeches of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) of the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Warburton), of the member for Dorchester (Mr. Roy), of the member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte), and you will look in vain for that harmony of views which hon. gentlemen say prevails in their ranks. Some of the statements of these gentlemen have been referred to by my hon. friend from North Toronto. The member for the Yukon certainly made no pro-British speech in this House; we on this side thought he made an anti-British speech, he opposed a contribution towards the Canadian navy. These gentlemen little thought at that time that they would be called upon to support a Bill of this nature. The hon. member for the Yukon, speaking here last year, opposed any contribution. He said, even if the fleet of England were destroyed, Canada would not be in the slightest danger of any foreign aggression. Well, I refer him to the speech of the Prime Minister, his own leader, who stated, on the second reading of the Bill that our whole national existence depends on the supremacy of the British navy. Let these gentlemen get together and harmonize their views that are now so divergent. And still they reproach members on this side of the House with holding divergent views. And yet the hon. gentleman stated in the same breath that Germany's fleet was the outcome simply of her desire to found colonies for her surplus population. Where is she going to get those colonies? According to the authority I have quoted, she must found them on British territory, and this desire must inevitably lead to a clash between Germany and England. The hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., I believe, has occupied an honourable position in his own province, and I am sorry he has not taken a broader minded view of this question. He was not in sympathy with the resolution, and he instanced what we were doing in the way of national defence. He took the ground that when we were developing our own resources we were doing all that we should be called upon to do for imperial defence. He says:

> We are providing homes for the people of England, and relieving the congestion in that country.

Fancy, Doukhobors, Galicians and Poles come into Canada, and are treated in all respects on the same terms as the Englishman, and we are relieving the congestion

of those countries quite as much as we are of England, and therefore we are contributing in the same way to the defence of Russia, of Poland and of Austria, and all other countries from which we get a foreign population. We are allowing these foreigners to come into this country on exactly the same terms as the Englishman, all of them get 160 acres of land free, after performing settlement duties in exactly the same manner. The Englishman gets no preference over the foreigner in that respect. It is indeed a strange argument to contend that in thus allowing Englishmen to come into our country and relieve the congestion in Great Britain, we are discharging our national duty in the way of defence. Now, the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Roy) also stated that he was opposed to the construction of a Canadian navy; still he will vote for this Bill just the same. He spoke against the immediate construction of the Canadian navy, especially, he said, 'if it is intended to take part in England's wars.' I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will go down into the province of Quebec and tell the people that this navy is not intended to take part in England's wars, and in support of his position he will quote the expression of the Prime Minister, when he says that this navy will not go to war without the sanction and consent of the parliament of Canada, including the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. He will thus be able to argue that the navy will not take part in the wars of Great Britain, while the government supporters from Ontario will also quote from another speech of the Prime Minister on the second reading of the Bill when he said that when England is at war Canada is at war.

Mr. E. ROY. Does the hon. gentleman say that I was opposed last year to the construction of a Canadian navy?

Mr. ROCHE. I said the member for Dorchester; I presume the hon. gentleman is the member for Dorchester. I read the hon. gentleman's speech carefully, and I think if he reviews his own speech he will find that he spoke against the immediate construction of a navy for Canada, and especially, he said, 'if it was intended to take part in England's wars.'

Mr. E. ROY. I do not think the hon. gentleman has carefully read my speech.

Mr. ROCHE. The hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte) also reflected upon those who are in favour of contributing to the British navy, or who were in favour of taking any part at all in the defence of the empire. That hon. gentleman, speaking against the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto, says:

> Instead of sacrificing millions in the construction of battleships and arming our coasts—

For what purpose?

> —to flatter the imperialistic propensities of those whose erroneous patriotic ideas have misled them, provision should be made to ensure the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

Here is another gentleman who talks of the development of the resources of Canada as a discharge in full of our national obligations to the empire. This hon. gentleman, like the others, will line up and vote for this Bill for the construction of a Canadian navy, to take part, according to some hon. members, in England's wars, but according to other members, and according to the premier, not to take part in any of England's wars without the sanction of parliament. And these are the gentlemen who rise in parliament and cast aspersions upon hon. members on this side of the House for want of harmony in their views, and in face of their contrary pronouncements of last year, they now come forward and actually glory in their subserviency. These gentlemen take the position that because we are engaged in our own domestic affairs, and building public works, we should be exonerated from contributing to imperial defence. They put me in mind of a little clipping that I saw in a Liberal newspaper. I would like to call the attention to it of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), who referred to members on our side of the House the other night as Little Canadians. This is what the paper stated:

> While Britain is building Dreadnoughts, Canada is providing the sinews of war, food for the men whose physique, pluck and stamina energize these floating battlements. While others do the fighting, let Canada do the feeding.

This is the little Canadianism that I refer to the hon. member for Red Deer. He is quite willing, as one of these little Canadians, to stay at home and let Britain's sons from all the other colonies and from the motherland fight all the other nations of the world in defence of the empire, while Canadians stay at home, grow wheat and sell it at war prices. That is his idea of the status of a Canadian.

I would like to ask if this present policy is designed to materially enhance the fighting strength of the British navy? If it is not, then it is absolutely useless as a fighting force in the interest of the defence of the empire. So long as Britain's fleet remains supreme, so long as she maintains a two-power standard, so long as she is overwhelmingly superior to her foes, as she has been in the past, so long Canada will be immune from attack, because the respect that is paid to the Union Jack

when it floats over the battleships of the British fleet will be a protection for Canada and she will need no other defence. I do not know whether it has been settled or not, but up to the present we have not learned what flag is going to float over our Canadian navy, whether it is to be the Union Jack or the Canadian flag. This has been kept in the background and probably for a very good purpose. While the British navy remains supreme that is a sufficient protection for Canada, and it has been so up to the present time, but should that navy be defeated, where, I ask, would we look for support and protection? Our present duty is to strengthen the British navy in our own self-defence and not to do so, in my humble judgment, would be unwise and unpardonable. The right hon. Prime Minister has practically confessed that he cannot give an accurate estimate as to when this navy will be provided. He did hazard a guess on the second reading of the Bill when he said that within a year he thought that docks should be constructed and within five years the navy. But, if the right hon. gentleman's estimate in regard to this is no more nearly accurate than was his estimate as to when the National Transcontinental railway would be constructed, and especially as to its cost, I think we can quite readily come to the conclusion that were his estimate doubled it would be well within the mark. We have no docks, no ships, no men to man them, no officers, no training schools, no equipment, and it takes years to secure these, and in the meantime should an emergency arise where is Canada going to be? The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) stated at the imperial conference that the supreme consideration was the constitutional freedom of the state to which all questions of strategy, no matter how important, must be subordinated. I ask, where would our boasted freedom of state be were the British fleet swept off the seas?—a not impossible contingency. Where would we get our freedom then? The Minister of Militia and Defence might get down upon the Atlantic shore and his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, on the Pacific with the most powerful megaphones and sing out to the enemy, many miles off, that word, 'autonomy,' 'autonomy,' until they were black in the face, and it would not be as much protection as our dinky little navy that we are going to construct under this Bill. If the Canadian navy is intended to be of any assistance to the British navy why does it not include a first-class battleship, a Dreadnought, such as Australia is providing, notwithstanding what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says about the Indomitable class, which is practically a Dreadnought. Why have we not contributed a Dreadnought to the fleet the same as New Zealand has? The nations of the earth are actually rebuilding their fleets in order to include vessels of the Dreadnought class in them. A modern fleet which is without a Dreadnought is practically useless as a fighting force. Any modern battleship of the Dreadnought class, on our Atlantic or Pacific shore, would send our navy to the bottom of the sea without coming within the range of the guns of our fleet. The question, in my opinion, is: Does Canada desire to be an integral portion of the British empire, and, if so, is she willing to undertake the responsibility for her share of the national defence? If we refuse I think we are neglecting our own duty and that we ought to be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves. I have referred to the character of the vessels required, and I will quote what has been already quoted from the words of a gentleman who was formerly First Lord of the Admiralty. Lord Selborne, speaking with regard to the character of the battleships required, said:

> The sea is one and the British navy must be all one. If the idea should unfortunately prevail that the problem is one of local defence, and that each part of the empire can be content to have its allotment of ships for the purpose of the separate protection of an individual spot, the only possible result would be that an enemy who has discarded this heresy and combined his fleets will attack in detail and destroy these separate British squadrons, which united could have defied defeat.

This was not the expression of a politician, but of the First Lord of the Admiralty in reference to the concentration of the fleet in time of war instead of having it separated as proposed by this Bill. Again I quote Mr. McKenna, the present First Lord of the Admiralty. Speaking in the British House of Commons on March 16, he is reported as follows:

> There will come a day when, by an almost automatic process, all ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnought will be relegated to the scrap heap. The maintenance of our superiority then will depend upon our superiority in Dreadnought class alone——

Not any second-class cruisers that are made to elude the pursuit of the enemy.

> The German power of constructing this particular type of vessel is at this time almost, if not fully, equal to our own, owing to their rapid development within the past eighteen months.

Again, Sir Edward Grey, the Foreign Secretary in Mr. Asquith's government, speaking on this same question, said:

When the German programme is completed Germany will have a fleet of 33 Dreadnoughts. That fleet will be the most powerful the world has ever seen. This imposes upon us the necessity of rebuilding the whole of the fleet. That is the situation. If we were to fall into a position of inferiority we should cease to count for anything amongst the nations of Europe and we should be fortunate if our liberty were left, and we did not become the conscript appendage of some stronger power. That is a brutal way of stating the case; but it is the truth.

These are the words not of a jingo, but of Sir Edward Grey the present Foreign Secretary, which practically in effect were repeated by Mr. Asquith who described the situation as:

Most grave, and to us not only unforeseen, but unexpected.

I think that is proof that a fleet without a Dreadnought is practically useless and that it is not an addition to the war strength of the navy in time of war. The hon. Postmaster General delivered an eloquent speech the other day which we all very much admired as far as its eloquence was concerned, but which contained a goodly number of misrepresentations. That hon. gentleman, swelling himself, said: This is the third occasion upon which Canada is rushing to the support of the motherland. The first was in the tariff of 1897, brought down to this House, in which we gave a British preference, the second was when we sent our troops to South Africa, and the third was when we brought down this navy Bill. Let us deal with these seriatim. In the first place I challenge the hon. gentleman to show one expression in the tariff of 1897 that gave a preference to Great Britain. That tariff contained a reciprocal clause, but while the hon. gentleman was not a member of the government, although a member of the House, the present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and his colleagues took particular pains to explain to the members of the House that any nation in the world might have the advantage of that reciprocal clause. It was pointed out by every hon. gentleman on this side of the House that it would be impossible to grant a British preference under that provision of the Tariff Act. But hon. gentlemen opposite knew it all and it was not until British diplomacy, which in years gone by was ridiculed so much by the Prime Minister, had helped them out of the hole into which their blundering legislation had got them, that they were enabled later on to give a British preference. So that, the hon. Postmaster General was not accurate when he said that in 1897 they gave a British preference. But was it the preference which had been promised the people by the right hon. Prime Minister? I have here the London speech of the Prime Minister in which he told the electors that he was just as much in favour of a preference as was Sir Charles Tupper. He stated that one of the first things he would do when returned to power would be to send a commission to England to negotiate a mutual preferential treaty, but within forty-eight hours after he landed in England he broke faith with the people of Canada and he advised the English people not to grant us a preference, and not to have anything to do with the obnoxious policy of protection which was the curse of Canada, but which by the way he has retained as a principle of his fiscal policy down to the present hour. I say he betrayed the people of Canada; I say that any one who acted as he did in the ordinary business relations of life, would be found guilty of false pretenses, in that the right hon. gentleman secured the support of the people of Canada on his pledge of preferential trade, which on being returned to power he absolutely repudiated. The Postmaster General must think that the people of Canada are blest with a very short memory when he claims credit to this government for sending Canadian troops to South Africa. We do not forget the Prime Minister's Chicago interview in which he stated that the Militia Act would not permit Canada to send volunteers beyond the confines of our own country, that the constitution would not permit it, that there was no appropriation, and that parliament would have to be called. We do not forget the interviews and editorials in the Toronto 'Globe' to the same effect. We do not forget that a colleague of the Prime Minister stated in the province of Quebec that not a man and not a gun would be sent by the Canadian government to assist the motherland in South Africa. We do not forget that Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Conservative party, wired Sir Wilfrid Laurier, pledging him the support of the Conservative party if he sent the troops to South Africa, nor do we forget that in reply to the telegrams of the Montreal Star ' sent to the mayors of every city, town and village the universal response came back: Send our boys to the front. We know that it was only when forced by overwhelming public opinion that the Prime Minister yielded and that Canada was able to participate with England in that campaign. We know that then the Prime Minister went down to the province of Quebec and that he practically apologized for permitting Canadians to enlist and fight in the British army. We had Mr. Bourassa, when a Liberal in the House, telling the whole story of that war some years ago, and the character of the campaign that was carried on in Quebec. Mr. Bourassa told us that there was a large section of Quebec opposed to the sending of

Canadians to South Africa, and he said that the campaigners in Quebec in order to make it as easy as possible for the government used this argument: First, they contended that the Boer war was indefensible; second, that Canada should not have participated in it; and third—and this is the excuse they gave—Sir Wilfrid Laurier was forced into it by the fanaticism of a united English-speaking population. And, in the face of this, the Postmaster General, has told us that out of the fullness of her heart Canada voluntarily sent her troops to fight the battles of the motherland in South Africa. It reminds me of that somewhat egotistical expression of the Prime Minister when he told us that he went to bed one night leaving Canada a mere blot on the map and he woke up in the morning and lo and behold, Canada was a nation, and: 'I did it'. What a personification of modesty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not prepared any typewritten peroration, such as we listened to this afternoon. I simply desire to say in plain words that I am going to oppose this Bill, first, because it provides for an independent Canadian navy which will have no association whatever with the empire fleet. It is not a unit of the British fleet such as Australia has, and I was surprised to hear the Prime Minister say, far from frankly, and wrongly stating the facts in regard to the Australian fleet, that Australia instead of giving a contribution to England of one million dollars for the upkeep of the British navy, as she formerly did, had now reversed her policy, and had come to Canada's way of thinking, and would do as Canada was doing. Australia is doing nothing of the kind. True it is, that Australia had been contributing for years to the upkeep of the British navy, as had the other colonies, and in 1907 she had increased her grant, but at the recent imperial conference Australia took the advice of the admiralty and is now constructing under that advice, an Australian unit of the British navy, which Canada is not doing. And why is England contributing to Australia's navy? It is because she is going to get something in return that will be of service in time of war. And if Canada had taken the advice of the admiralty and had done as Australia is doing, England would also have contributed to the Canadian navy a million dollars just as she is contributing to the Australian navy, which will be of some service to Britain in time of war. Then, the Prime Minister has told us that this is not a new policy of his, but that it has been before the country for the last eight years. He bases that assertion on what Dr. Smartt, of Cape Colony, called a pious affirmation by the Prime Minister, in 1902, that Canada was willing to take into its consideration the idea of some kind of

naval defence in the future. And mind you, that pious affirmation was made when, in 1902, the other colonies were giving fifty thousand pounds, and a hundred thousand pounds, and two hundred thousand pounds to the upkeep of the British navy, and when Canada was lagging behind just as she has been lagging behind ever since this government came to power in everything that appertains to contributing to the defence of the empire. But, even if the Prime Minister did make that declaration eight years ago, up to the present hour he has not lifted his little finger to implement it by practical legislation. It is ridiculous to claim that this is a new policy; it is not treating with sufficient respect the intelligence of the members of this House and the people of the country for the right hon. gentleman to make such a claim. And, Mr. Speaker, I object to this proposal, not only because it is not a unit of the British navy, but because its cost will be enormous, and in time of war it will be utterly useless. The initial expenditure will not be eleven millions dollars as stated by the hon. member for Pictou, because according to the statement made by the Prime Minister, if it is built in Canada thirty per cent will have to be added, and that will bring the initial cost to fifteen or sixteen million dollars. Its upkeep will be twice what it was represented to be, and in the end the navy will be of no benefit to the empire. The people of Canada have never had an opportunity of pronouncing an opinion upon this policy, and I am democratic enough to believe that such an opportunity should be afforded. We know that the Prime Minister, in days gone by, claimed to be a democrat to the hilt, but he has singularly changed his character in that respect. He once sneered at empty baubles and glittering titles, which appealed to men of less noble mind, but he soon changed his mind, and the excuse he gave was that Her late Majesty, Queen Victoria, had actually thrust a knighthood upon him that he could not refuse—another exemplification of his modesty. I am sufficient of a democrat to desire that before engaging in this permanent policy, which certainly can be of no help to the motherland for five years, and perhaps for ten years, if at all, the people of the country should have the opportunity of passing judgment upon it. I shall, therefore, support the amendment of the leader of the opposition for a direct contribution to purchase two Dreadnoughts, or the equivalent, according to the best expert opinion of the British admiralty. Again, the hon. member for Pictou reflected on that. We are going to send them any place the admiralty desires in time of war. Yes, we have sufficient confidence in the British admiralty—far more than we have in this government—to believe that they

will utilize their war fleet where it will reach the most vulnerable point and best protect and safeguard our interests. For this reason, I shall oppose the Bill and support the resolution in amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, with the firm belief that in doing so, I am voicing the consensus of opinion in my own constituency at least.

Mr. SEALEY. In view of the resolution unanimously passed by this House on the 29th March last, and in view of the newspaper discussion throughout Canada since then, as well as the discussions by public men in the meantime, it would seem to me that the time has arrived when Canada should make a beginning in the establishment of a Canadian navy. We have heard a good deal about our duty to the empire and loyalty to the King, but, personally, I have every confidence in the thorough loyalty of every Canadian to the empire and the King, to the last dollar and the last man. The only difference of opinion seems to be as to how we can best put that loyalty into actual and useful practice. For that purpose, we have three propositions before us. We have the Bill of the government proposing the construction of the Canadian navy, out of Canadian material, by Canadian workmen, in Canada and owned entirely by Canada. Then we have the amendment of the leader of the opposition, proposing a contribution of either two Dreadnoughts or $25,000,000, and a plebiscite to decide whether we should do anything further or not, and we have the further amendment proposing that we should do nothing. As between the three I favour the first—a Canadian navy, built in Canada out of Canadian material by Canadian workmen.

As the trend of the discussion generally has largely had to do with the attitude of Germany, so without repetition I might occupy the time of the House a few minutes in saying something about Canada and on behalf of Canada's interests in what we propose doing. The construction of a navy in Canada would do many things for this country. It would not only be in the best interests of Canada but of the empire as well, whereas a contribution of money would merely mean the expenditure of it by Britain and the incurring of that much additional debt by this country, because I do not suppose we have $25,000,000 surplus not in use to contribute. We would not be giving any immediate benefit to the British navy, because to-day the British navy yards have orders for future delivery more than they can fulfil, and are taxed to their utmost. Consequently to increase the British navy faster than it is being increased, we must have additional shipyards, and personally I would prefer to have those additional shipyards in Canada. A few days ago we learnt by the daily newspapers as well as quotations in this House that, to the credit of Australia, her first born had been launched in England and christened the 'Paramatta' by Mrs. Asquith. Personally, I would prefer seeing Canada's first born launched in Canada and christened the 'St. Lawrence' by Lady Laurier. I believe that by the construction of a navy in Canada we would not only be doing our duty by the empire, but by Canada as well, and we would add to Canada's prosperity along commercial lines as well as naval and military lines. This Bill provides for the construction of a Canadian navy, composed of four ships of the Bristol type, one Boadicea and six destroyers, the construction to be completed within the next four years at an expenditure of $12,000,000, or an average of $3,000,000 per year. The first $3,000,000 would of necessity require to be expended in the construction of dry docks and shipyards, and I believe that, apart from the question of the navy, it would be worth $3,000,000 to have those dry docks and shipyards constructed in Canada. A few months ago, when the Empress of Ireland became disabled and a notice came by wireless telegraphy, her owners arranged to send her around to New York to be repaired, because we had no accommodation in Canada for vessels of that size. In my opinion our trade and commerce, and our merchant marine are too important to remain longer in that condition, so that I believe that, irrespective of the navy, we should do something to secure in Canada facilities for the construction and repairs of our merchant marine, so that this first year's experience would be of the greatest possible benefit to Canadian commerce. If at the end of the first year, we have these dry docks and shipyards constructed, we shall have good results for Canadian trade and commerce apart altogether from the standpoint of a Canadian navy.

The second year we would require to go largely into the equipment of our navy yards with drills, punches, trip hammers and all that sort of thing. Our iron and steel companies would require to instal in their plants rolls, not for turning out steel rails, but for turning out ship plates, and every machine shop and factory in general would require to prepare for turning out the various requirements of a navy yard, because as I understand it, the intention is not merely that the parts be built in Britain and assembled in Canada, but that they be constructed in Canada as well as put together there. What a stimulus that would be to the various industries, machine shops and other concerns providing the necessaries for the equipment of our navy yards. That alone would be worth another $3,000,000 to Canada. And I believe that at the end of the second year, even though we had not a battleship constructed, we

would still have good value for our money in the benefit derived by our commercial marine from that expenditure.

The third year, the expenditure of the next $3,000,000 would go into construction; and if in that construction, we inaugurated a new era of ship building in Canada on steel lines, that would ultimately lead to our recapturing the position we occupied in the old days of the wooden ships. That, I think, would be well worth the $3,000,000. So far as the raw material is concerned, according to the reports of the Conservation Commission of Canada, as well as other information, we have abundance of iron and steel in Canada, and all we require is the plant to put that abundance to profitable use. For that reason it only requires some act to stimulate and develop it to reinstate our ship building industry until it occupies the same place as the building of wooden ships in Canada in the old days. If we had that, we would have splendid value for our $3,000,000 expenditure, when, on the expiration of the fourth year, if our expectations are realized, we will not only have a navy composed of four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers, but we will have expended $12,000,000 in establishing and in encouraging an industry that we so greatly need in Canada, and in addition to that we will have had an expenditure made in Canada for wages, materials, &c., in the actual construction as well as the allied industries which, on an average, would give a profit to the Canadian people of 25 per cent. So I believe in the organization and encouragement of that industry we would have splendid value for our money in addition to having the foundation for a fairly satisfactory navy.

I have compared these vessels with the vessels of the British navy, and while they have been characterized as a tin-pot navy and tin-pot vessels, I notice that the British navy is made up very largely of the same kind of vessels. If our four Bristols are tin-pots, Britain has 60 or 70 tin-pots of that same type in her navy. If our Boadicea is a tin-pot she has 71 of the same class. If our destroyers are tin-pots, she has 152 of that class, and it would seem that, outside of the advantage of the additional numbers, her eight Dreadnoughts would be about the only superiority of the British navy as compared with the Canadian navy. For that reason I think the Canadian navy will be a credit to Canada and of great value to the empire generally. I do hope that the argument which has been advanced that we could not construct a navy in Canada, that we have not the men and have not the ability, is advanced merely for argument's sake, and is not seriously held by any people in Canada. In entering the library of parliament we pass a tablet:

To the honour of the men who constructed the Royal William, the first vessel to cross the Atlantic in her own steam in 1833.

That inscription is evidence that in the early days we were the pioneers in the construction of steam vessels crossing the ocean, and if we bred the people who were in advance and leaders at that time, I think we can do it again. Mr. Samuel Cunard, afterwards head of the famous Cunard line, was associated with the construction of the 'Royal William,' although he afterwards went to the United States to seek a larger sphere for the exercise of his abilities. We have further evidence as to the ability of Canada compared not only with the remainder of the empire, but with the world, even in the matter of the South African contingent. The South African contingent, according to newspaper report and according to the reports and records of the officers and men who were there, seemed to have displayed the greatest ability and to have struck more terror into the enemy than any other body of the same number of men or even of two or three times the number; in fact, it is said that the appearance of the Canadian contingent close to the enemy's front was what finally prompted them to capitulate. That being the case, we certainly have the men here who are able in military matters to rank with the men of the British empire and the rest of the world, and I believe that with a little practice our people would rank equally high in naval matters. I am satisfied that the Canadian contingents in South Africa were worth to the British empire ten times what they cost in money, and I believe that the admiralty will value a Canadian navy at a cost of $12,000,000 ten times more than they would a contribution of $25,000,000 and nothing else. I believe that with the establishment of a Canadian navy and with the class of men we have in Canada and with the training that the Canadian government will give them, the whole of the empire will be infinitely better pleased than they would be with a mere contribution.

The importance of the Canadian fleet from the standpoint of the protection of our ocean borne commerce and the policing of our shores must not be overlooked. In Canada we are finding it necessary to increase our police protection not only in the centres of population, but in the rural districts as well. In my own county we have recently decided to establish a thorough system owing to certain cases of lawlessness that occurred. The products of Canada, not only of an agricultural but of all other classes, are protected during their production and transportation to the sea-board by the police, and in case of necessity by the militia of Canada. Once these products reach the sea-board, they are placed on

ocean-going ships and are subject to any chance or mishap that may occur. As we have protected our products within Canada, the general consensus of opinion would seem to be that we should do something of the same kind from a naval standpoint.

I said that the 'Royal William' was built in Canada and that we had reason to feel that we could, with perhaps some instruction and assistance at the outset, achieve similar success in modern naval construction. One evidence of that is that Sir Edward Douglas, a Canadian, is in charge of the construction of the Japanese navy which is expected to be most up-to-date.

Another evidence of our ability would be the Canadian construction of the Ross rifle which has proven superior to all rifles throughout the empire, and is likely to be adopted by the imperial government, and I believe with a fair chance our success in naval construction would be equally satisfactory. From a commercial standpoint—and that side of the question has not been much touched upon—the expenditure of $12,000,000 would seem quite an amount. Yet, considering that it would mean the employment of an average of 3,000 people during this naval construction, it would increase our population by 3,000 heads of families, or, perhaps, 15,000 people. For, if people now in Canada are employed in naval construction, the places they now occupy will require to be filled by others. Consequently, this naval construction would stimulate immigration and increase population in Canada. And the people would have to be provided for in Canada. A population of 15,000 would consume products from Canadian agriculturists and manufacturers—largely agriculturists—to the amount of from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 a year. We should in that way provide a home market for this additional amount of Canadian products during the construction. That would probably be equal to the results we shall receive from the French trade stimulated as a result of the negotiations during the past two years for better trade relations with that country. For, up to the present time, our trade with France has only amounted to about $1,250,000 a year. We have worried a great deal about our trade with Germany and about the German surtax. But our trade with Germany has amounted to only about $2,000,000 or $2,250,000 a year. So, Germany and France together have given us a trade of less than $4,000,000. The providing of a home market for between $2,000,000 and $3,000,000 of our product, would, I believe, be more profitable to the people of Canada than both the French and German trade combined. While I appreciate the advantage of these treaties, I am satisfied that the home market for one-half the amount of this foreign trade would be about as profitable, if not more so. And from an agricultural standpoint, I think it would be fair to assume that the agriculturists will have to contribute by way of revenue to a considerable amount of our naval requirements, because it is announced that the expenditure of $12,000,000—at the rate of $3,000,000 a year—is to be paid out of current income. That being the case, I think it would perhaps be fair for us to consider for a moment how we could make that as easy as possible upon the agricultural interests of the country and upon the people generally. And I venture the suggestion that, by a stroke of the pen, if my trade and commerce calculations are right, that could be done at once. We exported from Canada 800,000 cords of pulpwood for the year ending the 31st March, 1909, according to the trade and commerce returns. We received, according to these same returns, less than $4,500,000 for this pulpwood, or an average of about $5.50 per cord. After the purchasers outside of Canada had received that pulpwood they expended on it not $4,500,000, but a further sum of $34 per cord, or $26,200,000, to convert the pulpwood into the finished product. I have given some attention to how that expenditure was made. I find that half of it, or over $13,000,000, was expended for direct labour, which is equivalent to the employment of 15,000 people all the year round at an average of $3 a day. That 15,000, as heads of families, would represent 75,000 of a population. Over $13,000,000 was expended also in machinery, other materials, buildings, &c., and of this amount also fully one-half or about $7,000,000 went into direct labour. This would provide similar wages for 7,000 people, representing a further population of 35,000. If our conditions remained as they are to-day and provision were made for turning that pulpwood into the finished product here in Canada, it would mean an increase in our population of 110,000, or at the very least, 100,000. That population would require a supply of $10,000,000 a year, so that we should provide a home market for that amount of additional product, largely along agricultural lines. And an expenditure of $26,000,000, such as was made on this pulpwood, could not possibly be made without leaving a profit to the artisans, merchants and others, including farmers, of 20 per cent or upwards of $5,000,000. In that way we could provide for an expenditure of $3,000,000 on our naval construction, and also provide for the upkeep, which, I understand, will amount to from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. And the upkeep, of the navy will also create a considerable increase of demand for our home products. If I understand aright, there are to be about 1,500 naval officers and men to man the navy. In that way, it seems

to me our expenditure could be met, and Canada could be furnished with a navy, or, at least, a very good beginning of a navy, consisting of up to date vessels, without putting a heavy burden upon any person. In fact, so slight will be the burden if we adopt these other methods I have referred to, that, I believe, it could be borne with very little inconvenience. And, while things were pretty good, in fact splendid, along agricultural lines at the present time, I believe that, as 'preparation for war is the best guarantee of peace,' so, in matters of trade, I believe that in good times it is good policy to prepare for bad times. And I believe that the better we are prepared for bad times, the less bad times we shall have. Though there might be some objection at present, to raising the tariff on agricultural products, I do not think the tariff has very much bearing to the consumers on prices at the present time for it does help the producers. But, I think it would be a good thing for us to provide for dull times—not that they are likely to occur in Canada, but they will occur in other countries which will then try to dump their products into Canada in unfair competition with our own, and if we provide at the present time, when, perhaps, there is not so much need for it, for the difficult times that overtake the world generally, which we in Canada, I believe, will feel much less than the average country, but which, with proper precautions, I believe we can provide against feeling at all.

Returning to the construction of the navy, I believe in that construction being made in Canada—not merely assembling the work here, but rolling our plates here, and making the nickel steel that goes into these armoured cruisers and converting it into armour plate here. I believe that the concern undertaking the construction of the navy for $12,000,000 will spend $25,000,000 in providing materials and plant. I do not mean to say that they will expend $25,000,000 and sell the product at $12,000,000. But foreseeing the establishment of a merchant marine ports in Canada, they will build their plant and equipment accordingly, and will spend by way of starting that industry in Canada at least $25,000,000 before the $12,000,000 worth of war vessels is built. That will stimulate the construction of a merchant marine, and establish a shipbuilding industry in Canada upon quite an extensive scale. From some newspaper reports I have seen, and from remarks I have heard on the floor of the House, it is expected that a British company will get the order for building the navy, but it is yet uncertain whether they will do a large part of the work here, or merely assemble here, after building the docks. But I think by the time the government advertises for bids for the construction and delivery of this navy, they will have a bid from a concern entirely Canadian, who will be able to do the work at least as low as any other company. Of course the government will accept the lowest tender, and if a British firm chances to be the lowest, the government will oblige this firm to submit to the same conditions of construction and equipment in Canada as they would a Canadian firm.

Now, as to whether a Canadian navy will be an assistance to the British navy and of assistance to the empire, we have to remember what was said by the Prime Minister on the introduction of the Bill, that when England is at war, Canada is at war. I think that declaration should be sufficient evidence and guarantee that there will be no hesitation in placing the fleet at the command of the British admiralty in case of war. In keeping the navy under the control of the Canadian parliament, we are simply following the precedent of Australia and of other countries. You might as well say that our militia should be at the beck and call of Lord Roberts, as to say that our navy should be at the beck and call of the British admiralty. That is not practicable in time of peace, but in time of war it will be so. As to whether a contribution of $25,000,000 will be of more assistance to the empire than a $12,000,000 navy, I think we can consider what took place in the Russo-Japanese war. We are told that the Russian money chests were filled with gold, but their gold availed them very little when they met the war vessels of Japan on the open sea. Neither $25,000,000 of Canadian money, or Canadian notes, or promises to pay at some future day, would be of any advantage to the British admiralty, but a Canadian fleet, I am satisfied, would be of infinitely more advantage. I am satisfied that a Canadian navy, acting in conjunction with other fleets of the empire, will be of infinitely more value to the empire than any cash contribution we can make.

Now, I think, Sir, that every member of this House has a right to his own opinion, and I am going to express mine. We have heard a great deal said in this House about the German menace and the German war scare for months back. Personally, I have no faith in the German scare. I think it has been largely got up by the dukes and lords, and perhaps by the British admiralty. The dukes and lords have been inclined to champion unsound doctrines, they own the greater part of the land of Britain, and have been endeavouring year after year to shunt their responsibilities off on people who have much less; and now, when the dukes, and lords, and landowners are likely to be called upon to pay their fair share, they have created the German scare, in order to induce the colonies to contribute and relieve them of a part of their burden. However that may

be, I think the proposition contained in the Bill before the House is infinitely better than any other proposition that has been made. I think also that it will give an impetus to our merchant marine, and will make it a great credit to Canada. To-day, notwithstanding that our trade and commerce are growing so rapidly, only ten per cent of it is carried in Canadian bottoms. I think a country that is situated as ours is, with extensive coasts on two oceans, and an export trade that must be done almost entirely by water, we should do something to increase our shipbuilding industry, so that instead of ten per cent of our commerce being carried in Canadian bottoms, fifty per cent of it will be carried in Canadian bottoms before the expiration of the next ten years. I think also that a Canadian navy, in case a difficulty really were to arise—and I do not think there is any more probability of difficulty arising between Canada and any other nation than there is between Germany and England—but I say if difficulty really were to arise a Canadian navy would be a great assistance to the British navy and an effective support of our militia on land. With the construction of the new Weland canal to a depth of 27 feet from Hamilton to Selkirk on Lake Erie, 40 miles distant from the international boundary, and with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal our navy could pass up into the interior of Canada entirely on Canadian waters, and a Canadian navy could co-operate in case of emergency with our Canadian militia to much better advantage than two Dreadnoughts in England could possibly do. In comparing our position, and the position of our navy with that of Australia, I can only say that, from the remarks I have heard and from the newspaper comments I have read, I would much prefer the position of Canada, owning her own navy, built by herself, to the position of the Australian navy, to which the British government contributes.

While perhaps it has not been said in so many words, it has been said in substance that it is necessary, in order to show our loyalty to Britain, to contribute $25,000,000 in money. I think Britain has every confidence in the loyalty of Canada. Canada is loyal to the last man and the last dollar. It is entirely unnecessary to demonstrate our loyalty by a contribution of $25,000,000; in fact, there is no question about our loyalty except as it is raised occasionally for party advantage. Our trained men would be of equal advantage in case of a naval difficulty to Great Britain as our contingents were in South Africa. To question our loyalty and to read quotations in support of such argument is, to my mind, a mere juggling with words and has no real substance or meaning. The insinuations in respect to Canada's tin pot navy are as unfair to Great Britain as they are to Canada because our navy, except in minor particulars, will be on exactly the same plan and basis as the British navy. Therefore, if we speak about Canada's tin pot navy, we have to say that Britain has a tin pot navy also with the exception of her eight Dreadnoughts. There is no reason why we should not excel as Canadians in the construction of naval vessels and vessels of the merchant marine. We have excelled along military lines wherever we have come in competition with military men of other portions of the empire. At Bisley we have not only carried off our fair average share of honors, but for a number of years past we have carried off very much more than our share; in fact, it is said that we have carried off nearly fifty per cent of the honors that are granted at these great meets of the empire's military men. In South Africa our contingents won distinction by their conduct on the field of battle. In the construction of the Ross rifle we have certainly carried off honors in being able to construct military weapons on a small scale, and I believe that if we only have courage we will be able to engage in naval construction with equal success. The cost cannot be so very great if at present our military expenditure only represents eighty cents per head. The naval cost is estimated at forty-five cents per head only for the completion of the vessels which, with interest on construction and maintenance, will make a total of $1.25 per head. It would not seem to represent a very large increase in the expenditure and over rapid increase in population will in all probability by that time, not increase the per capita cost above the present 80 cents. But I believe that when we are expending eighty cents to see our products safely to the ocean ports we can afford to make a further expenditure for insurance on the high seas, even on commercial lines, of forty-five cents in order that our products may reach their destination without interruption. If we are going to be the granary of the empire in years to come it is necessary that we should have some naval defence for our coast. While not a military expert I have frequently paid visits to navy yards and know something of their equipment and methods, I may say that in actual warfare it is not expected that merchant marine can be protected by naval vessels during the whole course of the Atlantic voyage. If we had two Dreadnoughts placed at our disposal in the English channel they could not possibly be trusted to come out to Canada to escort our commerce over because they would require very considerable protection themselves. Therefore, two

Dreadnoughts from the Canadian standpoint for coastal protection would be white elephants on our hands. A navy such as that proposed consisting of four Bristols, one Boadicea and six destroyers is certainly the most practical and useful from the Canadian standpoint, and for these and many other reasons I propose to support the Bill now before the House for the establishment of a Canadian navy.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to weary the House by giving long extracts from the opinions of naval experts in order to crowd the pages of 'Hansard' with matter that is already on record. But, after listening carefully to the speeches which have been delivered on both sides of the House I propose to give some reasons, why, in my opinion, we should oppose this Bill and vote for the resolution introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). In reference to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sealey) I can only say that he has made one of the strongest appeals apparently that could be made to the government benches, namely, the appeal of the loaves and fishes. He has told them how the money will be expended in Canada, and how they will reap direct personal benefit from the expenditure of that money. That may appeal to a certain number of people, but I do not believe that the great Canadian people as a whole can be appealed to by an argument of that kind. As it seems apparent that no speech on the naval question can be made without reference to that great historcal character, Peter the Hermit, I shall commence by referring to what was said by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Referring to that character, he spoke of his wonderful ambition and eloquence and he reminded us that by means of that eloquence he had been enabled to gather together a large army of men in order that they might rescue from desecration by the Mohammedans the tomb of our Saviour. It proved, however, to be a failure. The reason of the failure was the lack of discipline, training and unity. But the right hon. gentleman failed to apply that to himself when he told us, with wonderful eloquence, of all the glories of the British empire. But, in the next breath he stated that in his opinion we could better aid the empire by having a navy of our own; in other words, that if we in this country undertook to have a navy separate from that of the empire it would end just as the great army of Peter the Hermit ended in disastrous failure. Again, I find that the leader of the government quoted with great favour from the poet:

Daughter am I in my mother's house
But mistress in my own.
The gates are mine to open
As the gates are mine to close.

But, Sir, I ask what would be thought of the daughter nursed at the mother's breast, nurtured in a mother's arms, shielded and protected by a mother's love and strength, until her house was thoroughly established and her children had grown into manhood and womanhood. Then, when the mother felt she was justified in asking the daughter's aid in protecting her own and her daughter's home, she should shut the gates in her mother's face. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would be thought of such a daughter? Yet, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. First Minister said he could conceive of such a case. I confess, I cannot. He said, page 3044, 'Hansard':

If Britain is at war, we are at war and liable to attack. I do not say that we shall always be attacked, neither do I say that we would take part in all the wars of England. That is a matter that must be guided by circumstances, upon which the Canadian parliament will look to pronounce and will have to decide in its own best judgment.

But, Mr. Speaker, he went further. He proceeded to give an illustration in which he, by inference, said he would not hesitate to 'shut the gate' in the mother's face. He referred to the history of the Crimean war, and these are his words:

I would hesitate very much before I would give my consent that we should take part in any such war.

But he piously added:

The conditions are not the same now as they were then; we have British Columbia to look after.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, how the right hon. the leader of the government proposes to look after the province of British Columbia? The British admiralty asked that there should be a Canadian unit placed on the Pacific to co-operate and work in unison with the China unit and the India unit, so that the empire might be safe-guarded on the Pacific. But what was the answer of the delegates sent from this government, and of the leader of the government himself? They said: We are unable to do that; we are not satisfied to be incorporated in that manner. Not only is that his policy as set forth by the leader of the government, but we find that the official organ of the government, the Toronto 'Globe,' took the same stand, and wrote:

And this question as against Britain has its Canadian counterpart. It ought to be said distinctly and with emphasis, that Britain's obligation to share in quarrels of Canada's making is also nullified by self-government and self-respect. If Canadian politicians

blunder into international conflicts, if Canadian capitalists become involved in aggressive foreign graft, if Canadian militarists succeed in picking a quarrel with their neighbours, no obligation of duty or of honour will rest with the British war office. Canada's quarrel must be just and the issues at stake must be imperial, otherwise it is no affair of the army or navy of Britain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to look a little further into that matter and to ask what would be the result of the argument advanced by the Prime Minister. If Britain entered into a war which Canada did not consider just, or if forsooth with a navy constructed as it is proposed to be constructed by the government, Canada should undertake a war, and if it is true that Canada would not be affected in the one case or Great Britain in the other. Let us assume for the sake of argument that Britain did enter on a war which in the opinion of the Prime Minister was not a just war, which in the opinion of this government was not a just war, and let us say further that Great Britain was finding difficulty in that war, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would be the position of Canada? Would she stand aloof waiting until the empire had been destroyed, or would she as duty called, arise and go to the rescue of Great Britain? If Canada failed in her duty; if she carried out what I understood to be the policy announced by the leader of the government, and the official organ of the government, she would stand aloof. Let us take as an illustration the South African war. You know how it was only after great pressure that this government was brought to send troops to South Africa to aid the mother country. I do not mean to say for one moment that Great Britain would not have been victorious without the Canadian troops, and further I want to say that great as was the physical aid rendered by the brave soldiers of Canada and the other parts of the empire, and nobly as they did their duty, yet I venture to say that the physical advantage gained from the troops sent by the various colonies was infinitesimal compared with the great moral effect their presence had, not only on the enemy himself, but on the world at large. Why, the speech of the right hon. the first minister reminds me of an extract from an oration by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackenzie King). He was describing one of his many peregrinations on behalf of the country, his trip from Vancouver to Japan, and, I do not quote him verbatim, but only his expression of thought—he said:

> As I lay in the luxurious deck chair of a palatial Oriental steamer, watching the smoke curls of my fragrant Havana, I saw in the heavens a great luminous body, and, as I gazed in wonder, the thought came to me 'like winged light' that this was 'the same old moon' that was watching over the peaceful slumbers of the good citizens of Berlin after a hard day's work in field or factory, in order that they might contribute of their earnings to keep me travelling in foreign countries.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speeches of the first minister and of hon. gentlemen opposite I thought it was the same old moonshine—a great cloud of words to hide the issue. There were no details as to how they proposed to carry out the provisions of the Bill, or how the Bill is going to benefit the empire. Why, when the first minister was asked by a gentleman on this side of the House for some detail, he said: I do not know anything about it, I am only speaking in a general way. And, when a moment later he was asked to give one or two facts in regard to very pertinent matters, the answer of the right hon. gentleman was: Oh, let me alone, I want to finish my speech—I was almost going to say 'work.'

Now, just a word as to the speech of our good friend the Postmaster General. As I listened to his eloquent description of French Canadian history I was reminded of my early school days, but it was evident to me that the Postmaster General had not profited by the admonition of his leader when he said: I think we are getting pretty far away from the question we have on hand just now. I agree with the first minister that the arguments advanced by the Postmaster General were pretty far from the question that we have in hand just now. Why, Sir, he undertook to place on 'Hansard' a list of what he called colonies, but all of which turned out to be independent countries, and if he were advancing any argument at all in regard to them, he was advancing the argument—because he used it in that direction—as to the advantage of an independent navy, and we find that the result of their independent navies was, that they became individual petty states in all these countries, and today, I would ask the Postmaster General to look over the financial record and see the large cost to every one of these states for the maintenance of these navies. And, let me ask: Is there a single state named in the list brought down by the Postmaster General that would for a moment stand today before any of the first-rate powers of the world? I say no, I say such navies would be of little assistance in such a conflict. Further, I find we have the opinion of Professor J. Shield Nicholson, who has written recently in his new book, 'the Project of the Empire':

> 'The need for effective colonial aid for the maintenance of naval power is,' he says, 'urgent and pressing; it cannot be met by promises which will require a long period for their fulfilment; nor merely by the adoption of means designed to advance the general

prosperity of the constituent parts of the empire.' Whatever is to be the future status of the colonies, the cost of naval defence must be borne. 'If,' says Prof. Nicholson, 'each colony aims in the first place at securing only its own local defence, or the trade routes in which it is most concerned, if it insists that its own contributions shall be spent entirely under its own control, there will be a loss of economy and a loss of efficiency.'

Now, Sir, I want to point out that that is the position taken by the admiralty and by the Minister of Defence for Australia. Here is what the Minister of Defence for Australia said, and it appears to be exactly the position taken by Professor Nicholson. I quote from the report of the conference of 1902, page 13:

I cannot think that for Canada and Australia to each have a few war ships, and the Cape and New Zealand a few also, each independent of the other, is a plan suited to empire; such a plan would seem to be in accord with the actions and sentiments of a number of petty states rather than in accord with the necessities and aspirations of a great free united people.

Again he said:

If the British nation is at war, so are we; if it gains victories or suffers disasters, so do we; and therefore it is of the same vital interest to us as to the rest of the empire that our supremacy on the ocean shall be maintained. There is only one sea to be supreme over, and we want one fleet to be mistress over that sea.

Again we find that Lord Selborne, at that time the First Lord of the Admiralty, took exactly the same view. Here is what he said:

The first point on which I would lay the greatest possible stress is the reason why we have eliminated from this memorandum any allusion to the word defence. There was a time in this country, not so very long ago either, when naval strategists regarded the naval problem mainly from the point of view of defence. That, I submit, is altogether heretical. The real problem which the empire has to face in the case of a naval war is simply and absolutely to find out where the ships of the enemy are, to concentrate the greatest possible force where those ships are, and to destroy those ships. That is the only possible method of protecting this empire from the efforts which other navies may make to damage her commerce or her territories. It follows from this that there can be no localization of naval forces in the straight sense of the word. There can be no location of ships to protect the mouth of the Thames, to protect Liverpool, to protect Sydney, to protect Halifax. If we make any such attempt of the kind we should only be inviting disaster.

I would call the attention of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to that quotation. Lord Selborne was very clear and distinct in stating that that was the most important point he had to bring before the conference. The hon. member for Pictou says that the British admiralty had removed its ships from the Pacific ocean. That is true, but the conditions of naval warfare are not those which existed some ten years or even five years ago. They are rapidly changing all over the world.

It has also been said that if we should make a grant of some Dreadnoughts, it would only be a few years when they would be relegated to the scrap heap. Well, should that be so, we would at least be in the same position as the other nations. Great Britain would stand, as she has always stood, ahead of them. I have read very carefully and with a great deal of interest the debate in the English House of Commons on the Naval Bill, and I regret to say that, according to that debate, England has lost forever the two-power standard, and it is now only the question of a one-power standard. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) I have always looked upon as a very logical man, particularly careful in his premises, but I find, in an argument he used in this House, that he drew exactly the opposite deduction which the premises warranted. Speaking with regard to the fact that Mr. McKenna had changed his opinion from that which he had held a few months previous, my hon. friend said that the reasons he changed was because England had laid down more warships and that consequently there was no danger to the supremacy of the British empire. Why, the reverse was the case. Mr. McKenna was pointing out how necessary it had become for him to change the opinion he had held a few months before. There was a similar change of opinion in the case of Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Asquith was perfectly honest and frank in admitting it. He said frankly and freely that when he spoke twelve months previous, he had looked on the German question merely as a paper programme, but now he regretted having to take another view. He said:

I am obliged to tell the House these matters in order to let them understand why we economists have presented these estimates to the House. There has been such an enormous development in Germany, not only in the provision of shipyards and slips on which the hulk and fabric of a ship can be built and repaired but what is still more serious—in the provision for gun-mounting and armaments of those great monsters, these Dreadnoughts which are now the dominating type of ship—such an enormous development—and I will venture to say this without attempting to exercise anything in this nature of unnecessary alarm in this country—such an enormous development as to be so serious a development from our national point of view, that we could no longer take to ourselves, as we could a year ago with reason, the consoling and comforting reflection that we have the advantage in the speed and the rate at which ships can be constructed.

That was the whole gist of his argument at that time—not that there was no danger, but that the danger had actually increased and he was compelled to alter the opinion he had expressed a few short months before.

As I understand the problem presented to Canada, it is two-fold. First, is there an emergency? Or better, if some of our friends object to the word 'emergency,' is there a danger to the naval supremacy of the empire? If there is, what is the duty of Canada and how best can that duty be performed? Dealing with the first question, after weighing all the evidence, all the records and the opinions of the leaders on all sides of politics in Great Britain —Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour, Mr. McKenna, Sir Edward Grey, Lord Milner, Lord Roberts, Mr. Blatchford and others—I cannot but come to the conclusion that the danger does exist. That being the case, what is Canada's position and what is her duty? I want to deal with this question for a moment from a purely Canadian standpoint. I believe that the sentiment among all classes of our people from the Atlantic to the Pacific is overwhelmingly in favour of our doing something substantial in assisting the empire. I am further of the opinion that if we are to have a permanent navy, to be added to from time to time as required, that navy should be built in Canada, manned by Canadians; but accompanying that opinion is the uncertainty that we shall thereby be plunging into a large and increasing expenditure from which we shall receive no commensurate benefit. Having regard to the past record of this government, that fear is not without foundation. When we consider the way this country was committed to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, when we consider the fact that the right hon. the Prime Minister, who was supplied, as he told us, with mountains of information, resulting from the most careful surveys, declared that this railway would cost only $13,000,000, and when we realized that its estimated cost has now reached the enormous sum of $114,000,000, and when we take in that connection the Hodgins charges and the charges in connection with the resignation of Mr. Lumsden, and when we consider further the fact that a fair and full, investigation into those charges has been voted down, by a straight vote of the Liberal party—when we consider all these things, are we not justified in opposing the construction of this navy?

Further, we were informed by the right hon. the Prime Minister that this navy is to be under the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Well, after the result of the investigation into the management of that department, after the evils which came to light through that investigation, hon. members on this side, are warranted in hesitating before they commit the people to this expenditure without giving the people an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

It has been said that the leader of the opposition is shirking his responsibility in asking for a plebiscite. I do not so undertstand the resolution. What I understand by the resolution of my hon. leader is that as this is an entirely new policy and as the carrying of it out, as proposed in the government Bill, may involve serious changes in our relationship to the empire, the whole question should be put before the people, not as a plebiscite, but as the National Policy was put before them in 1878, on the public platform and through the public press. That is my understanding of the resolution of the leader of the opposition.

I want to refer to another matter. The Prime Minister said that he was much impressed by the statement made by the leader of the opposition that England had time and again subsidized the nations of Europe to enable them to defend their autonomy and independence against the oppressor. Then he went on to say:

> She was able to do so. Why? Because of all the nations of Europe, England was the nation which had spent least upon armaments. She had never spent any of her resources as other nations did, purely on her arms. She had extended her trade and her commerce, she has developed her resources, &c.

Assuming that these statements are correct, we in Canada have an immense territory with a comparatively small population. We have many problems to solve that require a large expenditure of money. We have the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, we have the deepening and enlarging of the Welland canal, we have the building of the Hudson Bay railway, we have the building of the Georgian Bay canal. We have, over and above all these things that are great problems for us as Canadians, a far greater responsibility in assuming our duty rightly towards the great British empire. So I say, taking all these things into consideration, I believe it is a very strong argument why we should make a direct contribution. Following out the argument of the First Minister himself, let us follow in the footsteps of the mother country, gradually developing our commercial shipping, our plant and industries, until we are in a position to build such war vessels as may be needed. With this object in view, we must enlarge our docks on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, and encourage the establishment of ship-building plants in Canada, not based on the number of Dreadnoughts we can lay down, but rather on the fact that we have all essentials in the way of coal, iron, steel and nickel

for the successful establishing of such plants, and that our growing shipping trade warrants such a venture. We have given bounties to encourage steel, lead and other industrial pursuits, why not go a step further, and if necessary offer bounties to induce ship-building in Canada? But the member for Pictou calls it tribute. But it was not my intention to go into details or make suggestions as to how best this policy could be carried out, and I was only induced to do so by the argument of the right hon. the First Minister. But, Sir, before we can do that, we want to take the people into our confidence, we want to weigh well our position in this regard and see that everything is looked into carefully in advance and not have the same fiasco as we have had in the past.

Coming to the Bill itself, the Prime Minister assured the House that he had the unanimous support of his followers. I am not surprised at that. In this Bill we have something unlike anything in the Heavens above, in the earth beneath or in the waters under the earth. Therefore, our hon. friends can fall down and worship it. This Bill can be made all things to all men, if by any means we can save Laurier. That is the position we have before us. They can take this Bill to Quebec and say: We are not giving away your money in contributions to the British empire as the opposition are prepared to do; we are doing as little as we possibly can, and that little we are spending with you. Then they can go to the other provinces and say: We are doing exactly what the British admiralty asked for. And yet, as we see by clause 18, and the quotations I have made from the Prime Minister and the official organ of the party, they have said that they have neither part nor parcel in the wars of the empire. So I say that every man who is loyal to himself and loyal to his country should support the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Now for a moment let us look at that amendment and see what we are asking for as compared with the Bill before the House. This clause of that amendment reads as follows:

> The proposals of the government do not follow the suggestions and recommendations of the admiralty and in so far as they empower the government to withhold the naval forces of Canada from those of the empire in time of war are ill-advised and dangerous.

I would ask if any man can dispute the proposition laid down in the first clause of the resolution, that they are not following out the request of the admiralty. Clause 5 of the conference at page 24 says:

> In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.
>
> The fleet unit to be aimed at, should, therefore, in the opinion of the admiralty, consist at least of the following:—
>
> 1 armoured cruiser (new 'Indomitable' class) which is of the 'Dreadnought' type.
> 3 unarmoured cruisers ('Bristol' class).
> 6 destroyers.
> 3 submarines.

Again, clause 11, reads:

> As the armoured cruiser is the essential part of the fleet unit, it is important that an 'Indomitable' of the 'Dreadnought' type should be the first vessel to be built in commencing the formation of a fleet unit.

We have there ample evidence that that clause as introduced into the resolution is justified. Again the second clause of the resolution reads:

> That no such proposals can safely be accepted, unless they thoroughly ensure unity of organization and of action, without which there can be no effective co-operation in any common scheme of empire defence.

I have shown that this is the opinion not only of Australia at the imperial defence conference but also of the British admiralty, that they have clearly pointed out that under modern conditions a separate unit is of little or no value. Let me here say a word with reference to the last speaker's lauding of the Ross rifle. Not longer ago than the conference of 1902, the admiralty took occasion to refer to that and pointed out that even so small a departure as that was a very serious thing to the empire. They pointed out the absolute necessity of an interchange of arms in an imperial war and the advantage it would be to have rifles of the one type.

Then again, the resolution says:

> That no permanent policy should be entered upon involving large future expenditures of this character until it has been submitted to the people and has received their approval.

I think it is a reasonable proposition. As has been pointed out here to-night and during this debate, we are making a new departure. There is no reason at this time why we should not take the people into our confidence. There is no reason why we should not go before them and ask their instructions in regard to this great question. It is one that will involve a very large expenditure of money, it is one too that will mean a great change just as the introduction of our national policy in 1878 and it is one on which I think the people should be consulted. Again, the resolution reads:

> That in the meantime the immediate duty of Canada and the impending necessities of the empire can best be discharged and met by placing without delay at the disposal of the imperial authorities as a free and loyal

contribution from the people of Canada, such an amount as may be sufficient to purchase or construct two battleships or armoured cruisers of the latest Dreadnought type, giving to the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purposes of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the united strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Great objection has been made particularly to that last clause. Several speakers on the government side have said that we have asked authority to give away $25,000,000. Of course a matter of $6,000,000 or $7,000,000 is neither here nor there with the present government, but I would like to know where they get their authority for two Dreadnoughts costing $25,000,000. The estimate given by the British admiralty for a Dreadnought of the latest type is £2,000,000, and yet, in the face of that, they have repeatedly asserted that the opposition are prepared to give away $25,000,000 of the people's money. After all, it is not a question of amonut, but of principle, and I am here to endorse that principle. Sir, that will do more for Canada and for the empire than the navy they are proposing at this particular time. And the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) says: Not only will they give away $25,000,000 of your money, but you will never receive any benefit from it. I would like to ask hon. members on the other side of the House, whether, after carefully weighing those words, they honestly and sincerely can subscribe to the doctrine thus expressed—that money given to the mother country in a time of need will produce no benefit to Canada or to the British empire. That is a proposition that has been thrown across the floor of the House several times this afternoon—that we are giving away the people's money, from which they are to receive no benefit. We have taken great credit to ourselves for our wonderful growth and prosperity. I want to say, as a Canadian born, that there is no man in this House more loyal to Canada, more interested in, or more proud of its vast development, than I am, yet I want to say also that I realize that the best blood of our mother nation has been shed to water the soil of our country, that the best blood of her people has been shed that we might have the peace and prosperity under which we have grown from an infant to a great nation. But, while I do not hesitate to say, equally with those on the other side of the House, that I look forward to the continued growth and prosperity of this counry of ours, and believe that we shall be a nation, I believe also that we shall be a nation within the empire. And I want to say at once—because, as I said, I do not propose to weary or detain the House—I would change once more the metaphor of the First Minister. He has repeated this metaphor over and over again—that the time will come when we shall drop from the parent tree as the fruit drops from the limb. Let me say that to my mind the time has come when, as the new wood is grafted upon the old stock, so the dominions overseas shall be grafted on the mother of nations, and we shall become a mighty tree whose branches shall shelter and assure the peace and commerce of the world.

Mr. MICHAUD. In the absence of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Beauparlant), and, on his behalf, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT WITH GERMANY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. By command of His Excellency the Governor General, I beg to place before the House copy of a commerical agreement between Germany and Canada, signed at Ottawa this day, together with certain papers connected therewith.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall continue the naval debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, February 16, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MAGRATH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 143), to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to surround our western water-powers with greater safeguards than at present exist. Under the Dominion Lands Act no period is fixed for which licenses shall issue. Under the regulations prescribed by the Governor in Council that period is restricted to 25 years. I believe it is in the interest of the public, who own these water-powers, that that period should be fixed by law. There is no intention in this Bill to lessen the authority of the Minister of the Interior who issues these licenses. The Bill provides that no license shall be issued for longer than 25 years in any of our northwestern provinces nor for longer than 10 years in any unorganized territory.

There is the further provision that a license shall not issue without the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That idea is expressed in this language:

And any such license or other authority so issued shall contain a clause providing that the same shall not be exercisable until there is endorsed thereon the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province wherein such license or other authority is exercisable and subject to such conditions and regulations as may be imposed by such Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Mr. MONK. The legislation proposed by my hon. friend is certainly in the right direction. I would like to inform my hon. friend that the section of the Conservation Commission which has in charge the question of our water-powers is now preparing a Bill very much on the same lines as that of my hon. friend, and is getting information on the subject from different parts of the Dominion and from men experienced in these matters; and as soon as that Bill is finally adopted by that section of the commission, it is intended, with a very brief delay, to lay it before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS COMMISSION.

Mr. LAKE:

1. What properties have the National Battlefields Commission bought in Quebec for the purpose of making the park and driveway, from whom were the properties purchased, and what was the price given in each case?
2. Is it the intention of the commissioners to widen Gilmour Hill, the Belvedère road and parts of St. Louis and Ste. Foy roads? If so, when is the work to commence?
3. How much money have the commissioners on hand, and what has been the cause of the delay in beginning the works?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. I beg to submit the reply to the hon. gentleman's question, supplied by the chairman of the Battlefields Commission:

1. The following properties have been bought by the commission: (a) a lot of land situated on the north side of Ste. Foy road, being subdivision No. 58 of lot 26 of the cadastral plan of the Banlieue of the parish of Notre Dame de Quebec, belonging to one Pierre Cauchon. Area, 16,060 square feet; price, $7,846.55. (b) Part of lot No. 4440 on the cadastral plan for Montcalm ward, in the city of Quebec, belonging to 'Le Seminaire de Quebec'. Area, 1,137,111 square feet; price, $129,137.99. The following properties have also been deeded to the National Battlefields Commission, without cost, for the purpose of the park: (a) The piece of ground commonly designated as 'The Plains of Abraham', covering an area of 88 arpents and 71 perches (French measure). (b) The plot of ground on which is erected the monument known as 'Le Monument des Braves', on the Battlefield of Ste. Foy. (c) A certain parcel of land on which Martello Tower No. 4 is erected.

2. (a) Yes, if reasonable arrangements can be made with the landowners interested. (b) As soon as possible after the lands required have been secured.

3. (a) $348,387.56. (b) Certain legal points which have arisen in connection with the mode of procedure under the powers of expropriation given to the commission.

HALIFAX CUSTOM HOUSE.

Mr. CROSBY:

1. Have any repairs been made to the Halifax custom house since it was handed over to the customs authorities by the contractor? If so, what was the nature of the repairs, were they done by contract or by day work, and what was the cost, and who did the work?
2. Were any repairs made to the Queen's wharf or the Lumber wharf at Halifax during last year? If so, what was the nature of the repairs?
3. Was the work done by contract or day work?
4. If by contract, who was the contractor, what was the amount paid, who were the parties asked to tender, how were they asked, and what were the amounts of the different tenders?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

1. The following repairs have been executed:

	$ cts.
Repairing roof, copings, &c..	1,131 80
Repairing floors	554 68
Re-glazing	60 25
Re-hanging windows	400 00
Re-laying floor in doloment ..	564 90
	2,711 63

Materials were supplied and work was done by Malcolm & Johnston, Frank Reardon, Nickerson Bros. and the Montreal Doloment Company, under the supervision of C. E. W. Dodwell, district engineer.

2, 3 and 4. No expenditure by this department.

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE SUNDAY CLOSING.

Mr. A. HAGGART:

1. What applications have been made to the government or the Post Office Department for the closing of outer doors of the post office on Sundays, and what persons or institutions have made these applications?
2. In what post offices have these outer doors been recently closed and box holders refused access to their post office boxes on Sunday?

3. If the post offices have been closed on Sundays, what are the reasons for such action of the government or the department?

4. Is the action of the government or department only an experiment, or is it the final determination of the government to close the post offices on Sundays for all time to come?

5. Why should the department receive on Sunday a letter for transmission and prevent its delivery at its destination on that day?

6. Does the Post Office Department know that in Winnipeg for over thirty years box holders have had access to their post office boxes on Sunday, and that the present action of the department, it is alleged, will cause serious inconvenience to a large number of citizens?

7. Is it known to the Post Office Department that a large number of commercial men are said to so arrange to pass Sundays in Winnipeg with their families, to receive and answer their mail on that day?

8. What good purpose will be served by the recent action of the government in closing the outer doors of post offices on Sunday?

9. How many post office officials in Winnipeg, by reason of the closing of the outer doors of the post office to box holders, will be relieved from work on Sundays?

10. If the present action is only an experiment, then why did the government or department not make full and complete inquiries, and obtain sufficient information before taking any action?

11. What orders were given by the Postmaster General or his department to the postmasters in reference to this Sunday closing?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX:

1. Numerous communications and petitions have been addressed to the department from the local branches of the Lord's Day Alliance, and also from the citizens and business men throughout the west, asking that the lobbies of the post offices in that section of the country should not be opened for the convenience of box holders on Sunday.

2. At the following post offices, viz: Battleford, Saskatchewan; Brandon, Manitoba; Calgary, Alberta; Dauphin, Manitoba; Edmonton, Alberta; Emerson, Manitoba; Esquimalt, British Columbia; Fernie, British Columbia; Lethbridge, Alberta; Macleod, Alberta; Maple Creek, Saskatchewan; Medicine Hat, Alberta; Moosejaw, Saskatchewan; Nanaimo, British Columbia; Nelson, British Columbia; New Westminster, British Columbia; Portage la Prairie, Manitoba; Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan; Regina, Saskatchewan; Revelstoke, British Columbia; Rossland, British Columbia; St. Boniface, Manitoba; Saskatoon, Saskatchewan; Vancouver, British Columbia; Victoria, British Columbia; Winnipeg, Manitoba.

3. The post offices have been closed on Sundays in the west in accordance with what is believed to be the spirit of the people of Canada—that Sunday should be observed as a day of rest and cessation from business. The privilege of keeping the post offices open in the west was given or rather taken in the early days when the train service was scarce and irregular and the arrival of mails uncertain. When great numbers of the people coming into the country as settlers, or prospective settlers, had their mail directed to certain points where they exepcted to be at certain dates, and when it was important that they should obtain their mail so that their progress in travelling should not be obstructed. Moreover, the offices were a great distance apart, and settlers only went for their mails on the days when they were least busy and when the exigencies of their business permitted them. This usually occurred on Sunday as even then the settlers, moved by the spirit of their early training, did not usually devote themselves to business and labour for financial gain, and a great majority of them went into the towns where the post offices were situated for the purposes of public worship. Now, the situation is entirely different. The country is becoming settled, is intersected in all directions by lines of railway, and mails are received as regularly and frequently in all centres of the west as in the other and older parts of Canada, and the necessity which existed for keeping the offices open in the large towns and cities of western Canada, has entirely disappeared. Furthermore, it has been reported to the department by its officers, by many leading citizens, and men in religious and commercial life, that the result of business men obtaining their mails freely on Sunday has led to the transaction of business at these western points and the forcing of employees to labour on Sunday almost as much as on week days, at all events to a sufficient extent to interfere with their enjoying any advantage which might accrue by Sunday being granted a day of rest. The statement that conditions in the west differ from those in the east is due to the fact that, not the mass of western people, but great numbers of business men have imported into Canada the practice of carrying on business on Sundays the same as any other day, notwithstanding that it is absolutely opposed to the best interests of labour and the laws and spirit of the Canadian people, viz: That every man may enjoy where possible the benefit of Sunday as a day of rest.

4. The action of the government is not an experiment, nor is there any necessity for such an experiment. This has been tried in the cities of the east for many years, and it has been found that not only is no inconvenience caused to business, or to the travelling public, but that it has received the unanimous support of all classes of the community, who have found it to

be in the interests of both the employee and the employer.

5. The vast number of letters posted on Sunday, in fact, it might be said the whole of the letters posted on Sunday are not for local delivery, but for outside points and in most cases far distant points.. The refusal to receive these letters on Sunday would mean a delay during the week of perhaps 12 to 24 hours and serious inconvenience to business, and it cannot be compared with the delivery of mails on Sunday to addresses locally, where all unnecessary work is supposed to cease, particularly, in view of the fact that all such letters are delivered in plenty of time for the opening of business on Monday morning. Moreover, these trains would run whether mails were placed on them or not, and the public and business people would naturally resent any failure on the part of the department to forward the mails on all running trains, involving as such action would make a delay of 24 hours in the transmission of a large portion of the correspondence for business centres. This has been specially recognized by parliament and exempted from the working of the Lord's Day Act.

6. The department is aware that for many years box holders have had access to their boxes on Sunday, but is not of the opinion that the present action will cause any serious inconvenience to the citizens at large, and has reason to believe that outside of the few business men who take advantage of Sunday delivery for the purpose of working themselves and their staff on Sunday, as well as the other days of the week, there is no desire for the keeping open of the post offices on Sunday.

7. The department is not aware that a large number of commercial men are said to arrange to pass Sunday in Winnipeg with their families to receive and answer their mail on that day.

8. Better opportunities for the observance of Sunday, and protection to labour.

9. The men engaged in sorting for Sunday box delivery will be relieved from duty. The department is unable to say definitely how many clerks require to be engaged in this work, but there must always be a considerable number of men engaged in sorting these mails for Sunday delivery.

10. The present action is not an experiment, but was taken after the fullest consideration by the department.

11. A circular was sent out from the department on the 20th January, 1910, to the postmasters of the offices above mentioned, instructing them that on and from the 1st February, 1910, the lobbies of their offices must be closed to the public on Sunday.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

BOAT HARBOUR, TONEY RIVER, PICTOU, NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. What was the amount expended in each year to date on construction of Boat harbour at Toney river, Pictou county, Nova Scotia?
2. What is the total paid to date?
3. Is the work completed?
4. What further sum is to be expended?
5. Who were superintendents or overseers of the work, for how many days and how much was each paid?
6. What is the length of each wharf constructed?
7. What is the depth of water at the outer end of the wharf at high tide and at low tide, respectively?
8. How much further out will the wharfs be extended?
9. When so extended what will be the depth of water at outer end of high tide, and at low tide, respectively?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2.

In 1905-6	$4,727 55
1906-7	2,103 11
1907-8	758 05
1908-9	1,793 02
Total	$9,381 73

3. No.
4. $2,000.
5.

H. McKinnon (1906-8), 169 days at $3	$507 00
D. A. Barry (1908-9), 29 days at $3.50	101 50
D. A. Barry (1908-9), 24 days at $3	72 00
Total	$680 50

6 and 7. The works referred to are protection piers on east and west sides of a channel 1½ feet deep at low water and 7½ feet deep at high water; the east side protection pier is 291 feet long, and the west side one, 235 feet.

8 and 9. Fifty feet on each side, the depth of water at outer ends remaining the same as at present.

MR. BENJAMIN BOURGEOIS.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. At what dates were the services of Benjamin Bourgeois, division engineer, district 'B,' National Transcontinental Railway, dispensed with, and for what cause?
2. At whose instance was the investigation held, who investigated, and what is the report or finding?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM:

The following information is supplied by the Transcontinental Railway Commission: On the 31st January, 1910. The chief engineer having reported that the services of Mr. Bourgeois were unsatisfactory, an in-

vestigation was ordered by the chairman to be held. It took place in Quebec on 17th December last, when Mr. Bourgeois was examined by the chairman and the chief engineer on matters relating on residencies 27-28, division 7, district 'B,' namely, as regards rip-rap returns, and the admission of Division Engineer Bourgeois that he was wrong was deemed sufficient to justify his being discharged.

EASTERN DIVISION, GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Is the Prime Minister aware that the following formed a part of the speech from the Throne, read at the opening of the present session of parliament: 'The eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway is now open for traffic from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction, and thence by the Grand Trunk Pacific branch to the lake itself'?

2. Is he aware that the Minister of Railways did on the 4th day of February make the following statements in the House of Commons: 'There is no regular traffic over the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway, from Winnipeg to Lake Superior Junction. The engineers say that the contractors offered to put in a certain service; but I think they are not yet doing a regular traffic business on the road. His, Mr. Grant's, recent report to me is that it will be practically complete and ready to carry wheat almost in another year'?

3. Has the Prime Minister had any communication with His Excellency in regard to this matter, or has he any explanation to make to the House in regard thereto?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes.

2. The words which the question purports to quote seem to consist of portions of different places in 'Hansard' (unrevised), columns 3163, 3153 and 3154, not spoken in the order or connection quoted, and from which intervening sentences and portions of sentences are omitted.

3. What was in fact said on the subject by the Minister of Railways, as reported in 'Hansard,' is not in conflict with the statement in the speech from the Throne, and does not call for any explanation.

His Excellency has not been communicated with on the subject.

TORONTO SUB-POST OFFICES.

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Is there a sub-post office at 253 Avenue Road, Toronto? If so, in whose building is it kept, by whom served, and what is the yearly cost thereof?

2. Is there a sub-post office at 1160 Yonge street, Toronto? If so, by whom kept, in whose building, and what is the yearly cost thereof?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. There is a sub-post office at No. 253 Avenue Road, Toronto, which is known as 'Sub-Post Office No. 27.' The office is in charge of Mr. E. G. Seyler. The salary attached to the office, including commission on stamp sales, &c., is $319.80, for the year ended March 31, 1909. The Department is not aware who owns the building in which the office is kept.

2. There is a sub-post office at 1160 Young street, known as 'North Toronto Sub-Post Office.' This office is in charge of Mr. Jas. A. McKenzie. The salary attached to the office, including percentage on stamp sales, was $549.33, for the year ended March 31, 1909.

The department is not aware who owns the building in which the office is kept.

The various sub-post offices and letter boxes in the city of Toronto are all served under one contract, which is in the hands of Mr. R. Newell.

MR. JAMES H. McKENZIE.

Mr. FOSTER:

Is James H. McKenzie in the employ of the Inland Revenue Department at Toronto? If so, in what service, at what salary, and what portion of his time does he devote to that work?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. James H. McKenzie is employed in the excise branch of the Inland Revenue Department at Toronto He is a deputy collector with a salary of $1,700 per annum, and gives full attention to his official duties.

QUEEN'S OWN RIFLES.

Mr. FOSTER:

(a) Is the government informed that the Queen's Own Rifles are to go to England during the coming summer to take part in the Aldershot manœuvres? (b) If so, is the government to bear any portion of the expense of the corps?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) Yes. (b) No.

HAY AND WOOD PERMITS, MANITOBA.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE:

1. What amount was collected by the government during 1908 and 1909 for hay permits from Dominion lands in Manitoba?

2. What amount was collected by the government during 1908 and 1909 for wood cutting permits from Dominion lands in Manitoba?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER:

1. 1908, $859.25; 1909, $762.85.

2. Total revenue from timber cut under permits in 1908 $44,932.50; total revenue from timber cut under permits in 1909, $38,-042.98.

THE GERMAN SURTAX.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the hon. the Finance Minister a few questions with regard to the German arrangement which the hon. gentleman brought down last evening. Is what is called the German conventional tariff the lowest German tariff? Does the schedule that has been placed in our hands contain all the articles that are likely to go into Germany under that favoured clause and are we giving to Germany access to our markets for all German goods under our general tariff while the German people are only granting to us a portion of their most favourable tariff? Will the minister be good enough to bring down the letters and negotiations leading up to the present arrangement between this government and Germany?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no information to be brought down in addition to what has been placed before the House. Negotiations have taken place, almost entirely in the form of personal interviews between the representatives of the German government and the Minister of Finance. What little correspondence there is, is unimportant, but is necessarily of a confidential nature. There is, therefore, nothing more to be brought down. My hon. friend asks whether the articles mentioned are all the articles we might be able to send into Germany. That is a matter of opinion on which every hon. gentleman must form his own judgment. We think the list covers the things of most importance and which would be most valued by Canadian shippers. Whether or not every article on that list is of greater or less value than some other article would, I fancy, be a matter of some difference of opinion. At all events, we think the list comprises the things that are of most importance. The last question of my hon. friend whether we permit all German goods to come in under our general tariff while they only permit a limited list to enter Germany. That is correct, but it is worth remembering that we do not give to Germany favoured-nation treatment. We are not giving to Germany, under this arrangement, all that we were willing to give Germany at a previous stage of the discussion, we are refusing Germany the advantages of the French treaty. That is a matter that is left for further negotiations if it is found in the interests of Canada to have further negotiations. The arrangement is that we give up the surtax only; Germany in return for that gives us the benefit of her lowest tariff upon a specified list of articles which, in the judgment of the government, are the most important articles to the Canadian shipper.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister taken into consideration the fact that there are manufacturing interests in this country that have been built up under the surtax and that require perhaps some different treatment than this?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think my hon friend is quite correct in saying that any manufacturing interests have been built up in Canada relying on the surtax. The surtax was a war measure. Germany demanded that she should receive the same consideration in the markets of Canada as we gave to the products of Great Britain. That was the bone of contention. So long as Germany adhered to that view, we could make no arrangement with her. When Germany abandoned that contention, we felt we were free to negotiate with Germany. I am quite sure that any manufacturer in Canada who has given any attention to the question must have been aware that this surtax was, if I may so describe it, a commercial war measure, and that just so soon as Germany receded from what we regarded as her unjustifiable position of a few years ago, we should be free to remove the surtax, retaining as we now do the general tariff which was the basis on which, I think, all manufacturing establishments have been created in recent years.

Mr. LALOR. Has the minister considered, or will he consider, the question of the removal of the duties upon raw material that is used by manufacturers, who will be affected very materially by the removal of the German surtax? I speak from knowledge and experience, especially in connection with the knitting business, one of the industries that will be affected to a very great extent by the removal of this duty. It does not seem fair to these manufacturers that their raw materials should be taxed so heavily when they are brought in direct competition now under the regular tariff, with German goods.

Mr. FIELDING. What does my hon. friend mean by raw material, as applied to this industry? It is rather difficult to give a general answer.

Mr. LALOR. Mercerized cotton yarn, coarser than 40's, which is now taxed under the present tariff 25 per cent coming from any country, with the exception of Great Britain, and from Great Britain 17½ per cent. No yarns of that class are manufactured in Canada, there is no industry in Canada engaged in that particular business, and these yarns are used to a large extent. I am an importer of these goods myself to the extent of probably £100,000, and with a tariff of 17½ per cent against Great Britain and 25 per cent against the United States we are not in a position to compete with

Germany manufacturing the same class of goods and shipping them into this country.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a question with regard to the general tariff policy of the country, and I would hardly be able to answer that off-hand. I do not quite see that it has any particular relation to the surtax, because the surtax was not adopted as a revenue measure, nor in a sense was it even a protective measure; it was something over and above the revenue and protective elements in the Canadian tariff. It was imposed to meet a hostile position of affairs on the part of Germany, and when Germany abandoned its hostile attitude we felt free to remove the surtax. My hon friend's question would have relation to the general question of the duty on raw materials, and I would not be free to answer that off-hand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the Minister of Finance tell us the precise difference, if there be any difference, between the treatment accorded by Germany to Canada under this new arrangement, and the treatment accorded by Germany to the rest of the empire in respect to tariff matters?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that Great Britain receives the full conventional tariff, and in return for that Great Britain necessarily guarantees to Germany the most favoured terms that are granted to any foreign country. We have declined to grant to Germany, for good reasons we think, the most favoured terms that are granted to any foreign country. and so we have made only a partial arrangement. We receive the German conventional tariff on a specified list of articles in return for the abolition of the surtax. Great Britain would receive the full conventional tariff without any limitation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the empire as a whole. Does the hon. gentleman mean by the term 'Great Britain' to include all the rest of the empire, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, &c.? It is most particularly in regard to them that I was asking.

Mr. FIELDING. All the self-governing colonies, of course, in all recent negotiations, are treated independently of the United Kingdom. I will look into the matter from the point of view of Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. While it is only a matter of recollection, I understood that after the German treaty was denounced, another treaty was entered into between Germany and Great Britain, the terms of which included all the dominions of the empire except Canada. I would like to know whether or not the German conventional treaty, so called, applies in full force not only to Great Britain alone, but to the rest of the empire under any such arrangement.

Mr. FIELDING. I will look more closely into that, but the essence of the arrangement in any case would be that if any portion of the empire receives the full conventional German tariff it must guarantee to Germany most favoured nation treatment, and as we are not prepared to guarantee that to Germany to-day we would not be in the same position to demand the full conventional tariff. However, it is a matter of reasoning. I will endeavour to ascertain the facts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not altogether a matter of reasoning, but it would rather depend on the terms of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no difficulty in knowing that the German conventional tariff will be given in its fullness only to portions of the empire which are willing to give most favoured nation treatment to Germany. That is one of the first principles of international negotiation, and I think my judgment of it is right, but I will look into the facts as suggested by the hon. gentleman.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to a return ordered by the House with reference to Transcontinental railway matters on the 24th January, last. I have reason to believe, from certain things that have transpired since, that the return has been ready for some time although it has not been laid on the table.

Mr. STAPLES. I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) to an order that passed this House regarding papers dealing with the establishment of a post office at St. Charles in the constituency of Macdonald, and I would like to ask when we may expect these papers to be brought down.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see that they are brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) if he has issued an order that parcels sent by registered post must be signed for at their destination by the party to whom they are addressed before they will be delivered up.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend (Mr. Owen) will put a question on the Order Paper I will answer. This is an order from the department of which I may not have had any knowledge.

Mr. MAGRATH. I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to an order issued on December 13, and to a return brought down by the Minister of

Public Works on January 20. The return called for reports, documents and correspondence between the two departments and other documents as well in connection with providing proper post office facilities for Lethbridge. The return evidently was prepared by the Public Works Department, but I think it has escaped the attention of the hon. gentleman's department as there is no correspondence with his department shown in the return, and I know there is certain correspondence that has been had with his department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into the matter and see if anything has been left out but I do not believe it has been left out. I may inform my hon. friend that his wishes in the matter have been carried out. I know he has taken some interest in the Lethbridge post office. He is probably not aware that proper post office facilities in Lethbridge have been arranged for. At all events I will see that the correspondence is completed.

Mr. MAGRATH. I thank the minister for his courtesy in giving me this information, but it has come to me already through other sources from Lethbridge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That shows that the post office is well organized.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I may be allowed at the outset to express my thankfulness to my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Michaud), who was kind enough, at my request, to move last night, on my behalf, the adjournment of the debate, the state of my health preventing me from addressing the House at such a late hour. I have also to thank the House for having graciously acceded to such request, customary as it is to do so.

I had the pleasure of listening to part of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve). He is entitled to congratulations on account of the able manner in which he expounded his views, though distasteful to me. There is nothing beyond criticism in this world, and I shall single out two references in his speech to which I am bound to take exception. In the first place, he was in no way warranted in referring to the management of the Department of Marine in the manner he did. While technically a man occupying a position of trust may be called to account before the public for certain happenings, even if he be laid up and unable to attend to business, the hon. member should in all fairness have pointed out in what respect the management was inefficient in so far as the minister was concerned; and moreover he should have supplied some proof in support of his contention, and that was lacking entirely. He was content with making a few broad statements reflecting more or less on the minister whom illness confines to his house, and in support of these he has not adduced any facts, I repeat it, although he and his friends have had a whole session and a prolonged investigation devoted to unearth such facts. In the second place, the hon. member shows some inconsistency when directly after taking exception to the government's proposal to entrust forthwith, without consulting the people, the management of the proposed navy to the Department of Marine, he turns around and approves of the proposal of the leader of the opposition to send to England forthwith and without consulting the people, two warships of the latest design, representing an expenditure of some $25,000,000.

I am now coming to the question which has been brought up for the fourth time in this House within a year. As might be expected, the data in relation thereto have been pretty well sifted out. It has, moreover, been discussed at the last conference in London at which the Dominion government was ably represented by the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) and the hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden).

The question is assumed to be entirely new. At page 3075 of the unrevised edition of Hansard, for the current session, my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) is made to say:

> There can be no doubt that the policy is entirely novel, and that the people have so far been kept in the dark as to its real meaning and import.

Then at page 3078:

> Will my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or any of the gentleman who sit behind him, from the province of Quebec at any rate, state that even this has been laid before the people of our province? They have never heard of it, in that shape or in any shape, and have never had any occasion to pronounce their opinion upon so important a matter.

Nevertheless, the memorandum of 1902 quoted on a previous occasion by the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), is quite clear. Again, in the course of the debate which took place on March 13, 1903, previous to the two last general elections, and which was as usual widely distributed and discussed, I find that the following clean cut statements were made. At page 37 of

the French edition, Mr. R. L. Borden is thus made to speak:

Reference has been made, in the proceedings of the colonial conference, to a proposal by the Canadian government to establish a local naval force.

And the hon. Prime Minister, at page 51, is credited with the following utterances:

I confess that we owe it to ourselves as a nation—as we claim to be—to assume our own defence. And so far as that goes, if we have to spend more money upon military and naval service, I am sure that parliament and the Canadian people will not grudge any sum demanded for that purpose.

Then the hon. member for Jacques Cartier at page 64:

Sir, I listened attentively to the right hon. leader of this House when he spoke in regard to the colonial conference.

One could not possibly acknowledge receipt of notice in more explicit terms.

With such statements before us, there is not much ground for contending that the question is an entirely new one. On the other hand, it would be a matter of surprise were a matter of such importance to be threshed out without developing a new departure of some kind.

Men who are interested in throwing cold water on propositions of all kinds, contend that the proposed navy cannot possibly be autonomous. Notwithstanding which, I take the responsibility of stating that the principle of leaving the management of the various navies to the various governments building them is inserted in the Bill, in the same way that it prevailed at the London conference in August last and in this House on March 29, 1909.

True, that settlement of the question is not an ideal one. Of course, merchantmen are preferable to men of war, and such ideal settlement of the question could be brought about only through an international conference which would put an end to warfare for all time. Unfortunately, mankind has not reached as yet that degree of perfection and the settlement proposed is to my mind for the time being that which is best in accord with our political status and present conditions.

However, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and the government should not expect us to-day, any more than when the matter was brought up for the first time, to welcome this proposal of an expenditure for military purposes with as much enthusiasm and earnestness as if it were destined to promote agriculture which supplies, or manufacturing which transforms, raw materials and adapts them to the uses of man, or else trade which acts as an intermediary between the two. It stands to reason that means of destruction should not be viewed in such favourable light as those things which minister to our sustenance and our comforts. So it is not to be wondered at if members of this House or citizens of this country feel like approving of proposals of this kind only under circumstances when such expenditure cannot be dispensed with, and pending the adoption by the various powers of some more equitable means of settling their differences, than sheer force or luck, through the clashing of fleets or the hurling of explosives of all kinds.

We might, on the other hand, postpone action, as suggested by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and others. We have not been attacked for a long time past. There is no danger in sight. A fleet yet in its incipient stage will not enable us to face all emergencies for many years to come. Then our relationship to Great Britain and the neighbourhood of the United States may be considered either in the light of objection to the government proposals or of assurances of security for us. On the other hand, the landlord who has remained several years without feeling the need of carrying any insurance, may not always have the same luck. Then again, it will be acknowledged that there is some remissness in delaying armament until the attack is on. As regards the third objection, if Japan and the United States, whose organization and development were effected in recent years, had taken such a stand as is implied in that objection, fifty or sixty years ago, they would never have evolved into the great powers which they are to-day. Lastly, while recognizing the sterling qualities of the British people, while sympathising, as some of us may do, and as I for one do sympathize, with the neighbouring republic and its institutions, we cannot fail to perceive that neither the inhabitants of Great Britain nor those of the United States will be very prone to tax themselves to defend us as well as themselves. And should they be of any service to us in that respect, should they undertake to defend us at their own expense, we may rest assured that they will be expecting some remuneration for their services. That may take the shape of preferential duties, or may come through the settlement of boundary disputes, or be embodied in the clauses of some treaty, or result in a direct call of funds to meet the cost, the amount of which would be in due proportion, as we may well expect, to the expenditure incurred, to the risk undergone. Or possibly such a kindly ally would not mind retaining for himself something worth while, some fine section lopped off our territory. That is exactly what Uncle Sam has done in retaining Porto Rico as compensation for having helped Cuba to fight Spain ten years ago. That is also

what France did, in retaining Savoy, as a compensation for the help tendered in 1860 to Italy in the fight against Austria. That is also what England has done in obtaining the transfer of the major part of the Suez Canal stock and practically getting the control over Egypt after taking a hand in righting the finances of the country rather upset through the bungling of some khedive or other.

Should such developments take place, you may be sure that Cape Breton, which is the most important vantage point on the whole Atlantic coast, from the North Pole to the South, on account if its coal mines, would be greatly coveted by the United States, and it will be readily understood to what extent the holding of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence would be made difficult, were Cape Breton to fall into the hands of a foreign power.

Whoever contends that any government, whether American, French, English or other, will exact sacrifices of money and of men from their peoples, towards protecting, without compensation therefor, the interests, whatever they be, the trade, the welfare of a foreign country, is imposing on the good faith of his hearers or readers who take him seriously. No, Mr. Speaker, there never existed, and there does not exist today a country on the face of the earth that has not had to provide for its own defence, whether directly or through others, but always at its own expense.

I am not any more a spendthrift or a bravado than the most firmly convinced of the advocates of peace. I also, am opposed to militarism, and I trust that the idea of arbitration will prevail in the end. On the other hand, as long as international intercourse is carried on under the present system, I cannot agree that Canada should remain the only country in the world with coasts to protect, but without a single ship suitable for their defence.

The fair treatment which to this day is granted to those who are not in a position to defend themselves, is such an uncertain quantity, that not only a feeling of national pride, but one of self respect and the very instinct of self preservation should induce us to look for something better.

As we are aware that question was not at first a popular one in the province of Quebec. There are questions which it is advisable to take up first from the point of view of their drawbacks. Such is the proposal of undergoing a heavy expenditure for military purposes. Moreover our opponents took the lead. However, while such a policy has its drawbacks, its weak points, it has its strong points, its justification on the grounds of caution, dignity and the need of protection, and these will not be lost sight of any more in Quebec than in the other provinces of the Dominion. And when as the actual facts warrant us to do, we inform the people of Quebec that their opposition members in this House—averse as they are to contributing anything — greeted with tumultuous applause the proposal of the leader of the opposition to contribute at once the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts, or about $25,000,000—a foregone conclusion—and when we add that the major part of that opposition who advocate an immediate contribution, applauded in the same way the hon. member for Jacques Cartier and his few followers, the electorate of Quebec and other parts of Canada who do not like double dealing, will say, as they have said since 1896, that they prefer the outspoken attitude taken by the government who for all sections of the country declare that we have reached the state of manhood, that consequently we are bound to act as men and to see to protecting ourselves, which is more satisfactory, and ultimately will be cheaper.

It has been contended that if the people were called upon to express an opinion, the answer would be against the proposed expenditure. If it were so, do you believe the leader of the opposition, after spending ten months in poising public opinion, would be willing to go even farther than he had decided to go in the footsteps of the government on March 24 last?

These hon. gentlemen are free to seek encouragement from audiences made up mainly of opponents of the government—which they have the right to be—and who have numerous other grievances against us. It is an easy matter to find flaws in a measure of such importance; but numerous queries remain unanswered after our opponents have stated their platform.

If through the courtesy of England and the United States we are to be dispensed with the burden of maintaining a navy, it is preferable to be a colony to being a sovereign state. In that case the inhabitant of the metropolis would be made to pay tribute to the colonist. That is certainly not in accordance with history, and the experience of all people the world over and from time immemorial upsets such a contention. There is no example of a nation having preferred the status of a colony to that of a sovereign state, as its ultimate condition. If a navy is an unnecessary thing, how is it that all countries of any standing in the world have provided themselves with one?

It is stated that there is no attack impending. As a matter of fact, there is no immediate danger, but Canada with its young and enterprising towns and its vast plains is the country which has the greatest attraction for immigrants from the old world; and if Japan has had the pluck to take exception to the management of schools in California with a view to protect-

ing Japanese children attending such schools, it is likely enough that this same power might be disposed to question the wisdom of our immigration laws. Now, Japan, which was very little known fifty years ago, has an already powerful fleet.

Only a few days ago, British diplomacy, seconded by the prestige of the British navy, secured for us from the government of Uruguay an amount of $50,000 as compensation for the illegal seizure of some of our fishing boats along the coasts of that country.

In many cases a navy cannot be put to any use, and so much the better. It then has indirectly its usefulness in accordance with that rule, which though objectionable in practice, has some strong points in its favour: 'Si vis pacem, para bellum.'

In his speech of February 3rd, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier recalled an incident of those troublous times of 1837: a British officer present at the trial before court martial of a patriot took pleasure in sketching the prisoner as he would appear on the gallows. Now, there is not a member of this House, there is not a Canadian, whether of English or French lineage, but will repudiate such cruelty, such cynical insult to misfortune. The very perpetrator of such an offence must have been ashamed of himself as soon as the first period of excitement was over. On the other hand, I fail to see what argument the member for Jacques-Cartier will draw from this incident either in favour or in condemnation of the government's proposal. Excesses of that kind cannot be charged against our forerunners, who were the victims and not the perpetrators of such deeds.

During that same debate of February 3rd, the hon. member for North Toronto depicted the former prime minister of Quebec, the late Honoré Mercier, under rather unfavourable colours. He represented him as anti-British, and in so doing he was speaking of a man of whom he had a very imperfect knowledge. Mercier, who had a free hand in Quebec about 1888, was well disposed towards Ontario. We all remember how such disposition materialized in 1890, when unfortunately the university of Toronto was consumed by fire. I refer to this fact, not that it has a great meaning in itself, but as showing what were the real feelings of the man and how uncalled for are the aspersions cast on his memory by the member for North Toronto on February 10. If that hon. member only took the pains of ascertaining the facts in regard to Quebec's representative men, he would have to modify a good many of his utterances.

Now, as to those who would be disposed to contribute cash or the equivalent of two Dreadnoughts.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). Will the hon. member allow me to ask a question?

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. Certainly.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe asserts his willingness to defend Canada on land and on sea, but will he go so far as to say that he approves of the idea of our taking part, in case of emergency, as stated in clause 18 of the Bill, in all imperial warfare?

Mr. BEAUPARLANT. (Translation). If the hon. member will take patience, he will see in the latter part of my remarks what position I take. I propose voting for the Bill and clause 18, subject to amendments which may be made in committee.

Mr. PAQUET. (Translation). Then you are in favour of the proposal of Canada participating in imperial wars?

Mr. BEAUPARLANT (Translation). In so far as I am concerned, I do not wish to be debarred from the privilege of entering into an alliance with whomsoever I may deem it useful to make such an alliance in my country's interests. As a French Canadian I have just as much the right to enter into an alliance with England whenever I believe it in the interest of Canada, in the same way that the French people in France have themselves formed an alliance with England previous to the Crimean war in 1854. I take just as much pride in my French Canadian ancestry as the hon. member for l'Islet may take; and it is this very desire of doing my duty as such which enjoins me to take all means possible of promoting the interests of Canada according to circumstances, under the control and responsibility towards the representatives of the Canadian people of the Minister of Marine of Canada. I would not be doing my duty as a French Canadian, by laying down as a principle never to enter into such alliance or other, under any circumstances, even though should that alliance be useful to us.

Now, those who are willing to contribute purely and simply, forthwith and unconditionally $25,000,000, or any other amount, or who, in other words, would be disposed to hand over the whole outfit to be controlled exclusively by the home authorities, do not appear to realize that differences may arise between the mother country and the colonies, or else should such differences arise, they would allow the matter to be settled at the sweet will of the adverse party. Now, that is not at all in accordance with the Anglo-Saxon's love of liberty, or desire of upholding his rights, nor with his legitimate craving for managing his own affairs.

Differences of that nature do not arise solely between foreign nations. The Spanish colonies of South America, the peoples

who colonized North America, though homogeneous and of either Spanish or Anglo-Saxon undoubted origin, have not always had interests or views similar to those of their mother lands, neither have the northern and southern sections of the United States, following the war of independence, always had similar views. And the question of bi-metalism, while it did not bring about such grievous animosities between the East and West, was an occasion of serious differences.

Within the very bounds of the Dominion, British Columbia, has not always been in unison with the other provinces on the question of oriental immigration—as my eloquent friend from Nanimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) is aware— neither as regards its financial arrangements with the Dominion government. The Dominion government and the Ontario government have also been at loggerheads, especially regarding the license law, a difference which culminated in the carrying of the Hodge case, though unimportant as regards the amount involved, to the foot of the Throne. The province of Quebec has also occasionally differed from the other provinces. Finally, in England, a country wherein order and public opinion have a predominating influence, and make for stability to a remarkable degree, harmony has not always prevailed on important issues.

Some may object that these are questions of local government, and that when it comes to a question of national defence, the whole forces of the nation should be made to converge towards the attainment of one same object. But, in such a case the least that could be done would be to provide representation in the same measure as new obligations are imposed. And the plan proposed by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) though I cannot approve of it, would be more in harmony with the principle 'no taxation without representation,' than the system which consists in handing over the control to a country over whose administration we have not the slightest control.

Now, if diversity of interests and differences of opinion have arisen within the bounds of a single Dominion, there is still greater reason to expect that such differences exist or will assert themselves between countries separated by oceans. And the diplomatic wording, the ominous expressions, wherein such an emergency is deftly passed over, is necessarily pregnant with concealments and reservations.

Whoever puts himself at the mercy of others might just as well at the outset give up all contention of his own. The proposal agreed to at the last conference, the principle of which has been retained in this Bill, is preferable to the former system, inasmuch as it provides for the protection of Canada's special interests, and if, as we have reason to hope, the navy is to be built in Canada, it also ensures to the Canadian producer and worker the benefit of such contributions as we are called upon to make. That is why I approve of such proposal in preference to that of contributing without anything been granted in return, while we are ourselves deprived of all means of control.

It is that liberal policy of the home authorities which ensures to Great Britain the loyalty of its colonists and helps in maintaining her in the forefront of the nations of the world. Of all the dependencies of Great Britain, Ireland alone has been deprived of its autonomy, of its self government, and that at the beginning of the last century. Now, if I am not entirely mistaken, there is not much sympathy towards England to be found in Ireland than there is in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or even South Africa, whose conquest is of such recent date.

Equal rights and mutual consideration are better cementers of durable and true alliances than the mere exercise of force. However, it is from another view point that I propose dealing with this question.

If the philathropic idea which inspired the Hague conference had been fully put into practice, the question which we are considering, as well as all questions of militarism, would have been solved in a thorough, final and world-wide manner. And if it were Canada's power, even through the expenditure of an amount equal to that necessitated for the establishment of a navy to take a hand in bringing about such a result, I do not say that I would oppose the government's proposal, for then there would be of course no occasion for the government introducing such a measure.

Of course, the great powers only are in a position to deal effectively with such a matter. The voice of a colony, whatever its importance, would not be heard. Sovereign countries only had representatives at the Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907. On the other hand, conferences between the mother country and ourselves are of frequent occurrence; and that means is always open to us of reaching the international concert, should we be more fearful of assuming a status of complete sovereignty,—an isolation which may be deemed alarming,—than other colonies which though weaker at the time than we are to-day, have been bold enough to assume such a status.

Universal peace is a dream of philanthropy, the carrying into effect of which may be permitted to wish for. Apart from her own forces and those of her colonies, England may rely on the help of the neighbouring republic a natural and powerful ally, and on the co-operation of her old-time rival, France, a friend to-day; and we

have reason to believe that the combined influence of those three great powers and of those who naturally follow their lead, would bring about the acceptance of certain all important clauses in the treaty for universal peace. The United States, France and England after coming out victorious in war, would crown their achievements by a final victory in peace.

These humanitarian views have been given expression to by the official delegates of the British workingmen, Mr. Appleton, who at the International conference held at Paris last summer, deplored in bitter terms the fact that while England was spending two billions for the maintenance of the army and the navy, she was spending fifty millions only towards education and the development of arts and sciences. And bear in mind that England is one of the countries of the world wherein the illiterate are in the smallest numbers, and one of the countries of Europe, at any rate wherein military service is less exacting, inasmuch as it is not even compulsory.

The feeling in France in this respect has also already received semi-official expression. As the result of a competition bearing on the question as to who was the greatest Frenchman of the nineteenth century, a competition initiated by a great French newspaper, modestly designated 'Le petit Parisien,' militarism was relegated to the fourth place by a majority of subscribers to this paper, who represent practically French public opinion, and the first place was assigned to philanthropy, which commends itself to the human reason and to the good feelings of men, when not vitiated by circumstances. Through that plebiscite France proclaimed that her greatest citizen of the last century was Pasteur, the healer, the benefactor of humanity, and not Napoleon, the scourge of humanity.

French and German advocates of peace, forgetting their broils of recent occurrence, and their old-time grudges, extend a friendly hand and unite in denouncing those constantly recurring conflicts and armaments by their respective governments.

The president of the United States, Mr. Taft, and Canadian statesmen, among others the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), whom I now see at his seat—have also with marked satisfaction, during the recent festivities at Burlington, celebrated the centenary of peace maintained between Canada and the United States, and that along a frontier of 3,000 miles in length.

In this Dominion of Canada, in Toronto, that hot-bed of loyalty, there has been established a Canadian association for peace and arbitration, of which Mr. William Mulock is the president and Dr. C. S. Eby, the secretary. In the course of a sermon delivered at the Crescent street Presbyterian church of Montreal, an English preacher, the Rev. W. W. Dickie, has not hesitated in condemning before a numerous audience the policy of militarism as a disgrace to civilization.

Finally, the two conferences both held at the Hague in 1899 and 1907, may be pointed to as events of a novel character to this day, as regards their humanitarian inspiration, preciseness of their object, the plausibility of their methods and the evident good faith of their promoters. The human conscience, which for centuries past has not tolerated that differences between private owners as to property rights should be decided by handicuffs on the street, is beginning to be impatient at witnessing the settlement through pitched battles of differences arising between sovereign countries of boundary disputes or other international conflicts.

Ethics should not be made to vary in accordance with the importance of the interests at stake. These are, amongst many others, indications of a desire to see universal peace firmly established, a result which the heads of the ten principal states of Europe and America should and might bring about through the making of an international code which would be finally and permanently accepted.

What the heads of the ten leading states of Europe and America have not had the courage or power of accomplishing, delegates of the working fraternity the world over who are to meet in London next summer, have decided to attempt at their conference. On that account they are entitled to universal gratitude.

The acceptance of an international code carries with it the establishment of tribunals. Tribunals are human institutions; as such, they are not always above reproach; but their decisions as a rule should be more equitable than the rule of the sword.

It has been objected that there exists no sheriff, no bailiff in international matters, to carry out the orders of a world-wide tribunal and ensure their observance. That would be the part assigned to the common international force to which the various nations would contribute units much smaller than their present armaments. And if a bailiff, single-handed can enforce on individuals the will of the nation, a few thousand men will be in a position to enforce the observance of international decrees.

These are facts, theories and hopes on which the advocates of universal peace rely for ultimate success; but, it should be admitted that the spirit of warfare is far from being yet extinct on the face of the earth. While making a pretense to peaceful intentions, the various powers are all very self

asserting. At the Hague conference motions for postponing the settlement of various questions were more likely than any others to carry unanimously. Many are the reservations made in regard to the final conclusions. And if we are not willing to be content with what other nations despise, if we are desirous of being on a footing with other countries, at any rate on a par with a few of the 47 states who were represented at the Hague, apart from Canada, we will have to make sacrifices somewhat similar to those made by mature nations, at any rate until the time comes when international conflicts are settled through arbitration.

While adapting Canadian politics to meet the needs of the moment, we should strenuously deprecate those doings which are the main causes of international strife; the excessive ambition of nations, of institutions, and even of individuals, self conceit, prejudice, the coveting of riches, the spirit of domination, and above all possibly that false patriotism, the outcome of which is merely to set up each nation as the foe of all others.

Patriotism, as it is oftentimes understood and advocated, is a deplorable evil which has done humanity more harm than all other covetings and wrong-doings of men. We often hear people dilating on the ardent love men should have for their country. Now, that love of country, which in itself is worthy of admiration, ceases to be such as soon as it depends for its sustenance on the hatred of the foreigner. If in France, the people are to be taught to love France jealously, exclusively, if in England the people are to be taught to love England jealously, exclusively; if in Germany, in the United States and in the various other countries of the world, the same policy is followed, then bloody wars will ensue and to horrible condition will humanity be brought.

A theory cannot be considered good, if the consequences it leads to are undeniably deplorable. If only we habitually viewed our fellowmen as human beings and not as fellow-citizens or foreigners, those in the majority, the great powers, and those in authority would lose nothing of their privileges, while minorities, small nations and weaklings would obtain some improvement in their condition.

Let appeals to national prejudices be discarded, and grasping individuals, institutions or nations, who have existed under all climes and at all ages, will thus be deprived of the means of preying on the naive heroism of the masses, and finding themselves unsupported, will lose all hope of attaining their object. Though it may be designated as patrotism, such exclusiveness is nothing more than egotism and selfishness extended to the nation is neither more generous nor worthy of greater admiration, while the consequenecs are proportionately more disastrous as it extends from the individual to the nation.

No, Mr. Speaker, though substantial progress has been made in that direction, the problem of universal peace has not yet been solved. And we have to choose between making sacrifices in proportion to those made by other nations, or else be content with what others will be willing to concede to us. Now, history and experience have long ago apprised each one of us that if we expect to get fair treatment when left at the good will of others, we will be sadly mistaken. As long as international intercourse is ruled by the customs now in force, it would be folly on our part to put ourselves in such position.

Our opponents entreat us in the name of what is dearest to us, to abstain even from providing the basis of a Canadian navy. That is pure rhetoric, which may appeal to an audience made up for the most part of opponents of the government, who have numerous other reasons for fighting us, but it is no answer to a question which requires to be solved by a growing people, who have reached the adult stage, and who unwilling to continue subsidizing others directly or indirectly for their defence, have resolved to undertake that task on their own account. We might as well and with better cause state that it is in the interest of those who are dearest to us that we consent to the necessary sacrifices being made with a view to laying the foundations of status superior to that of mere wards or dependents of other nations, and to ensuring to the Canadian people and to every one of our fellow-citizens security, consideration, greater independence and more comfort, either at home or elsewhere; to the merchant on the ocean, as well as to the farmers and manufacturers who supply his cargo. Whether powerful or not, whether rich or poor, for the stay-at-home as well as for the traveller, for the diplomat, the shipmaster or the crew of the fishing craft navigating in foreign seas, for the youthful emigrant seeking fortune in neighbouring countries, as well as the hardy pioneer who winds his way to the mining regions of Alaska or the poor miner who goes down into the depths of a Pennsylvania colliery. It is better to belong to a nation esteemed and respected than to a nation enjoying no such consideration.

In conclusion, the proposed expenditure is of a most undesirable character. It is not at all necessary to be in the ranks of the opposition to recognize that. However, it cannot be avoided under present international conditions, unless we are willing to abide by whatever concessions foreign nations are willing to make in our favour. As long as other nations go to the length of

appropriating money for armaments, we cannot reasonably suppose that they will not be more exacting than ourselves as regards the sharing of powers, riches and other advantages.

And if we Canadians are obliged to make further sacrifices towards armaments, let us at any rate retain control, and not only in principle or in theory, but practically, effectively and permanently. We shall thereby occupy a better position in matters of international import, and obtain better treatment should we become a party to some treaty of alliance, or otherwise, with other nations.

However, let us hope that before these ships that we are about to build have become old, out-of-date, through the progress of aerial navigation and otherwise, the arbitrators of international peace will have accomplished long ago, that is they will have contributed to the settlement of that question the required quota of good will in the shape of mutual concessions, and that these ships instead of being used as a means of prolonging such unreasonable and onerous conflicts, will have for the greater part been remodelled and made to develop international trade, that powerful agency for promoting international prosperity and welfare.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). I am sorry I was not able to follow very closely the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beauparlant) who has just sat down. If I understood him correctly, however, he directed a good deal of his discourse towards the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and also the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). While I applaud his enthusiasm and the patriotic way in which he delivered himself, I detected however, a strain of selfishness in his address, for he seemed to confine his patriotism almost entirely to the province of Quebec. Now I will just say that the Dominion should be taken as a whole, we should have equal loyalty to every part of this Dominion. The province of Quebec is not the whole of Canada; and there seems to be in some quarters a feeling that the proposed fleet should lie in the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Again, I think we should take in the whole of the British empire into our consideration, just as we should take in the whole Dominion. We should look to the safety of the British empire, feeling that we are citizens of that empire. I am sure that if the province of Quebec were attacked, the other eight provinces would rise as one man to go to her defence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate very carefully for a number of days, and I have tried to do so with an open mind. I feel that we should conduct this discussion entirely above politics, and it is in that view that I desire to discuss it myself. In the first place when this question began to be discussed, I was under the impression that we should have a Canadian fleet built by Canadians, built in Canada, and of Canadian materials. However, as the discussion has gone on, one question struck me continually, and I waited day after day and hour after hour to hear that question answered. That question is this: What are we going to do for Britain and the British empire if the British empire is attacked within the next five years? We have no guarantee that peace will be maintained for five years, that Germany will not attack Britain within the next five years. But we are told plainly that it will take us one year to enlarge our dry docks, and four years at least to build our little Bristols. Now what are we going to do in the meantime? Are seven and a half millions of King Edward's loyal subjects on this side of the Atlantic going to stand with folded hands and see the old land taken by an enemy, see her robbed of her wealth, see our beloved King Edward led off a prisoner as Napoleon the Third was? Are we to stand idly by for five years without doing anything to ward off such a catastrophe? Until that question is answered I feel that I cannot agree with the Bill that is now proposed for our consideration.

After listening to this discourse for a considerable time, I feel it my duty to speak out boldly and freely in regard to a question of such vital importance as the defence and preservation of Canada and of the British empire. I do this the more freely, because I have some suggestions to make which I think might be of use if they were properly considered, but which I fear will scarcely be in accord with the views of either the leader of the government or the leader of the opposition. I may say however, that some of my constituents and many others whose opinions I value very highly, seem to think that my views are sound, safe, economical and businesslike. Of course I may be wrong, but I am open to conviction. Let me say, however, that there must be something more to convince me than mere bald assertions. That has been tried on me already, and it has failed. I must have logical arguments put up to me, arguments founded on known facts and founded on common sense. In the meantime I feel that I would not be doing my duty to my country and to my constituents if I sat silent in this House, and beheld one of the greatest and most far reaching follies that was ever perpetrated in a civilized country enacted before my eyes. My duty becomes doubly imperative when I find that some hon. gentlemen on my own side of the House are inclined

to advocate measures that I do not find quite satisfactory. You will, therefore, gather from what I have said that I do not think that either of the two great political parties in Canada exactly realize how they can most effectively assist Great Britain in the present emergency.

That there is an emergency, I make no doubt. No one has yet proved that there is not an emergency. The very fact that the Asquith government brought in a budget imposing extra taxes to meet an emergency, that they required so much more money, and that the budget was so unpopular, that the Asquith government was nearly defeated, shows that there is an emergency. Since that election was over they have ordered the building of four extra Dreadnoughts, showing that in Great Britain at least an emergency is believed to exist. Actions speak louder than words. Now, an emergency requires emergency measures, and these are generally of a temporary character. Therefore, it seems to me that all we have to do at present is to make some temporary arrangement that will enable Britain and the empire to tide over the present crisis. Now, in the old days when a great general met with a military emergency in the shape of a great river that impeded the onward march of his army, he did not stop to build a stone bridge with solid stone abutments, and erect thereon a steel structure; if he had done so, he and his army would have been taken at a great disadvantage, and would have been ruined. Instead of that, he built a bridge of boats over which he safely transferred his army. Similarly, by adopting the principle of a temporary arrangement, I am prepared to show how Canada can give to Britain seven extra Dreadnoughts until this crisis is over. Now, Sir, you may say that is a strong assertion, but I will ask you not to condemn it until you have heard my argument. Besides that, I think I can show you how we can save millions and millions of dollars at the same time to the Canadian people without spending nearly as much money as either of the proposed plans would entail, simply because it will be a temporary measure. Now, if I undertake to prove that big proposition, it will be necessary for me to examine thoroughly the ground and establish my arguments on a solid foundation, because there is no doubt that I will have the whole House against me.

In the first place, I will take up the question of dry-docks. I am in favour of the enlargement of our dry-docks, and I think the government in that respect are going in the right direction. It is absolutely necessary that we should enlarge our dry-docks. Our trade and commerce require it. Take the dry-dock at Lévis, Quebec, only 600 feet long and 62 feet wide. Suppose the 'Oceanic' wished to come to that port, she is 685 feet long and 68 feet wide, and if any accident should happen to that vessel in the Gulf of St. Lawrence she could not be repaired on this side of the water, she would have to cross the ocean before she could be repaired. Now, we know that a vessel, when injured, generally draws more water than she did before. Therefore, I say that the dry-dock at Lévis should be enlarged. We have many other vessels plying to Quebec which the dry-dock is too small to accommodate. We have sailing the ocean such ships as the 'Kaiser William II.,' the 'Deutschland,' the 'Cedric,' and the 'Baltic,' the great size of which renders it necessary that dry-docks must be made larger and larger. Why, not so long ago, the 'Empress of Ireland' had to be taken across the ocean to be repaired. I say, Sir, that the requirements of our trade and commerce demand that these dry-docks should be enlarged. If we are to compete with an enlarged, and deepened, and improved, Erie canal, we must do everything in our power to keep up the good name of the St. Lawrence route, and to provide that insurance rates on that route shall be reduced. For my part, I would approve of the dry-dock at Halifax being enlarged, and I may say here that I am in favour of the establishment of a naval college in Halifax, or anywhere else, where it may best be located. I believe also that the dry-docks at St. John and Esquimalt should be enlarged. But, Sir, I object entirely to saying that such improvements are to be charged up to the motherland as something we have done for her or on her behalf. Why, to say that, would be acting on the principle that if a man had a fine residence in this city with beautiful grounds, and some tramp was to attack him in his garden, and a neighbour came across to assist him, and after the melee it was necessary to take that neighbour into his house, get a surgeon and have his wounds attended to, and then when he would be going away, instead of the man thanking him for coming to his assistance he would say: I built this big house and fixed up these grounds for your special accommodation and benefit. In a similar way, if a war vessel of Britain is ever injured in Canadian waters, it will be when she comes here to protect the cowardly Canadians who will not defend themselves, and surely we might give these British ships the benefit of our dry-docks until they get their wounds repaired.

There is another matter which I think should be taken up by the government, and that is the encouragement of aviation. I think this government should have done something for Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin, when they attended the military camp at Petawawa last summer. We are told that the government gave them the use of some sheds on the grounds, but what the gov-

ernment ought to have done was, to pay their way there, maintain them properly when they were there, and pay their expenses back again at least. They are considering in other countries the question of the navigation of the air and Canada should not be behind. I notice that is the course of one experiment made in California a man had gone up in an airship and was able to drop 200 pounds of sand on to a piece of white paper ten feet square. If the science becomes so perfect as that it might be possible to destroy even Dreadnoughts by airships. We know what they are doing in Britain in this matter, we know what Zeppelin has done in Germany, we know what success they have had in France, and why should not Canadians be encouraged in the development of aviation. When we consider that Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin had backing them a man of such genius as Dr. Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone, surely this government should have accorded them some practical help. I notice that Mr. D'Almcida, in a lecture before the Engineers' Club, of Toronto, stated that he thought the time was near at hand when airships would be considered the safest, cheapest and best means of transportation, and added that the time may come when we will be able to go around the earth in seventy hours. Surely, there may be some wonderful developments in the future when such remarks are taken cognizance of by an intelligent and educated body like the members of the engineers club. Now, why are we neglecting this very important factor in the defence of our country? It is stated in the Toronto 'Globe' of the 14th instant—and no doubt it is true when the ' Globe ' prints it—that a military airship in Britain was launched for the use of the British army, and that she answered her helm perfectly on her trial trips, even when speeding in the teeth of a stiff breeze. Well, our Canadian people should be encouraged in the pursuit of this science and in the near future it may mean more than a fleet of little cruisers, or even Dreadnoughts. Indeed, the control of the navigation of the air may mean more to Canada than either of the propositions now before the House. This is an important day in the history of Canada; it is an important day in the history of the British empire and the world, because I believe that to-day the eyes of every nation on earth are turned towards Canada. It is known everywhere that a perilous time and fearful crisis in the affairs of the British empire is approaching, and the world is wondering what Canada will do. I would remind the House that the very moment it was known that this crisis was near our younger, smaller, and weaker sister nations did their duty and did it vigorously. They did not wait to write, they cabled assistance to the mother country, and Canada has been the only tardy child, the only laggard in this great family of nations. It was known right here in Ottawa more than a year ago, that this danger was coming, and what have we done? Deliberately in the face of that knowledge we spent the whole of the year 1909 in passing, unanimously it is true, a very high sounding and loyal resolution. We made a noise but we did nothing. The session of 1910 is well advanced now, and still nothing practical has been done; we have had a great deal of talk, Grit talk and Tory talk, but we have done nothing. I think it is admitted that we will have to spend 1911 in enlarging our dry-docks, and then I suppose we will spend 1912 in building the slips on which, in 1913, we will begin to build our little cruisers. If we may judge by the progress that is usually made in erecting public buildings and the construction of government works in this country we may safely assume that the ships cannot be ready before 1920. The Prime Minister said it will take four years to build the cruisers and it is admitted it will take one year to enlarge the dry-docks; the leader of the opposition says the cruisers will not be ready for fifteen years, but I will take a happy medium between the two and say they will be ready in ten years.

Could the enemies of Britain wish anything better than to know that under these circumstances we are to have a Canadian-built navy composed of little vessels or cruisers that are sure to be obsolete and out of date before they are constructed? Why, if the government were in league with the enemies of Canada, it could not give them a better guarantee. It is simply a guarantee that even these little cruisers will not be ready for from seven to ten years, and will not be of any use when they are ready. Britain has a great many of these small vessels now, and has had them for a good many years, before Dreadnoughts were built. She could only use a few of them in a struggle in the North Sea, because these little vessels of the Apollo and Bristol type are used only as scouts; they are used to evade the enemy, to run away, not to fight. They would be worse than useless in a contest on the ocean unless there were a Dreadnought or super-Dreadnought in the neighbourhood behind which they could run for shelter. There is no doubt, however, that Great Britain can use all the little vessels she has to good account, without taking them into the North Sea, to guard her cotton raw material and food supplies. Those who are pretty well on in life remember well the great suffering that there was in Lancashire when the cotton supply was cut off at the time of the American war. If Britain's cotton supply were cut off tomorrow, there would be the greatest possible suffering, and if her food supply were

cut off, she could be surrounded like a beleaguered city and starved out in a month. We have recently heard a great deal in this House and out of it about the immense aggregate tonnage of Britain's warships. This is a very plausible argument, but it is just as deceptive and misleading as it is plausible, and it is unworthy of a great man and a clear thinker. We all know that the smaller ships are so far out-classed by Dreadnoughts that in a battle on the ocean they could not get near to a Dreadnought or injure it in any way. Therefore, in future nothing but the tonnage of Dreadnoughts and super-Dreadnoughts will count. I often think that Canadians who live hundreds or it may be thousands of miles away from the ocean, have a small idea of what a fearful death-dealing monster a Dreadnought really is. We can only convey this idea to them by comparison and description. We cannot take them to see one. Some idea can be formed when I say that a Dreadnought has a displacement of 22,000 tons, whereas the little ship in which Jacques Cartier first crossed the ocean and landed in Canada had a displacement of only 60 tons. A Dreadnought is simply a death-dealing monster covered with nickel steel eleven inches thick and armed with ten 12-inch guns, any one of which, if discharged at close range, would send a ball through a solid mass of wrought iron three feet thick. It requires 200 pounds of cordite for a single charge and it throws a shell weighing 750 pounds; so that if the ten guns were discharged all at once, they would hurl forth nearly four tons of metal bursting shells which would be deadly at six miles. Now, Germany will have a great many of these Dreadnoughts by 1912 or 1913. We have heard so many different estimates here, and they are so confusing that I scarcely know how many she will have; but from what I can gather, she will have from 17 to 20 of these marine monsters in 1912 or 1913. Britain will have as many or a few more; but she cannot, like Germany, put all her Dreadnoughts in the North Sea at the same time, because she has many outlying points to guard, in the Mediterranean and elsewhere; and she will have to guard Quebec too. More, owing to her insular position, she must in every case guard the line of her food supply, and protect it perfectly. It is as important to guard that as it is to meet the German fleet in the North Sea. We would still have an adequate idea of the preparations which are being made to dismember the British empire if we had not some idea of the invincible land army with which Germany is now guarding the Dreadnoughts which she is building. A writer for McClure's magazine for November last, gave a very good description of that. He said that Germany could on 12 hours notice hurl 400,000 men, fully armed and equipped, and 800 guns upon either her eastern or western border; that in two days she could increase that number to a million, in two weeks to two millions, and finally to four millions, the greatest and best army on this earth. Germany has in her war office ready for use, plans for the invasion of every country in Europe. She has an intelligence system that seems to make known to her what is going on in every part of the world. She has accurate maps of every country on earth, and every officer and man in that vast army has secret mobilization orders that will enable him, when notified by telegram or telephone, to take his place immediately in the great German fighting machine. The railroads of Germany are mostly owned by the state, and are part of her military machine. She has armoured trains ready. She has bridge-building materials lying at suitable places, and at the great fortress of Spandau, near Berlin, this writer says, she has many hundreds of sacks of gold, a part of the French war indemnity, which is carefully guarded, and which forms the nucleus of a war fund. I might also call your attention to the fact that Germany has a magnificent air fleet capable of thundering destruction from the skies. At Ehrenbreitstein not long since that air fleet had military manoeuvres and a sham battle that lasted three hours. So that in every direction Germany is preparing for the conflict; even her air ships are ready for action; and I think we know what all these preparations are for. Germany has an immense population, rapidly increasing, of more than 60,000,000 people, cooped up in a little territory of 208,000 square miles, about four-fifths the size of our new province of Alberta. Her farmers are thoroughly protected, and therefore they are prosperous and numerous; and by means of her technical schools and the wonderful industry of her population she has become one of the leading manufacturing countries in the world. Germany wants more room and new markets, and there can be no doubt that is the origin of the trouble. This is no false alarm, because we find the Krenz Zeitung, a leading German paper recently said that for England to think that Germany was not building her Dreadnoughts for the purpose of opposing Britain, was simply to adopt the policy of the ostrich which sticks its head into the sand and then thinks it is safe.

During this debate, we have had the names of eminent statesmen quoted to us time and again—men who are leaders in both the great political parties in the old land, men who have the means of knowing and who do know, men whose word and wisdom are above suspicion—and

these men have told us that not only the integrity, but the very existence of the British empire is threatened. If Germany is not making those preparations to attack Britain, why is she building so many Dreadnoughts? She does not require them to attack France or Russia or any other land power. She is evidently building them for one purpose, and that is the destruction of the British empire. Her evident intention is to outclass and outnumber and defeat the British fleet on the North sea, seize the very heart of the empire, plunder the country, exact an enormous war indemnity, and perhaps carry away our beloved King, a prisoner, as she did the Emperor Napoleon III, and then proceed to crush and conquer the colonies at her leisure, and as a matter of detail. When the German Dreadnoughts are ready, she can choose her own time to make an attack; and there is no doubt at all, that when she does strike, she will follow her usual course of striking quickly, and when least expected. Just look at her strategical position. She has everything to gain if victorious, and if defeated she has nothing to lose, for all her fleet has to do is sail back to the protection of her invincible land forces; whereas should she win she can dismember the British empire, capture its immense wealth, control the ocean, and become the leading power in the world. That is something for Germany to fight for; and if we do not watch ourselves, there is little doubt that she will succeed. Judging by her past record I fear she would make a merciless conqueror and a hard taskmaster. We know what she has done to others. In 1864 she picked a quarrel with little Denmark, and despoiled that kingdom of two provinces. In 1866, owing to the discovery of her needle gun, she succeeded in crushing Austria in a single battle. In 1870, she overran France, seized two of that country's most favoured provinces, took the Emperor Napoleon away a prisoner as a hostage, and allowed him to die at Chiselhurst, and exacted the until then unheard of war indemnity of $1,000,000,000. Need we expect that this hitherto invincible power will spare Britain and her colonies if that unfortunate day should come when conquered Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen and oversea Britons would have to plead for mercy before their victorious and unrelenting masters. Germany, it is said, has spent thirty years in preparing for this. In the meantime she has consolidated her empire, she has enlarged and improved her old canals, and built many new ones. She has been increasing and perfecting her invincible land army, and also supported and encouraged the enterprising firm of the Krupps until it has become the greatest manufacturing establishment of military supplies in the world.

Germany has the advantage of being able to attack Britain by sea, whereas Britain cannot attack her by land; and I would just say that should the day come when Germany shall have conquered Britain, and a German tax be put on our products going to the British market, our Canadian farmers will suffer very severely. Even that is something to look after. Should the day of peril ever come, those silly Canadians, who are willing to trust to our little unbuilt cruisers, would then find out, when too late, that their cruisers, even if built and going out to meet the fleet of German Dreadnoughts, would simply be the laughing stock of the world. And what is still worse, if these cruisers were manned by loyal Canadian citizens and seamen, the poor fellows would be slaughtered before they could raise a finger to defend themselves. They would be simply butchered to make a German holiday.

As to those other foolish Canadians who depend on the Munroe doctrine, they would find, also when too late, that though the United States might not be willing to allow a European country to take permament possession of Canada, they would never think of going to war, especially with the conqueror of Britain, for the purpose of preventing Germany from levying on Canada a war indemnity of such astounding proportions that it would simply mean the ruin of this country.

In the face of all this, we are told there is no danger, that these preparations do not mean anything; and although one of the greatest military disasters that could befall a civilized country is almost upon us, our government is doing nothing but waving the old flag, shouting loyalty and marking time. I had a letter from one of my constituents the other day in which he said the people were becoming alarmed and suspicious. He said that they heard the 'hail master' and the giving of the kiss, and were beginning to be afraid of what might follow. Britain requires Dreadnoughts in the North sea. She requires them without delay. Why then this policy on the part of our government of putting off, doing nothing, dilly dallying? Is it any wonder that our sister colonies are beginning to suspect Canada's loyalty to the British Crown? In my opinion Canada is loyal, but the whole trouble is not a lack of loyalty on the part of the government, as some of our friends seem to think, but simply their want of promptness and business ability, because there is neither promptness nor business ability shown in their proposal to build those little cruisers. In the first place should the crisis come upon us, we have no time in which to build them, we have not the trained mechanics, we have no mills with facilities to roll plates of nickel and steel

such as would be required. It would take us years to get the men trained for this work and those necessary appliances.

What good would those cruisers be to Britain if they were lying in the mouth of the St. Lawrence if Britain were engaged in a life and death struggle with German Dreadnoughts in the North Sea? They would be no more use to her than my hitching post standing on the street in front of my office in Wingham would be to me today in trying to rouse the government to do their duty and avoid this foolish and extravagant expenditure of public money. If a wounded man were in a position where he could not get away, and saw a man loading a rifle with the avowed intention of attacking hm, if he was not just fit for the lunatic asylum, he would not sit down there to manufacture a little wooden popgun to defend himself. He might try to borrow, or hire, or buy, some weapon. The government is in a similar position, and is acting just in that way. The German Dreadnoughts are nearly ready to launch, and yet our government are going to sit down to build little Dreadnoughts of their own. I think that settles the government question.

I will now undertake a task which is probably not so agreeable, that is an examination of the resolution that has been brought in by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I must say that I do not approve very much of either, but, after all, the resolution brought in by the leader of the opposition would give Great Britain two extra Dreadnoughts at the right time and in the right place, before 1912 or 1913. It may have a great many other drawbacks, and certainly there are a great many reasons why I do not approve of a gift of money, but at the same time it has that good quality, and I consider in that respect it is a little better than the government plan. I must admit that there was some truth in the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just assumed his seat (Mr. Beauparlant). He referred to the fact that the government were proposing to spend a certain amount of money on war ships, and that there was a proposal that there should be a plebiscite. I think myself there is a great deal of force in that, and if the government are to be blamed for spending $15,000,000 or $20,000,000—for I have no idea it will be anything less—without consulting the people, certainly there is a little force in the argument that the opposition should not propose to spend $20,000,000 without consulting the people. I must admit there is some force in that argument. There is another argument. We have not got $20,000,000 to spend. I notice that there has been a continual reference to $25,000,000. That sum is not mentioned in the resolution of the leader of the opposition, it only mentions enough to build two Dreadnoughts. The original Dreadnought cost not qute $10,000,000. Therefore, $20,000,000 is the amount. We have not $20,000,000. If we pass a resolution to-day to give to Britain $20,000,000, or two Dreadnoughts, we have neither dollars nor Dreadnoughts to give. We will have to go to Great Britain to borrow the money, and if we gave the Dreadnoughts, we would have to go to Britain to get them built. We would be like a child going to his father in the Christmas holidays and saying: I want to get $100 to buy you a new watch, to make you a present. The father to please the child might give the $100, but he would know he was weakening himself financially, for if he kept the $100, he could certainly make a better bargain than the little boy.

Another objection to a money payment is that by it we would be paying for protection instead of fighting for our freedom. Canadians are not such cringing cowards that they are afraid to fight. They are ready to fight for the empire but here we are going to give them a few dollars and say: Let us away. That is the part the coward always plays, he does not want to meet the foe but hires a substitue, he gives a little money. In this connection I may say plainly that no nation that has long depended on hired protection has retained its liberty for any length of time. We have an example of this in the old days. At the close of the Persian war, the Athenians and the minor Greek states met together and arranged to raise a fleet for the protection of their common interests. It was arranged that three small states should have fleets of their own and that the others should pay an annual subsidy to Athens and she was to keep a fleet for their protection. This went on for a short time until after a while, some of the smaller states requested that Athens should account for the money she had received. Pericles told them: Oh this is a tribute, you have no right to ask for an accounting. He had command of the fleet they had paid for and they had to continue in subjection. What was the result? These hitherto invincible Greeks remained subjects and were enslaved for nearly 2,000 years, being mastered by the Macedonians and the Romans and the Turks in succession. But we have another example more easily understood by people in this country. After the Romans left Britain, the people of Britain who had been doing no fighting for about 400 years, were unable to protect themselves against the Picts and Scots. They hired the Germans under Hengist and Horsa who came over to assist them and it runs in my mind that the descendants of the Saxons who came there at that time are there yet, they took possession of the country. We have also an example in our own country. When Champlain came to our country the Algon-

quins, a powerful people, employed him to assist them in their wars against the Iroquois, and we see to-day that Champlain's friends have possession of this country and the once powerful Algonquins are simply subjects of charity, wards of the people of this country.

In the course of this debate the example was brought up that Britain at one time gave a great deal of money to Frederick the First to assist him in his wars. Great Britain gave a great many million dollars to Frederick the First of Prussia. What is the result? That same Hohenzollern family that laid its foundation so solidly and deeply in British gold has to-day grown to such dimensions that it is threatening to take possession of the British throne. The old story of the Saxons repeated, hired assistants trying to take possession of the country that employed and paid them.

Another objection to a money contributon is that it proclaims to the world that Great Britain is financially weakening under the strain of the war—of ship-building which has been put upon her. It is, as it were, making a pauper of her. It is a case of telling Germany that Britain is in difficulties, that her colonies have to give her money, that she cannot continue this warship building which has been put upon her.

Another objection is that we do not keep control of the money which we raised. I know that there are examples of cases in which we have given away money; we gave $50,000 to the French in Paris, we gave money to Italy and to San Francisco in times of disaster, but these are only small sums, no more to Canada than $5 or a $10 gift would be to a town council. When we come to give away millions of dollars, I do not consider that the peoples' representatives have any right to make any such valuable gifts of other peoples' money. It is contrary to the principles of responsible government, because it is a grand principle of the British constitution that those who pay the tax should have a voice in spending it.

Now I am ready to put my proposition before the House. I shall proceed to prove that we can give to Britain during this crisis the use of seven extra Dreadnoughts, and at the same time not spend more than one-third of the money that s called for by either of the other propositions. I must explain that Britain's food supply must be protected. She cannot get it from the Mediterranean, because Austria will have 13 large war vessels in the Adriatic by the time the crisis is expected in 1912 or 1913. She cannot get it from Australia, or India, or New Zealand, or South Africa, because the lines of food supply would be too long, and it would take too many ships to protect them. You could not depend on a foreign nation like the United States. In the United States one man out of every four is either a German or of German origin. There are 20 millions of people in the United States of German origin, out of the 80 millions altogether. Then Britain has other enemies in the United States besides the Germans. I think, therefore, that in time of war Britain could not depend upon the United States even if they did not actually declare war. Now then I come to this point, that Britain will be compelled to get her food supply from Canada. For that purpose it would be necessary for her to put all her spare small vessels and at least four Dreadnoughts on the line of that food supply, because that line would extend from the south of the island of Newfoundland away into the centre of the Atlantic, and it would be difficult to guard. Now Britan must have many small vessels on that line, whether we do anything or not. It is only a matter of business for us, we are as much interested in giving her the food as she is in getting it, and it is only a business transaction that we should do something to protect her food supply while it is being conveyed from Canada to the shores of the motherland. I would propose that Canada lease a certain number of these small vessels from Britain until this crisis is over, lease as may of those vessels as she can get, say each year for $1,500,000. In the meantime we would have a few Canadians trained in our naval college to put on those vessels. Now $1,500,000 would pay the interest on $50,000,000. Britain can borrow money at 3 per cent; if we borrowed it we would have to pay 3½ or 4 per cent. Britain can pay the interest on $50,000,000 and with the money that we will give her, she can pay the interest, and not a single extra dollar of taxes would be put on the British people. With the $50,000,000 Britain can build five Dreadnoughts, and when the crisis would be over Canada could negotiate with the motherland on the grand old British principle of the budget that if we have to pay and to fight we should have a voice in the expenditure of money and in the making of war and the declaration of peace otherwise we will take over $20,000,000 of the debt and two of the Dreadnoughts, one for the Pacific and one for the Atlantic. She can build a Dreadnought in from 20 to 24 months, and she can have these extra five Dreadnoughts in time for the crisis. Not a single extra cent would the British people have to pay, and the people of Canada, with that small amount of money, would accomplish that great work. Now I will show you how we could give her two more Dreadnoughts. The line of food supply from Canada would be a very long one, and a difficult one to guard. I would propose that we should open up the Hudson Bay route, that would shorten the line of

Britain's food supply, and would be so much safer and more easy to guard that she could take off two of the Dreadnoughts which she would otherwise be compelled to have on the long line, and then there would be seven extra Dreadnoughts for the North Sea. I know I am undertaking a difficult job to open the Hudson bay. But as I said in the beginning, I am speaking impartially. I would say to the government that their proposal to build the Hudson Bay railway may do more to aid Britain than both plans the two parties are offering to-day. I know that in proposing to open up the Hudson Bay route, I have to face powerful antagonisms. I know that the Hudson Bay Company succeeded in making us believe for 274 years that we could raise no grain in our whole northwest. A British nobleman some years ago talked about the immense deserts of North America covered with ice; and we know that a French king signed away Canada with the remark that it was only a few acres of snow. I have here a little pamphlet published by the government dealing with this question, which says:

According to Dr. Saunders, the head of the Dominion Government's Experimental Farm system, and an authority second to none, if only one-fourth of the suitable land in Manitoba and the southern parts of the two other prairie provinces were annually under wheat, the yield would be more than 812,000,000 bushels, reckoned at the Manitoban average of 19 bushels per acre. This, he points out, would not only feed a population of 30,000,000 in Canada itself (at present there are only about 7,000,000), but would meet the present requirements of Great Britain three times over.

Now, Sir, there is just as much fallacy current about the navigation of the Hudson bay as there was about our wheat lands. There are certain powerful companies interested in keeping the shores of the Hudson bay as a fur preserve. There is another great obstacle in the way, and that is our transcontinental railways. They are very much opposed to opening up the Hudson Bay route, because it will take away their trade. I know that eastern Canada is opposed to it, but I am a big enough Canadian to give western Canada all her rights. I see no advantage in being so narrow minded. We have now four lines of railway running from Winnipeg to Fort William; we have the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and a double line of the Canadian Pacific railway, and these have all they can do. In the Agricultural Committee the other day we were told that only six per cent of the available wheat lands in the west is under cultivation. Now it is only a calculation for a ten year old boy to figure out. If six per cent of the wheat land in the northwest requires four lines of railway to move the product, how many lines will it require when the whole hundred per cent is under cultivation? It will require 64 lines. Then why should we dilly-dally about the opening up of the Hudson bay route?

Now I am going to deal with the climatic conditions of Hudson bay, and first I will read something that I find in 'The Dominion of Canada,' published by the Hon. Sydney Fisher, as part of our immigration literature. Here is what he says about the Hudson bay and about Lake Superior. We have only two ways of getting our food from the wheat fields of the west or our meat from the ranches, either by the Hudson bay route or by the Lake Superior and St. Lawrence route. Now here is what this book says:

The large bodies of water inland greatly modify the severity of the climate. Hudson bay is 1,000 miles long by 600 wide, with an area of 444,000 square miles. Its temperature is 65 degrees F. during summer; in winter it is 3 degrees warmer than the waters of Lake Superior.

This is the point I want to make, that the waters of the Hudson bay in winter are warmer than those of Lake Superior. Why? Because the waters of the Hudson bay are on the level of the ocean, while the waters of Lake Superior are 600 feet above the level of the ocean. Take the mountain of Ben Nevis in Scotland, 4,004 feet high, with sheep grazing at the foot of it and snow all the year around at the top; showing that if we could raise the water of Lake Superior six or seven times as high as it is now, it would be frozen all the year round. But there are other agents. The water of Lake Superior is soft and the water of Hudson bay is salt. I have here a document published by the Marine Department which tells us that:

Immediately after its formation sea ice contains a noticeable quantity of salt, chlorides as well as sulphates, carbonates and other salts. Such ice is very different from fresh-water ice in its physical properties. It melts below zero, and begins to show signs of melting by contraction of volume at temperatures far below zero.

Now then it takes 13 degrees more cold to freeze salt water than fresh water. I have shown that there are three degrees more cold in Lake Superior owing to the elevation, and there are 13 degrees more in favour of Hudson bay on account of the water being soft. Not only that, but the ice of the Hudson bay is more porous, and the ice is more easily smashed. There is another reason. It is a well known law of physics that large bodies cool much slower than small bodies. The Hudson bay, being a thousand miles one way and 600 miles the other, is a very large body of water, while Lake Superior is a smaller body and will cool more rapidly than the water of the

Hudson bay. We have not only to compare the large body of water at Hudson bay with Lake Superior, but we have to compare that with our shallow canals, and with our little shallow lakes that we meet with in the St. Lawrence route. Then there is another reason, which I would commend especially to our friends from the west. The climate of western Canada will improve very rapidly. I will undertake to show that the climate will be so much improved inside the next 50 or 100 years that we will be raising wheat further north than the mouth of the Mackenzie river. I commend that idea to the government. Here is another point. Science tells us that black is the warmest of colours. We can prove that any time during the next month, when the suns rays are getting strong, by taking a piece of black cloth and putting it on the snow and near by it a piece of white cloth. A little further away cover a piece of snow of the same size with a matting of grass or hay. After four or five days you will find that the suns rays have penetrated the black cloth, they have not been reflected, while the heat rays falling upon the white cloth have been reflected, and consequently you will find that the black cloth has sunk into the snow, while the white cloth will not have sunk so far, because it has rejected a certain amount of the solar heat rays. But when you come to the spot that has been covered with hay or grass, what will you find? You will find that the snow has sunk away from it on all sides, because snow and grass are not a conductor of heat. If you wish to keep ice during the summer we will cover it with hay or straw. My good friend from Pincher Creek (Mr. Herron) tells me that he went to that country first thirty years ago, and that at the end of July he dug down into the ground that was covered with hay and grass and found ice two feet from the surface. Now, that black is the warmest colour I have had frequent opportunities to prove in travelling through the country for 33 years.

I would have occasion in the spring of the year, after the sheep were sheared, to go out through the country, during the night time, and as I drove along I would find flocks of sheep lying right on the black road. I would drive over them, and I had the greatest trouble in the world trying to avoid them. I wondered why the sheep lay on the black road, and I thought it was more reasonable that they should lie on the grass at the side, but, these sheep had been sheared, they were cold and they naturally got upon the black road, because the black road absorbed the heat by day and gave it out at night. Therefore, when our western country is all black, when it is all ploughed, it will absorb the heat through the summer day, give it off at night, and you will have no more summer frosts to kill the wheat. All that we have to do is to wait a little. I think I have given a scientific reason why the climate will change. Most men have read Caesar's De Bello Gallico—I read it when a boy—in which he described the climate of Germany, and from which it is evident that they have overcome the disadvantages of climate in the same way there. He talks about the fierce Germans, the rigour of their climate, and the Hyrcinian forest. That forest has been cleared up and drained, and it is now a vineyard, and it is there that the celebrated hock wine is made. The same can be said with regard to the climate of the whole of Europe to-day, the change being so great that it has made a difference of ten degrees of latitude. That means a difference of 695 miles, or, let us say, a difference of 600 miles. That being so, it means that we will be growing wheat as far north as the 73rd parallel of latitude. If you can go 600 miles north, our wheat district will extend to that limit just as soon as the whole country is blackened, or cultivated, and we will be raising wheat on the islands of the Arctic that Captain Bernier is going to look after. There is another reason why the Hudson Bay route will be the better one. It is not only that it is in a better position than Lake Superior, that it is open longer, but it will be benefited by this improvement in the climate much more than Lake Superior will, because that blackened and consequently warmer country will be nearer to Hudson bay. There is another reason why the Hudson Bay route will be preferable. We hear a great deal about drift ice coming down from Fox channel, and we have a great many reports about this drift ice. I had the old principle instilled into me when I was a boy that the whole is greater than its parts. The drift ice coming through Fox channel must come through the Fury and Hecla straits, and it occupies only about one-sixth of the width of Hudson straits. It is impossible that the drift ice coming through Fury and Hecla straits can fill the whole of Hudson strait. All the reports we have about ice in Hudson strait are reports of ice along the south shore of the strait. The floe ice coming down Fox channel will naturally lodge on the southern shore of Hudson strait. At the same time it is quite evident that there cannot be enough ice to fill the whole of Hudson strait, and there must be clear water to the north. Wireless telegraphy, signal stations, &c., would remedy this by giving warning and information to passing ships. I will read to you what some people say of the navigability of Hudson bay and straits. I have a few authorities here. There was a committee appointed by the legislative assembly of Manitoba in 1884 to inquire into this subject. It was composed of Messrs. Harrison, Greenway, Killam, Lea-

cock, Wilson, Davidson, Cyr, the Hon. Mr. Brown and the Hon. Mr. Miller. On page 14 of the report of this committee we find the following:

1. Captain James Hackland has been employed by Hudson Bay Company 39 years. First navigated Hudson bay in 1843, and was in command of Hudson Bay Company's schooner for 16 years from that time.

He says, 'the straits are open all the year round, never freezes; there is no reason why steamships should not navigate the straits at any time. The navigation of Hudson bay is not considered dangerous. There are no shoals, there are few fogs. During that sixteen years, navigation was never impeded by fog.'

Page 16:

2. Walter Dickson was twenty years in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company, from 1853 to 1873. I lived for thirteen years on the coast of Hudson bay, and for seven years in the interior between James bay and Lake Superior. I have had an opportunity of gaining information respecting Hudson straits from my long acquaintance with Esquimaux who reside about the straits, and from my personal observation of the bay itself. I have every reason to believe that the Hudson straits and a great body of the bay proper, are navigable at all seasons of the year and afford no peculiar difficulty to ordinary navigation.

To Manitoba and the Northwest, the route via Hudson bay is very important, giving them a shorter and cheaper route for both export and import than can possibly be had by any other route. I believe that Hudson straits are never frozen over in winter. My reasons are first, that the latitude is not too high; second, that the current and tide are too strong to allow of a general freezing over at any time.

Page 18:

3. That the Esquimaux make use of skin boats for ordinary hunting and travelling purposes in winter, and during a residence of thirteen years amongst them, I never heard of any Esquimaux crossing the straits on the ice. Icebergs, properly so-called, are not formed in Hudson bay and straits, nor can they get there so far as I am aware. The nature of the ice found in Hudson bay is shore ice, generally from 2½ to 3 feet thick, and at many places along the coast is porous at all seasons.

To my knowledge, there have been fewer losses or disasters to shipping in Hudson bay and straits than any known route of travel during the past 250 years. I do not know the rate of insurance, but believe it to be less than the average. I believe the Hudson Bay Company have ceased to insure their vessels, deeming the route so safe as not to call for it. Hudson bay is less subject to storms than the great lakes.

Page 19:

From what I have observed of the movements of ice in the Hudson bay during the summers I passed there, I am perfectly assured that an ordinary iron screw steamer would never have any difficulty in getting through or around that which is usually met with in the bay and straits. The chief reason why the old sailing vessels of the Hudson Bay Company often met with detention in the ice was that at the season when floe ice is met with, there is generally very little wind, and sailing vessels are consequently as helpless amongst the ice as they would be in a dead calm in the centre of the Atlantic or elsewhere. Hudson bay has always been found of easy access to a good and careful navigator.

Page 27:

Dr. Bell obtained from the company's offices in London, a record, which, printed in his report, shows the date of arriving and sailing of their vessels at York Factory for ninety-three years, and at Moose Fort for 147 years. These lists show that in some years, several vessels were sent in charge of British-men-of-war, and there has been almost every year during the past two centuries, ships of various classes and sizes navigating the strait without loss, and it seems almost incredible that such a number of voyages could be made, extending over 274 years without the loss of over one, or as is claimed by some writers, two small sailing vessels.

Page 28:

It is but a comparatively short time since it was claimed that it would be impossible to navigate the St. Lawrence with steamships.

Page 29:

The lower St. Lawrence, notwithstanding its comparative narrowness, is partly open even in the middle of the winter. But the difficulty, as in the case of Hudson bay, in the apparent impossibility of getting into the harbours. Harbours, such as Churchill or York on the Hudson bay, would have the advantage over Quebec or Montreal of connecting directly with the open sea, and hence, in autumn, vessels would not be so liable to be frozen in, as occasionally happens in the St. Lawrence, as for example, in the autumn of 1880, also in the autumn of 1870, when the outward bound shipping got frozen in below Quebec, occasioning a loss, it is said, of over a million dollars.

Page 46:

James Hargrave was at the Factory on Hudson bay from 1867 to 1871 in the employ of the Hudson Bay Company. Have heard the captains of vessels and sailors say that the Hudson straits are navigable all the year round.

Page 47:

President of the Northwest Navigation Company, Winnipeg, says, 'I am interested in the carrying out of the Hudson Bay scheme, and during the time I was in England in January last, I conversed with many persons in Liverpool and London as to the project. I also met in London, some gentlemen from Berlin and conversed with them. The opinion of all with whom I conversed was that the straits and bay were navigable for powerful steamers all the year round.

Page 52:

James Ward left Stromness on the 6th July, 1882, on the Hudson Bay Company's ship, 'Prince of Wales,' Captain Hard, who commanded the vessel, told me that was his forty-sixth trip through the straits. Hudson bay was clear of ice and as smooth as glass. The bay and straits are open all the year round.

Page 53:

I am surprised how people can doubt the navigation of the straits or bay on account of ice. Not one man that has come over the route but believes in its practicability. Mansfield island will be a good place for a lighthouse and station. There is a little lake of good water on that island.

In the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals at page 22 I find the following reference to the Hudson Bay survey:

It might be mentioned here in passing, the greatly increased difficulty a hostile fleet would have on blockading the Atlantic coast of Canada were the Hudson Bay route opened. The fact that ships may enter and leave Port Nelson all the year round is a fact worth remembering when the possibilities of war are considered.

In a publication by the government called 'Canada's Fertile Northland' I quote from page 117:

Evidence of Robert Bell, M.D., C.M., F.R. G.S., C.E., &c., of the Geological Survey of Canada, given before the Select Committee, March 12, 1907.

Dr. Bell explained that he had been through Hudson strait nine times. The first time was in 1880 in a ship called the 'Ocean Nymph,' a small sailing vessel, and the last time was in 1897 with Commander Wakeham. His trips were distributed over those seventeen years between 1880 and 1897.

All his trips were between June 22 and about October 10.

In navigating the strait during the season between those dates, with a steamship, they never had any difficulty.

Witness never heard that the strait was frozen across in winter.

Dr. Bell said he did not know any more desirable piece of navigation in the world, excepting the middle of the ocean and even then a common sailor who could not take an astronomical observation could sail through the straits with perfect safety. That is what Henry Hudson's men did after putting him and part of the crew into an open boat and leaving them behind.

Now, Sir, I think I have shown that Hudson bay is navigable and that it is open for ten months in the year, instead of being frozen for ten months, as some people allege. We have evidence that wheat can be raised at the 63rd degree of latitude, and do you mean to tell me that a salt water bay located in a latitude without fear of summer frost, is frozen up for ten months in the year.

Mr. CONMEE. And where there is a fairly high tide.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Yes. The Gulf of the St. Lawrence has always been looked upon as somewhat dangerous for navigation, and before its coasts were equipped with wireless telegraphy and its waters charted and modern aids to navigation erected, it was difficult of navigation and the insurance rate on ships was high, and is still high, a thing which has handicapped us in competition with the Erie canal. If we go back we will find that when John and Sebastien Cabot sailed along the north coast of America in 1498 they did not venture into the inhospitable Gulf of the St. Lawrence. We are told that Verazano and Cortéreal also sailed along the Atlantic coast, but there is no proof that either of them entered the gulf. The first man who had the courage to navigate the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, so far as history tells us, was Jacques Cartier, a native of Normandy, and he had in his viens the daring blood of the sea kings. He sailed from St. Malo on the 20th of April, 1534, and we find him in the Baie de Chaleurs in the latter part of July. We do not know the exact date, but we know that the weather was very hot, and so he christened that sheet of water 'Baie de Chaleur' (Hot Bay). Then he went to Gaspé and erected a cross and took possession of the country in the name of his King, Francis the first. The Indians told him there was a great river not far off, the source of which they did not know, and Jacques Cartier sailed for that river and arrived at the Island of Orleans, near Quebec, on the 7th of September, which shows that it was far on in the season before he entered the gulf. There he was met by Donacona. Cartier did not tarry long in these waters on that voyage because he feared being caught in the ice so late in the season. Next year he came back, but he took good care that he would not reach the St. Lawrence even in July, for we find that he landed on the 10th day of August, the feast day of St. Lawrence, after whom he named the bay and the river. Then he sailed along and succeeded in reaching Hochelaga on the 2nd of October. But he made out to get back to the mouth of the river, but was there frozen in all winter, and could not get away. The next indication we have of the sailing conditions in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is in the coming of Champlain. Did he come in January or February or March or April or May or even June? No. He landed on the third of July, and we have recently celebrated the tercentenary of his landing. All this shows that the Gulf of St. Lawrence was looked on as far more dangerous to navigation than Hudson bay. Now, I think I have shown that Hudson bay is open. The next thing is to show how to get out;

because I have still these two Dreadnoughts to put in the North Sea. I am trying to show how to shorten the route for the food supply and in that liberate two Dreadnoughts. Remember, it was the small vessels I proposed to rent, not the Dreadnoughts, which would be required to complete the fleet units on the longer line.

I can go to Mr. Gouin, at Quebec, and say to him: 'I see that not long ago you were in Toronto, where you and Sir James Whitney were talking pretty loyally. We are going to give you a dry-dock at Quebec, and we are going to give you something else. You want that great territory of Ungava; there is in it a great deal of land and also timber, fish, minerals and water-powers. That territory does not belong to you; it belongs just as much to British Columbia, to Nova Scotia and to Ontario as it does to you. But we want to make a bargain with you. We will give you that, but you must do something for us. We want you to build a railway right away from the St. Lawrence river to the Gulf of Ungava. That will develop that country. You do not know what you may find on the road. It may contain great mineral deposits. The Ontario government have built a railway towards James bay, and in the process they discovered Cobalt, the royalties from which will pay for the whole road. You build a railway to Ungava bay; we will give you the land, and you can borrow on the land the necessary money to build the railway.' Then I go to Sir James Whitney and say to him: 'You have been shouting loyalty a bit lately, and we want to give you a chance to do something to prove it. Your railway is now within 129 miles of Moose Factory. You want a portion of the territory of Keewatin. Finish the railway to Moose Factory, and we will give you a portion of that territory.' Then I go to Manitoba, and, as Mr. Roblin is away, I shall probably find there the Hon. Robert Rogers, who we know is pretty loyal, and I will say to him: 'Here is a bargain for you. You want to get a piece of Keewatin; we will give you that, with the land, the minerals, the timber and everything, only you must build a railway from Winnipeg to the mouth of the Nelson river.' Then I go to Premier Scott of Saskatchewan and I say to him: 'You have no lands or timber or minerals; you should have had them long ago; but we will give you all these now if you build a railway from Regina to the extreme north of your province, with a branch to Fort Churchill.' I go with a similar proposal to Premier Rutherford of Alberta. In that way we shall have five railways built to Hudson bay by 1912 or 1913, like so many spokes of a big wheel, and the Dominion government will build a sixth. We need them all. I have shown that the Hudson bay is navigable and how much safer and shorter the Hudson bay route will be for the products of the Northwest, and how quickly we can send the two Dreadnoughts to the North Sea, because we can spare them on the shorter line. My plan is a business plan. We rent Dreadnoughts from Britain in a business way, temporarily, paying for them $1,500,000 a year for four years, by which time the crisis will be over. That will only take $6,000,000 altogether, and it will give Britain seven extra Dreadnoughts in the North Sea. Then look at the strategy of this arrangement. If our Atlantic sea-board were blockaded, Britain would send her fleet to Ungava bay, and convey an army to relieve Quebec. If Toronto were attacked an army could be landed at Moose Factory. If Winnipeg or Regina or Edmonton were attacked, Britain could send an army of relief via Fort Nelson or Fort Churchill. By means of this plan we would develop our country to such an extent that instead of our population increasing by half a million a year, as it has done recently, it would increase by more than a million a year, and in twenty years from now we would have 30,000,000 people in this country; the country would be developed in width as well as in length; the farmers of the west would get ten cents a bushel more for their wheat and $10 a head more for their cattle, while the goods they used at home would be greatly reduced in cost because of reduced freight rates. We have an immense country to build up, and when we have a population of 30,000,000 I shall be in favour of a Canadian-built navy, and one equal to that of Great Britain. I have no doubt that there are men living to-day who will see the time when Canada will have a navy larger than that of the mother country. We shall have one of the greatest inland seas on the face of the earth for the manoeuvres of a military fleet. Look over the whole world and you can find no place equal to Hudson bay for the manoeuvres of a great military fleet, if the country around it were only properly settled and developed. I think I have shown that this is a business proposition and that it violates none of the principles that I have laid down. I think I have shown that by this means where we have to fight we must pay. We do not want to hire any one to go on fighting for us. Our French-Canadian fellow citizens can truly and proudly say that at one time the heroes of Chateauguay saved Canada to the British Crown, and to-day Canada has the opportunity to have it said of her in the future that she saved Britain to the empire.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, I trust that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) will not

accuse me of any disrespect toward him if I confess myself as at present quite unable to answer him. Besides my inability to follow him in many of his learned disquisitions, I am under the misfortune of not having heard some portions of the hon. gentleman's speech when he turned aside to address gentlemen behind him or lowered his voice. Therefore, if I attempted to answer his speech, I fear that I would make myself ridiculous by confusing banana belts with Hudson bay, hitching posts with Dreadnoughts, or committing similar confusions which might make it appear that I was ridiculing the hon. gentleman's effort. I have no doubt that upon that effort the hon. gentleman has bestowed a great deal of time and learning, and I think it would be impossible for me or any one else, merely from hearing such a speech, to make an appropriate answer to it. One thing stands out perfectly plain and clear from his speech, and that is, that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has in his ranks another gentleman who has another policy to propound on this naval question. I regret that certain portions of this debate have assumed a tone which I think not quite worthy of this House. Let me begin with my hon. and learned friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I have always listened—as I think most men in this House have—with great respect to any speech made by the hon. gentleman. I know of no man in the House who has more dignity of bearing, a better parliamentary style, more learning, better reasoning faculty and greater eloquence, but I venture to say that the House will share my opinion, when I assert that he descended to a plane not worthy of him when he ventured to characterize hon. gentleman on this side as having entered into the plan proposed by the right hon. the leader of the government, merely because, if they did not, they would be deprived of patronage. Sir, hon. gentlemen on this side are as high-minded and conscientious as is my hon. friend, and are no more influenced in the views they express and the positions they take by the lust of patronage than is the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Another passage in the hon. gentleman's speech was, I think, unworthy of him; and for it I believe the hon. gentleman, if he were present, would, on his attention being called to it, express regret that he had so far forgotten himself as to accuse the right hon. the Prime Minister of being a master of circumlocution and deceit. Such language does not raise the tone of the debate in this House. On the contrary, it lowers debate from that lofty plane on which every well wisher of Canada, every one solicitous for Canada's fair fame and reputation, would desire to see it carried on.

I do not think there is much necessity to deal with the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman. I take it for granted that one or two members in this House may be found to support it, but it embodies a principle so novel in the history of Canada and so much at variance with our theory of responsible government, that practically it implies a change in the principles and methods underlying our constitution. At all events, whether open to this objection or not, it is sure to receive so small a measure of support, that I do not think it deserves very serious consideration.

The most important matter to discuss is the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). In respect of that, I desire to say that it starts out with a statement which very nearly ventures on the borders of audacity and ends with an inconsistency. It starts out with the assertion that this scheme of the government is not upon the lines laid down by the imperial conference of 1907. True, the policy outlined in this Bill does, to some extent, vary from that proposed in the imperial conference of 1907; but does the hon. gentleman accept the doctrines of that conference as absolutely conclusive or final? Has he run aground upon the conclusions of that conference, and is he not willing to allow even an imperial conference, directed by the admiralty, presided over by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, to advance a step in regard to these matters. Because it is plain, from the correspondence which has been laid on the table that, though in some degree the proposition in the Bill may slightly vary from that originally entertained in the conference of 1907, it does not at all depart from but absolutely carries out the conclusions arrived at by the conference of 1909; and surely, in regard to these matters, we are not bound up by the conclusions of any one imperial conference, but are at liberty to follow from time to time the latest developments and adopt the latest conclusions in that connection.

In the conclusion of his amendment, the hon. gentleman was guilty of the inconsistency so well pointed out by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). It assumes that, without reference to the people, it is quite proper for this House to vote $25,000,000 to meet the cost of two Dreadnoughts, and send the money over to England to be used there, but that it is improper for us to construct a Canadian navy of our own, out of our own material, by our own men, and man it by our own people, without submitting that proposition to the people of this country. It seems to me inconsistent to say that you shall take so large a sum of the revenues of our people and send it over to the mother country,

and allow it to be spent there without submitting that proposition to the people, but that when you come to consider the proposition of improving our naval capacity and establishing a Canadian navy, you cannot do that without referring it to the people and taking a fresh vote with regard to it.

Another point in the resolution, which requires to be dealt with to some extent is, that it is founded on the idea that an emergency is actually in existence. One would imagine that we were in the midst of a long and arduous military and naval struggle with Germany, that the conflict between the British and the German empires was only now reaching the stage which required us to intervene and collect our resources into the shape of a bill of exchange and send it to Britain to save her from destruction. This matter of panics is not a new one in British history. Shakespeare, in Henry IV., indicates the cause of their origin, when he puts in the mouth of Henry IV. this advice to Prince Hal; 'Therefore, my Harry, be it thy course to busy giddy minds with foreign quarrels, that action thence borne out, may waste the memory of the former days.' In those days, when it was necessary to busy men's minds with foreign quarrels, the advice was addressed to stout-hearted men who believed: 'Come the three corners of the world in arms, and we shall shock them, nought shall make us rue, if England to itself do rest but true.' There was nothing like panic then. But in modern times a degenerate spirit has entered the minds of some men, because when they want to divert attention from domestic to foreign matters, they do not busy giddy minds with foreign quarrels, but busy giddy minds with dread of foreign countries.

If you come down through the years, you find as early as 1847, a change with regard to this, and that all these panics have been at one time or another, initiated by old men who have lost their nerve. Mr. Asquith, the British premier, says they have usually been initiated by old women of both sexes. I would not desire to use that expression, because coming from me, it contains a measure of insolence, but I say that from the first panic of 1847 down to the present time, there is not one of them which has not been instigated by some elderly gentleman who has completly lost his nerve. Get Cobden's history of the three panics, and you will find in each one the same little alarms we hear to-day; in each of them—heated speeches, plans of invasions and senseless talk about silent toasts—all those absurd things raised to-day to induce the British empire to imagine that the Emperor of Germany, without any reason or cause, is building up his power for no other reason than to make an unprovoked attack on the liberties and rights of Britain. There is a class of Englishmen who have inherited nothing but the tendencies of their old Saxon forefathers to dread foreign invasion—who keep peering out over the North sea, imagining that the Danes and Saxons are coming to invade their shores, sack their homes, and put their king to ransom. This endeavour to excite a panic by reason of anything in the relations between Britain and Germany is absurd—just as absurd as were those panics which took place in 1847, 1851, 1854, 1858 and 1859.

These panics exhibit in a most remarkable degree as has been well said by a recent clever essayist how much in the shape of illusion can be accomplished by the resolute lying of a few respectable men. There is no falsehood that has not been urged to prove in former cases that France was contemplating an invasion of England; that later on, Russia was seeking to attack Great Britain, and recently that instead of France or Russia, these old powerful enemies of Great Britain, Germany is taking their place and endeavouring to attack the British empire. In 1847-48 the panic was begun by a pamphlet written by Prince Joinville, a Frenchman. There was nothing alarming in that pamphlet. He pointed out what he considered the inferior position of the French navy, and paid what were considered by many thinking Englishmen, to be extensive compliments to the British navy. But it was seized on by some panic-mongers in England as an indication that the prince was endeavouring, not merely to induce the authorities of France to bring the French navy to a state of efficiency, but that it was intended to build up at once in France a navy that would threaten the integrity of the British empire and attack Great Britain. That brought forth a letter from the Duke of Wellington to John Burgoyne, which the duke afterwards said he never intended to have published, but which was secured by some person and published. That letter contained an expression to which only the venerable age and the great ability of the duke would have given any weight or influence whatever. In it he said that there was a portion of the southern coast of England which at any season of the year, in any state of weather, or any condition of the tide, could be assailed by France, and an army of 50,000 troops landed without difficulty. As was pointed out by Mr. Cobden, no one would have paid the slightest attention to such a remark from an ordinary man because there is no coast of twenty miles in the world in respect to which the statement of the Duke of Wellington could be considered to be true. There is no coast of that extent where in any state of the weather, in any condition of the tide, or at any time of the year it would be possible in the brief space of a few hours to land

so considerable a body of men as 50,000. The campaign relating to that panic went on through 1847 and 1848. It was ended by something similar to what was sought in the recent budget as a cure for the late panic in England; the panic of 1847-48 was largely cured by an addition of five pence to the income tax. Hume pointed out that these panics in olden times were produced by old women, but that this panic and recent panics differed from the former ones in this regard that they are occasioned not by old women, but by too many clubs in London of half-pay officers who desire employment, and have nothing else to do except write letters to the papers pointing out the defenceless character of the empire and the danger of attack from this, that or the other enemy.

It must not be forgotten that Canadians must have regard to their own interests as well as to the immediate interests of Great Britain. It is no disloyalty to say that. By the way, there are some people who imagine that if a gentleman in this House, or in Canada indulges in a criticism which would be taken as a matter of course, a matter of ordinary intellectual interest in Great Britain, if say an Englishman who has come to this country, and is living here where he should be 'in Britain with elbow room and doubly free,' makes use of an expression that would attract no attention or would simply provoke an answering argument in England, the moment he says it in this country, the answer is that he is disloyal and a traitor. I claim as a British subject living in Canada that I am not going to sacrifice one of those rights which the Britisher who remains at home exercises constantly. Mr. Fred. Jane, recently Unionist candidate in Plymouth, has made a most effective reply to the remarkable book of Captain Mahan on 'The Influence of Sea Power'. In his answer he discusses the question of what must be the ultimate destiny of the great dominions of Britain beyond the sea. He argues and argues with great force and strength that the ultimate destiny of these great dominions must of necessity be independence. He invokes in support of that, history and all the thousand reasons that can be urged in favour of it. Does any one in England say that because Mr. Jane argues that the ultimate destiny of the great dominions must be independence, he is a traitor? And yet I find the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and even the hon. and learned member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) citing as disloyal a passage from a speech which I had the honour of making in the House last year on this subject in which I introduced Macaulay's reference to the New Zealander standing on London bridge and viewing the destruction around him. No one would ever accuse Macaulay of being anti-British, and yet, because a Canadian happens to venture on a line of argument like that, not indulging in any overt acts or doing anything to break the connection, but pointing out what may be the ultimate destiny of this country, he is met, not by argument or reasoning, but by the wild flopping of the old flag, and shouts of disloyalty. The time has come in this country when the people are sufficiently advanced to permit, without danger to our relation to the mother country, without the slightest danger to the interests of the empire or of Canada, every citizen of this country to indulge in the freest and most open possible manner, not only thought and intellectual exercises in regard to these matters, but open and free discussion of them.

The next panic that occurred in England was the panic from 1851 to 1854. That panic was raised in very much the same way. It was said that England was going to be invaded and occupied by an army of 50,000 Frenchmen. There was the usual complaint of some French General proposing and laying out the whole scheme for the invasion of England. He denied ever having made such a plan. No one ever produced it, but again and again it was reported that such a plan had been proposed by him. There were all the usual incidents of these panics, 'our special correspondents' at Paris kept writing about the vast increase in the French navy, and the same inquiry was made that has been made in this House repeatedly: What does France want of these ships, if not to attack England? The same cry that we hear to-day except that instead of France it is Germany, what can Germany be building ships for except to attack Great Britain? I want to know if France in those days, if Germany to-day, has not as reasonable and fair a right to build up her naval strength as Great Britain has? You must find and show some reasonable ground for believing that it is directed solely and wholly against Great Britain before you can start any complaint in regard to it. It is the duty of every great people to provide for their own defence. There never will be a time, I trust, when any portion of the British empire will not be ready to engage in the greatest sacrifice in order to protect itself against attack from without. But I say that it is the duty of every loyal subject of the British empire, that it is the duty of every man who is loyal to civilization and the happy progress of the world, not to go around howling and raising prejudices against Germany or any other country.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) read a number of German extracts, from articles for which I do not know how much had been paid by the magazines. One gentleman seemed to say that every na-

tion must have one other nation that it hates and the nation that Germany had especially selected for hatred was the British empire. Does the hon. gentleman want us to cultivate something of that same spirit in order to meet this hatred? Is it necessary that the people of the British empire should take pains to instill in the youthful breast of every British subject hatred of Germany? Is it not better that we should rather be silent on these subjects than incur the danger of creating in this country a hatred of Germany and increasing the corresponding hatred of Germany to us? Is it not better that, if we have any causes of ill-feeling and friction with Germany that we should have such pleasant removal of it as we see to-day, in the conclusion of an agreement by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) with the hon. the Consul General of Germany and endeavour to remove all possible cause of friction between these two nations.

The remarkable feature of this panic to which I have been referring, from 1851 to 1854, was that, as Cobden said, had a British subject left England on a certain day he would have been in the midst of a panic created by the possibility of a French invasion of Great Britain. Had he gone to New Zealand, and immediately returned to Great Britain, he would have seen two fleets lying side by side in Besika bay, the British and the French fleets. And knowing only what he knew of the relations of the two peoples when he left England he would naturally be solicitous to know what would be the result of an encounter between the British fleet and the French fleet, and he would be overcome with surprise when he learned that these two fleets which he contemplated as only enemies to one another were lying side by side in alliance against the great power of Russia. That panic was concluded by the alliance between France and Germany, the two nations that took part in the invasion of the Crimea. Then came the panic of 1858-59. Notwithstanding the fact that the Emperor of France, Napoleon the Third had always been friendly and was then engaged in Italy in his war against Austria, notwithstanding that apparently all the rest of the world considered that his hands were full with the management of that conflict, the panic started. It was represented in Britain that the French soldiers at Rome were chafing in their eagerness to get across the channel to take part in the sack of London. That panic continued until the Mason and Slidell incident—the Trent affair. On that affair arising Great Britain found it necessary to rush forces to Canada. Great Britain found that she was short of long boots and the French government sent a message across to England offering the British government 1,500 pairs of boots to supply the soldiers who were going to Canada. Further than that, notwithstanding the attacks made upon it by the panic mongers, the French government joined with the other governments of Europe in urging upon the government of the United States that it had made a mistake in this seizure, that it had violated the law of nations, the result of these representations being that the United States government returned the two gentlemen who had been taken off the British vessel by an American man-of-war. That incident was closed in that way. Yesterday the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) went over the history of the later panics, and it seems to me that no one can review the panics of this kind without being persuaded that it is absolutely necessary and essential as a common sense people that we should not allow ourselves to be carried away by panics of this kind, but that we should endeavour as far as possible to assume the part of true statesmen by not creating, increasing and arousing panics but by honestly and sincerely endeavouring to allay them. There is found a passage in a speech, or possibly a pamphlet, of Sir Robert Peel who will be recognized by every one as one of the most cautious and sagacious statesmen that Great Britain produced in the last century. His language ought to appeal very strongly to all Conservatives, because he was undoubtedly one of the great Conservative leaders of the last century, and it seems to me that his language in this regard contains so much truth and common sense as to be worthy of being inculcated in the minds of all sane people. He was speaking of this eagerness for armaments in time of peace instead of reserving the gigantic efforts of the nation for times of war and he said 'We must consent to incur some risk.' He is urging retrenchment and he is pointing out that the nation is not fitting itself best for war if it expends too great a part of its resources on war in time of peace. Sir Spencer Walpole referring to the old Roman maxim si vis pacem, para bellum—in time of peace prepare for war—points out that it is a maxim which has been greatly modified in modern times by the recognition of the fact that money is the sinews of war and that the best preparation for war is by husbanding our resources in time of peace. As Defoe said it is not the longest sword, but the longest purse that wins in the end, and it is wise to be governed in these matters by a certain conservatism and to recognize that if not only Canada, but the whole British empire expended all its resources in endeavouring to secure itself against attack, such an expenditure made by the mother country and by all the great dominions in the endeavour to secure the em-

pire against every possible risk would not probably achieve its object as completely as would be done by merely initiating proper movements of defence and consenting with regard to the rest to incur some risk.

The great trouble about all these discussions is that the very starting of the idea of danger, the mentioning of another nation as possibly coming in conflict with Great Britain, the statement that the British empire may soon be involved in war with Germany, the very consideration of the subject, tends to produce in both nations a spirit that inevitably must help to lead to war. Let me say in regard to this country, that I do not think that any real danger of trouble in the future is likely to come from any of those gentlemen in this House, or throughout the country, who are frequently made the objects of attack as being disloyal and traitorous to the empire, but rather from the ultra-loyal gentlemen, who, not being satisfied with their devotion to the British empire, must exhibit on all possible occasions their hatred and detestation of all other nations. It does not seem to me that the man is extremely loyal, however much he may think he is, who, not satisfied with loving and serving to the utmost his own country, but thinks it necessary to pin-prick and create hostility in the minds of other nations and incur difficulties in the future. I believe, myself, that a moderate course in this regard is the proper course. I do not believe that it is wise for us to continue to the extent even that we do to-day this policy of endeavouring to dominate the world. It is enough for the British government to dominate the British empire, it is enough for the people of Canada to dominate the vast domain which they possess. More than that, is a spirit which is provocative of war. It may lead to the ultimate destruction of civilization if we are not satisfied with controllng our own dominions and treating other people with that same respect and regard with which we wish them to treat us. I heard a gentleman, not long ago, not in this House, but elsewhere, state that our children and, if not our children, our children's children, would see the time when Canada would dominate the whole of this continent. Could anything be more absurd than an idea of that kind? Could a gentleman who expects to see his children, or his children's children dominating this continent, including the great republic to the south of us, which has so much power to-day that it would have no great difficulty in dominating this country if it desired to do so, complain if the Americans say, if this is the spirit which is to dominate civilization, we will be guided by it also, and we will attempt to dominate the American continent? Lord Beaconsfield originated the absurd policy, which he was obliged to withdraw, the policy of claiming for Great Britain ascendancy in the councils of Europe. Why has Great Britain to arrogate to herself ascendancy in the councils of Europe? Does Great Britain expect to have ascendancy in the councils of France, of Germany, and of Russia? Is it not to be expected that Frenchmen, Germans and Russians will resent such a policy, and what would be thought if they attempted themselves to dominate any portion of the British empire? It is not the spirit that should dominate the Canadian people in endeavouring to aid the British empire and her colonies.

Now, I shall come more directly to the question before the House, although I think that the discussion that I have already entered into is incidental to the assertion contained in the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), that there is an emergency which requires this aid. I think what I have said is germane to that in showing that there is no more evidence of hostility to-day than there was on every one of those previous occasions, and history shows that every one of these panics was so utterly and inexcusably absurd as to render the old gentlemen who created them absolutely a subject of laughter to those who read the history of that time.

Let us come directly to the question: What is it necessary Canada should do, having due regard to her own self respect, in the way of taking part in the defence of the great empire to which we belong? There are several courses before Canada. I am not speaking now as to the form of the defence, but as to whether she shall continue to rely upon the defence afforded by the vast naval power of Great Britain? If Canada is to continue to do that then no one who has any regard for his self respect could refuse to aid in a reasonable and proper proportion in the defence afforded to Canada by the British navy. One gentleman, in his newspaper, has repeatedly opposed the policy of the government as well as the policy of granting two Dreadnoughts, and he has said that Canada for her defence is amply provided for if she depend upon the Monroe doctrine. Well, I am one of those who believe that there is no reason why the Munroe doctrine—which by the way originated with a great British minister—should not supplement materially in assisting not merely in the defence of Canada, but in the defence of the whole empire. But I do say this, and I think most Canadians will concur in this view, that even if we were safe under the protection of the Munroe doctrine, the self respect of a courageous people, such as undoubtedly the Canadian people are, will not let them accept such defence without contributing their portion of assistance towards what is required to maintain the Munroe doctrine. Therefore,

in my humble judgment, whether we continue to rely upon the protection of the great British fleet—and every one of us in this parliament is anxious and willing to make the greatest possible sacrifices in order that we may so continue whether we so continue, or whether we are to abandon British connection and rely solely and wholly on the Munroe doctrine for our protection, our own public spirit, the pride and self respect of our people will certainly declare that whether protected by the navy of Great Britain or by the navy of the United States we must contribute a fair proportion to the support of the protecting navy. I think it is perfectly evident from my observations made in this House on former occasions, that I am one of those who do not believe in militant imperialism. I believe that, the imperialism that is going round flopping the flag and insulting, and causing quarrels with other nations is the greatest mistake in the world. And, even though some gentlemen who deem it extremely loyal to flaunt the flag, may think that one who objects to that is not loyal, I venture to say that the highest and truest loyalty to the British empire is to be found in the endeavour to keep that empire out of difficulty and trouble. If you regard the condition of the German navy at the present day you will find certain curious things. In the first place you find in Germany a most remarkable growth of naval power. It is only a few years since there was no German navy. I must confess that I sometimes think it is the irony of history that to-day Great Britain is being cursed to a very considerable extent by the dread of a German navy, when I recollect that in 1850, in the days before the German empire was established and when the German confederation existed, there was a difficulty about Heligoland, and when the Germans sent out some of their hired fleet, they were notified by the British government that there was no such flag known on the seas as the German flag, and that any vessel flying that flag would be treated as a pirate. I do not think that any one who has any conscience at all would to-day justify on the part of Great Britain such treatment of the inferior naval power of Germany at that time. At all events Germany has reached a position to-day that no vessel flying the German flag is longer in danger of being treated as a pirate. It is within the memory of most of us living, when Germany scarcely had a sea-port and when the German empire had to buy five square miles from the Dutchy of Oldenburg to get a naval station. We know that the naval stations of Kiel, Wilhelms haven, Emden and Elbing are practically artificial, and that when the present German Emperor came to the throne Germany scarcely had the semblance of anything approaching a navy. The progress made by Germany in creating a navy is surprising to every one who studies the evolution of the nation. The great progress of Germany in the construction of warlike ships has been accompanied by equal progress in the building of merchant vessels, and by the industry, the aptitude, and the intelligence of her people Germany has to-day placed herself in a very considerable position among the nations of the world, as regards both her naval and merchant service. It is a noticeable fact that the decline of ship building in Canada was practically concurrent with the growth of ship building in Germany. It was due undoubtedly to the fact that wooden ships had passed their day, that steel ships were coming into vogue requiring mechanics, artisans, stokers, electricians, all congenial to the scientific bent of the German people. Germany started to build a navy, and Germany has to-day a navy that is certainly remarkable considering the short time spent in its development.

On the motion of Mr. Congdon the debate was adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, February 17, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VOLUNTEERS BOUNTIES ACT.

Mr. S. SHARPE:

Is it the intention of the government to so amend the Volunteers Bounties Act to enable the Canadian civil surgeons who served in the war to receive grants? If not, why not?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. It is not considered advisable to enlarge the scope of the Act.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL LESSEES.

Mr. MONK:

1. What persons occupying government lands along the Beauharnois canal, now under lease, to the Canadian Light and Power Company, are at present indebted for rent, and for what amount?
2. Has the government given instructions to issue legal proceedings against such persons so indebted for arrears of rent?
3. If so, to what lawyers or firm of lawyers have such instructions been given?
4. What instructions have been given?
5. What persons have been sued?
6. Have instructions been given to sue all or only some? If so, which of the persons so indebted?

Hon. GEORGE GRAHAM:

1. The names of several persons appear as being indebted to the government for arrears of rental for lands along the Beauharnois canal; but as some of the above parties have raised the question, as to the validity of the amounts claimed, it is not considered in the public interest to give the names at present pending a settlement.

2. The Department of Justice are now in negotiations with their agent, Mr. R. A. E. Greenshields, K.C., of Montreal, who is acting in the matter.

3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by number two.

MR. CALVIN McKENZIE.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Was Calvin McKenzie employed on the Intercolonial Railway, in Pictou county, N.S., in October, 1908, and February, 1909?

2. If so, where was he employed, what was his work, and what was his wage per day?

3. Was he at work on the 26th October, 1908, and was he paid the usual wages for that day?

4. Was he at work on the 16th February, 1909, and was he paid the usual wage for that day?

5. If he was not at work on the days mentioned, or either of them, why was he off duty, and why was he paid his usual wages, for such days, if that was the case?

6. Is he still in the railway's employment? If so, what is his work and what are his wages?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. At Stellarton, as boiler maker helper at sixteen cents per hour.

3. Yes, at night, received the usual wage of sixteen cents per hour.

4. Yes, at night, received the usual wage of sixteen cents per hour

5. Answered by numbers three and four.

6. Yes, he is still employed as boiler maker helper, working at night, at sixteen cents per hour.

TRENT CANAL FLOODS.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. Have the following persons in the township of Asphodel, namely, John Lynch, John Sayent, Patrick Crowley, G. A. L. Humphries, James Warner, Thomas Davidson, J. J. Breckenridge and Charles Faux, been paid damages for flooded lands occasioned by the dams on the Trent river at the village of Hastings?

2. If so, for what acreage, has each been paid, what sum, and when was payment made?

3. Who acted as valuator for the government?

4. Who acted as solicitor for the government in each case, and what sum was the solicitor paid for his services, in each case?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes.

2. John Lynch, 8 acres, $40, 14th June, 1909; John Sayent, 60 acres, $600, 17th March, 1909; Patrick Crowley, 32 acres, $320, 16th June, 1909; G. A. L. Humphries, 50 acres, $550, 17th March, 1909; James Warner, 30 acres, $330, 5th March, 1909; Thomas Davidson, 5 acres, $45, 30th April, 1909; Charles Faux, 80 acres, $720, 29th April, 1909; J. Breckenridge, 6 acres, $60, 14th June, 1909.

3. James Dickson.

4. L. F. Clarry. Nothing has yet been paid, but his accounts have been approved by the Department of Justice, and will be paid as soon as the money is available, April 1, 1910.

MR. GEORGE WALTON.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

1. What amount of money has been paid each year to Geo. Walton, Manitoba, by the Interior Department from January 1, 1906, to December 31, 1909?

2. Has Mr. Geo. Walton received any money since January 1, 1906, from any other department of the government?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. 1906, nil; 1907, $200; 1908, nil; 1909, $1,650.71. In regard to the second part, as it involves more than one department, I would suggest that my hon. friend move for a return.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand as a notice of motion for a return.

MR. ARTHUR JOHNSON.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR:

1. Is the following return correct in the last report of registered vessels: No., 122417; name, 'Reliever;' owner, Manley Chew; post office, Midland; length, 226 feet; horse-power, 80; tonnage registered, 306.

2. Was one Arthur Johnson engineer of said vessel during the season of navigation of 1909?

3. What certificate would be required of the first engineer of said vessel?

4. Did said Arthur Johnson have such a certificate duly issued by the Marine Department?

5. If not, was a permit issued by the department allowing him to act in such capacity?

6. If a permit was granted, under what circumstances was the same granted and at whose request?

7. Has the said Johnson now a certificate from the department entitling him to act as engineer on a vessel of such tonnage?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING:

1. Yes, excepting that the registered tonnage should read, 366. The horse-power by ship's register is 80 but the nominal horse power from actual measurement is 70·5.

2. Yes.

3. Third class certificate.

4, 5 and 6. Yes.

7. Yes.

MR. JOHN E. RUSSELL.

Mr. J. D. REID:

What amount in each year, including the current fiscal year, has been paid to John E. Russell for work done in connection with Toronto harbour and the eastern entrance thereto?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY:

	$ c.
In 1898-99..	1,585 95
1905-06..	5,856 67
1905-06..	4,299 82
1907-8..	5,785 83
1908-09	3,705 82
1908-09..	2,529 60
1909-10	9,783 81
Total	33,547 50

CANADA PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. BORDEN:

1. What proportion of men serving in the permanent force of Canada have re-enlisted after the expiration of their term?

2. Is the permanent force at full strength? If not, what is the shortage?

3. If there is a shortage or deficiency, what is the cause of it?

4. What proportion of the permanent force is Canadian born?

5. For what term are men enlisted in the permanent force?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 50 per cent.

2. Yes.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Approximately; officers 90 per cent, non-commissioned officers and men 20 per cent.

5. Section 17 of the Militia Act provides that the period of service in time of peace shall be as follows: (a). For the active militia, *three years. (b). For the reserve militia, such period as is prescribed.

*The term active militia includes the permanent force.

SUBSIDIES TO BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What subsidies have been granted to the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company by the Canadian government?

2. When were these granted and are they still in force?

3. How much of this line has been completed, and how much has been paid in subsidies?

4. Has any application been made recently for renewal of subsidy to this line?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1 and 2.. By Subsidy Act, chap. 7, 1901, item 24, a subsidy was granted for a line of railway from a point on the Algoma branch of the Canadian Pacific railway at or near Bruce Lake station northerly to a point at or near Rock lake, not exceeding nine miles.

Mr. FIELDING.

This subsidy was granted to the above-named company by contract No. 14,360, dated November 5, 1901, and expired May 23, 1905.

By Subsidy Act, 1903, chap. 57, item 38, a subsidy was granted to the above-named company for 21 miles from the end of the line subsidized by chap. 7, of 1901 (no contract was made for this subsidy). This subsidy expired October 24, 1907.

By Subsidy Act, 1904, chap. 34, item 2, a subsidy was granted to the above-named company for:

(a) That portion of its line of railway from Bruce Mines junction south to the town of Bruce Mines on Lake Huron, not exceeding three miles.

(b) The six miles of railway constructed from Gordon Lake station, being the end of its line as subsidized by chap. 7, 1901, north of Rock lake, a distance of six miles.

(c) Twelve miles from Rock lake north, a distance not exceeding twelve miles.

These subsidies were granted in lieu by item 38, section 2, of chap. 57, 1903.

On October 20, 1904—A contract was entered into by the above-named company for the subsidy covered by section 'b' of Act of 1904, being from Gordon lake to Rock lake.

By contract dated January 28, 1905, the company were granted subsidy for the line (a) mentioned in Act of 1904, chap. 34, for the line from Bruce Mines junction to the town of Bruce Mines, a distance of three miles. These subsidies expired August 10, 1908.

3.—

1903—	
January 24. Subsidy on nine miles at $3,200, from a point on the Algoma branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, near Bruce Lake station, to a point near Rock lake..	$28,800
1905—	
January 4. Subsidy on 5·90 miles, Gordon Lake station to Rock lake at $3,200 per mile..	$18,880
March 9. Subsidy on 1·95 miles, from Bruce Mines junction southerly to town of Bruce Mines at $3,200 per mile..	$6,240
	$53,920

4. Yes, an application was received on the 4th April, 1909, from McCarthy, Osler, Hosken & Harcourt, on behalf of the railway company.

ADDITION AND REPAIRS TO KENSINGTON WHARF.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. Upon whose representations did the Department of Public Works act in sending its engineer to make an examination of Kensington wharf for the purpose of ascertaining what additions and repairs were necessary?

2. Upon whose recommendation or representation was the sum of $3,300 placed in the estimates for the addition and repairs to this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In matters of the kind referred to in these questions, the minister must take the responsibility of his action, and does not usually, I think, feel prepared to state upon whose representations matters have been decided upon. All I can say—all I think proper to say—is that in the matters referred to, the action taken was taken by direction of the minister.

MILITARY PROPERTY AT ST. JOHNS, QUEBEC.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Is it the intention of the government to dispose of the military property at St. Johns, Que., to the College of De Monoir, or to any other corporation or persons? If so, to whom, and on what conditions?

2. (a) What is the valuation of the land held for military purposes by the government at St. Johns, Que., (b) what is the valuation of the buildings thereon, and (c) what has been the annual cost for the last five years for maintaining the upkeep of these buildings?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. No.

2. (a) $31,200.
   (b) $88,218.
   (c) 1904-05 .... $4,869.77
   1905-06 .... 1,761.90
   1906-07 .... 4,007.35
   1907-08 .... 3,057.93
   1908-09 .... 9,194.65

FISHERY INSPECTOR PETER GUNN.

Mr. BRADBURY:

Has Peter Gunn, of Lac Ste. Anne, been appointed a fishery inspector? If so, for what district, and what salary does he receive?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, for the electoral districts of Edmonton, Victoria and Strathcona. Salary, $1,200 per year; but the department has received his resignation, which has been accepted.

MR. THOMAS COSTELLO.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. Has the government any further information, reports or correspondence that was not brought down in reply to a question on the Order Paper of February 11, 1909, 'Hansard' p. 1176, vol. I., 1909, re woollen industry by John Costello? If so, what is the nature of the correspondence, and when will it be brought down?

2. Has the government any information concerning a report made at the same time for the United States government by United States government agent W. Graham Clark?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The government has no further reports or correspondence to be brought down in reply to a question on the order paper of February 11, 1909, 'Hansard' p. 1176, vol. 1, p, 1909.

2. There is in the Department of Customs one copy of a report by W. A. Graham Clark, on 'Manufacture of Woollen Worsted and Shoddy in France and England,' published by the government printing office, Washington, 1909.

MILITARY SCHOOL OF INSTRUCTION AT ST. LAMBERT, QUEBEC.

Mr. WORTHINGTON:

1. What is the nature of the military buildings, the erection of which the government has under consideration at or near St. Lambert, Quebec, and for what purposes are these buildings intended?

2. By what corps or regiments will they be occupied?

3. Has the site for these buildings been purchased? If so, from whom and at what cost?

4. When is it intended to commence the construction of these buildings, and what is the estimated cost?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. Barracks for the permanent corps to accommodate a school of instruction for Montreal and vicinity.

2. Answered by No. 1, but the actual details of the units have not yet been settled.

3. No; it is expected that these buildings will be erected on land already vested in the Crown.

4. The surveys and plans have not yet been completed, and, until this has been done, it will not be possible to say when construction will commence, or what the cost will be.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) concerning a statement forming part of his recent speech, pages 3415 to 3418, of the unrevised 'Hansard' What I particularly desire to ask is concerning the cost of the 'Rainbow,' which does not seem to be included although the ship is mentioned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not included. I think the cost is about £50,000. I am not sure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to know also what is included under the term 'upkeep?' For example, does it include interest and depreciation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the statement I gave, these are not included.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does 'upkeep' include? May we count it as including practically everything else besides interest and depreciation?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN Yes, everything outside of interest and provision for sinking fund.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

On the orders of the day being called:

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring before the House a matter of privilege. On the 14th instant, the hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) read an extract from the Toronto 'Globe' of a day or two before, as follows:

By reading extracts from some documents and carefully refraining from reading others he sought to convey the impression that money was being taken from the public treasury and spent upon a wharf at Pink Rock owned by a company managed by a political friend of the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Mr. Pugsley destroyed Mr. Crocket's pretty little piece of political patchwork at one blow by producing an agreement which showed that the wharf had passed from the hands of the company referred to by the member for York into those of the Crown, and that the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

The hon. member for York is reported as making the charge that the statement in the Toronto 'Globe' was untrue, and stating also that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) knew it was untrue. It is with regard to the latter assertion of the hon. member that I feel it my duty to bring the matter before the House as a matter of privilege. I may say, as the hon. member appealed to me, that I am unable to corroborate in the slightest degree his statement that the report in the 'Globe' was untrue. I think that, if one takes the whole report, one must conclude that the reporter did give a true account of the state of affairs, so far as the Pine Rock wharf is concerned. It is necessary to read the whole report in the 'Globe' in order to form a correct opinion of the truthfulness or otherwise of it. I will read it more fully, including the paragraphs quoted by the hon. member for York, which I have just referred to:

By reading extracts from some documents and carefully refraining from reading others he sought to convey the impression that money was being taken from the public treasury and spent upon a wharf at Pink Rock owned by a company managed by a political friend of the Minister of Public Works.

The impression which I received from the statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), and I think it was an impression fairly to be received from his language, was that the Public Works Department were expending money on a private wharf which was owned by the Albert Manufacturing Company. The facts of the case are that nothing of the kind has been occurring. Not one single dollar of public money has been expended upon a private wharf. The wharf which is being constructed is wholly the property of the Crown. My hon. friend from York may not have intended to create that impression, and I trust he did not intend to do so, but that was the fair inference to be derived from his language, and it is the inference which the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) also drew from his language, because that hon. member made the statement that money was being expended on private property. Therefore, I think that the reporter of the 'Globe' was clearly warranted in drawing that inference from the remarks of my hon. friend. Then the article proceeds:

Hon. Mr. Pugsley destroyed Mr. Crocket's pretty little piece of political patchwork at one blow by producing an agreement which showed that the wharf had passed from the hands of the company referred to by the member for York into those of the Crown, and that the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

I think that the agreement which gives to the Crown the absolute right to collect wharfage tolls, both side wharfage and top wharfage, and which gives to the public the right of way over the property which had been originally constructed by the Albert Manufacturing Company, over that property, to the work which the government was itself constructing beyond the length of the wharf originally built by the Albert Manufacturing Company, entirely justified the reporter of the 'Globe' in stating that the control of the property had passed from the Albert Manufacturing Company into the hands of the Crown, because that is the effect, not only substantially but wholly the effect of the agreement, subject simply to the right of the Albert Manufacturing Company to have its own vessels lie at the wharf free of tolls. Then the reporter further proceeds:

That the expenditures complained of were for the improvement of a public work in the public interest.

That statement was also absolutely correct. Therefore, for these reasons I, as I have said, am entirely unable to agree with the member for York (Mr. Crocket) that the report appearing in the Toronto 'Globe' was in any way inaccurate.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). The Minister of Public Works has apparently felt it necessary to do some more explaining, a thing that he has been very frequently called upon to do in this House. He states that he is not able to corroborate the statement of the hon. member for York on Monday last, that the statement in the 'Globe' newspaper was untrue. If

the minister is not able to corroborate that statement, I am able to corroborate and confirm the statement I then made, from a return furnished to me by an officer of the minister's own department. Although the minister started with the statement that he was not able to corroborate the statement I made, he ended by practically confirming the statement, inasmuch as he admitted that the wharf had not been conveyed to the Crown. The statement to which I took exception in the 'Globe' was the statement that this wharf, to which the government is building an extension, had passed from the hands of the company into the hands of the Crown. I said the other day that the statement is untrue. I reaffirm it to-day. And the minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

Mr. CROCKET. It is all very well for the Minister of Public Works to talk about this being in the public interest. That is an expression we very frequently hear from the Minister of Public Works. I suppose the many expenditures that have taken place in St. John, and important places in New Brunswick, have been, of course, primarily in the public interest, according to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All in the public interest.

Mr. CROCKET. But there are very many works in the province of New Brunswick for which the Committee of Supply of this House has voted thousands and thousands of dollars which are not primarily in the public interest, and which have manifestly been for the improvement of private property. The minister says that the wharf which is being constructed is the property of the Crown. The wharf which is being constructed by the vote which passed the Committee of Supply is for an extension of the private property of the Albert Manufacturing Company, of which Mr. Osman is the managing director; and the agreement that has been referred to, which the minister states is practically a conveyance of the property to the Crown, is nothing more or less than a colourable arrangement providing, as I stated the other day, that Mr. Osman, or the Albert Manufacturing Company, would very graciously allow His Majesty to charge wharfage upon all vessels other than their own, or vessels chartered by the company, that might use the wharf. The fact is, and the minister knows it to be true, that there is no other shipping at that wharf except the shipping of the Albert Manufacturing Company, and will not be for some years to come. I have the documents here, and I challenge the Minister of Public Works to contradict a single statement I have made to this House with reference to this subject. The very second document on the return which was furnished to me by an officer of the Department of Public Works states that the wharf is intended for the shipment of gypsum, which is the product of the Albert Manufacturing Company, the only gypsum that can be shipped from that wharf. There is the statement from a return brought down by the officers of his own department. Furthermore, it is not only to the fact that this wharf had not been conveyed to the Crown that I took exception in this case, it is to the fact that the expenditure which has been made and which has been entered in the Auditor General's Report for one year's work on this wharf, was made by Mr. Osman, under his own management and direction, without any supervision or direction from the Department of Public Works, and that the bills which Mr. Osman contracted were simply forwarded to the Department of Public Works, and the whole of that expenditure, amounting to over $2,000, was paid and entered in the report of the Auditor General as if the expenditure had been made by the Department of Public Works under its supervision. That fact is abundantly proved by the return which I have.

In order that the House may understand the matter fully, and may understand particularly that the statement I made the other day was absolutely true, I have here a letter signed by Mr. J. C. Osman, and dated at St. John, New Brunswick, September 7, 1907, from which it appears that although an officer of the department suggested that this wharf should first be transferred to the Crown before any public money was expended on it, Mr. Osman declined to do that, and he suggested this beautiful colourable arrangement which the Minister of Public Works has represented as complying with the requirements of the case. The letter is as follows:

I am in receipt of a letter from your secretary in reference to the extension to the Pink Rock wharf, Westmorland county.

In regard to the suggestion that our company should convey the wharf which we have already built to a length of about 250 feet to the Crown, I do not see how we could properly be asked to do this, and I do not think that it was the intention of parliament that we should do so. The appropriation, as you know, is for the extension of the wharf. We would, however, be willing to give to the Crown, for the use of the public, a free right of way over our property from the highway to the wharf, and will make a good road and keep it in repair, and we will also undertake to give to the Crown, for the use of the public, a right of way over our wharf to the proposed extension, and will undertake to keep our wharf in repair, and for vessels other than ours or those chartered by us coming to the wharf——

And, as I have stated, no other vessels than those of the company, or those char-

tered by the company, do use or will use the wharf.

—we will allow the Crown to collect wharfage, both in respect to such portion of our wharf as the vessels may occupy and the government extension, without ourselves making any charge for its public use, and as an equivalent for vessels chartered by us and our own vessels having the use of the government wharf, we will undertake, at our own expense, to keep the whole wharf in repair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the very firm conviction that I have that the Minister of Public Works would be absolutely incapable of doing such a thing as dictating a letter to himself to be signed by somebody else, I would be disposed to remark that that letter is couched in such smooth and skilful terms as to be almost worthy of the fine Italian hand of the hon. genius who presides over the great spending department of the government. The suggestion comes to me the more readily because of a subsequent letter of September 10, written by Mr. Osman, in which he refers to a very pleasant interview which he had had with the minister at St. John a few days before. This letter is dated September 10, and it was written from Hillsboro. The last was September 7, and written from St. John.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Dr. Pugsley,—Referring to the matter of the extension of the wharf at Pink Rock. the details of which we fully discussed during the pleasant interview I had with you in St. John, I now beg to confirm on behalf of the Albert Manufacturing Company and the New Brunswick Gypsum Company the proposition I then made to you.

I think that these letters not only confirm the statement I make, but they show that it was suggested to the minister by an officer of the department that this wharf ought properly to be transferred to the Crown before a public expenditure could be made upon it, and that that was a suggestion which Mr. Osman refused to comply with.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) is entirely in error. There was not one single dollar of public money expended upon this wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's statement. He took an appropriation from the Committee of Supply the other day of $10,500, or something of that kind, to complete an extension of the Pink Rock wharf upon which nearly $5,000 had already been expended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a new wharf.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it independent of the old wharf? I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he could name another case in the history of the Public Works Department where a private wharf has been extended by the government for private or public purposes without the department first acquiring the wharf to which the extension was being made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, my hon. friend will find an identical case upon the western side of the harbour of St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. Who was the owner of the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The city of St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. It was a public wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So was this.

Mr. CROCKET. If this is the only instance that the Minister of Public Works can give it is one which does not help his case very much. I do not think it necessary to add anything to the statement I have made. The minister started out with the statement that he could not corroborate the statement which I had made, but before he concluded his speech, he himself absolutely corroborated the precise statement which I had made, viz.: that the wharf had not passed from the hands of the company to the Crown as alleged by the 'Globe'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While the discussion may be somewhat out of order I presume the House will accord me the privilege of replying to the hon. member for York. I first desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the hon. member for York has not denied yet the statement——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume we will have a general discussion on this subject?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I cannot consent to that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance cannot consent to that it had better stop now.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the discussion has rather wandered a little.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Public Works had an opportunity of making a full statement. If the debate is going to continue it will have to be general.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would appeal to the sense of fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite to allow me to make a brief reply, and for this reason that the hon. member for York did not confine himself to the statement in the Toronto 'Globe', but went on with a general discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. A question of privilege partakes of the nature of a per-

sonal explanation. The Minister of Public Works having made his statement it was quite fair and within the rules that the hon. member for York should reply. The minister may be permitted to reply to the hon. member on the understanding that no new matter is to be introduced. Solely upon that ground perhaps the minister may be allowed to complete any explanation, but to bring any new matter would be irrelevant.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not introduce any new matter. I was calling attention to the fact that the hon. member for York has not denied the statement which was contained in the report of the Toronto 'Globe' that he had sought to lead members of this House to believe that the Department of Public Works had been expending money upon private property. In regard to the agreement of transfer——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister will permit me to ask him a question: Is this an extension of a private wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a wharf which is built at the end of the wharf which was owned——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY——which was owned by the Albert Manufacturing Company. I stated that in the city of St. John the government is building a wharf which you might call an extension of a wharf owned——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I object to the minister going into that unless it is understood that this debate is going to be a general one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not want to make it general.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be confined strictly to the matter now before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of the city of St. John, the city owned the wharf——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I object to going into the question of the wharf in the city of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be brief, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not interrupt the hon. member for York, although he wandered far afield, although he did not keep within miles of the question which is really before the House, and I do think I should be allowed a few words of reply. In the case of the building of the wharf beyond the wharf in the city of St. John—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I object to introducing new matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, I will not go into the wharf at St. John.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I think you will have enough on your hands to deal with this wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All right. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has referred to the agreement regarding this wharf and he has called it a colourable agreement. There is nothing whatever in the agreement, or in anything which was before the committee, or is in the possession of my hon. friend, which would justify him in making that statement. That agreement provides that there shall be a free right of way to the whole public over this wharf, a right of way over the road which was constructed by the Albert Manufacturing Company, that the whole public shall have the right to use it, subject to such tolls as the Crown may impose, and that the Crown shall have the absolute right to collect wharfage upon all vessels except those which are coming there for the Albert Manufacturing Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because they were the only ones that use it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) had been in the House the other day he would have heard the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) state that not only are other vessels using the wharf besides those of the Albert Manufacturing Company, but that there are scores of vessels, a large number of vessels using it and that it is of the utmost importance to the traders and fishermen in the vicinity.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CROCKET. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have tried to be as fair as possible to both sides and the minister will understand that no new matter can be brought up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. My point of order is that the Minister of Public Works attributed a statement to the member for Westmorland, which the member for Westorland did not make. The statement of the member for Westmorland was that there were some fishing vessels using the wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What the member for Westmorland stated was that to his knowledge there were a large number of vessels besides these belonging to the company which were utilizing this wharf, and it was a wharf in the public interest entirely, outside of the Albert Manufucturing Com-

pany's business. Further, it seems to me that the agreement that this company was to maintain its original wharf of 225 feet in length at its own expense and give to the Crown all these privileges over it; was an agreement made in the public interest, and I repeat that it absolutely justified the reporter of the 'Globe' in making the statement which he did.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the minister this one question—in that letter from Mr. Osman he says: We will not only allow you to charge for vessels over the old wharf, but the extension which we now propose to make. Does not that imply that the Crown cannot own it? He says: We will allow you the privilege of doing so for both the old wharf and the new; as though it was their own wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the language of the letter, but I will say to him that there is no question whatever, and nobody has ever raised a question outside of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) as to the ownership of the soil right in the wharf which the Crown has built. That belongs absolutely to the Crown. It is built upon Crown property and it is the sole property of the Crown. Now, just one other word and then I am done. The hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) with that sense of fairness, or rather what he would I suppose assume to be fairness, which characterizes him, suggests that this letter which the manager of the Albert Manufacturing Company wrote to me, with regard to giving these privileges upon the wharf originally built by the company, was probably written by myself. I need not answer that suggestion further than to say that those who know Mr. Osman will know that he is just as capable of putting a fair business proposition in a letter as I would be, and a good deal more able to do it than I would be. I can simply say that I never heard of the letter and never saw the letter until it was submitted to me by my officials in the department here at Ottawa. That is the answer which I make to that, and I think that my hon. friend really had begin to devote his attention to somewhat larger subjects; begin to deal with people a little more fairly, and if he does he will not only do more public good, but he will really do himself very much more good than by pursuing the small tactics which he is pursuing.

THE NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), an Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. F. T. CONGDON (Yukon Territory). —resuming—Mr. Speaker, this debate has already continued so long that it seems almost necessary that one should offer some apology for venturing to address the House further. I do not suppose that it is possible for either myself or any of the gentlemen who will follow me, to add much interest or refreshment to the topic now before the House. I do not know but we shall be compelled to take refuge in the excuse of Elihu the son of Barachel, the Buzzite who after having listened for a long and considerable time to the elders speaking; to Eliphaz the Teemanite, Bildad the Shuhite, Zophar the Naamathite and to Job himself, deemed it necessary that he should apologize for speaking and gave his excuse in the words: I will speak that I may be refreshed. Under the circumstances, Sir, those of us who are deeply possessed of sincere opinions on this subject may feel that if we cannot refresh the House we may at all events have some satisfaction in refreshing ourselves when we speak on this matter. I trust that none of us will be open to the accusing inquiry that came in the whirlwind: 'Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge.' I endeavoured yesterday to review somewhat briefly the panics which had possessed the British public in former years. I endeavoured to show that these panics were largely instigated and intensified by the action of elderly men, whose lives had in some cases been spent in warfare, but who had lost somewhat of the nerve and vigour of their earlier years. I mentioned the Duke of Wellington, Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Ellenborough, and Sir Charles Napier. These are the men who at that time added greatly to the panics which possessed the public mind. I endeavoured to show further that none of these panics were justified by the event. Some of them arose out of the fact that men who for long years had been engaged in military and naval affairs appeared to have lost a correct sense of the perspective regarding the British empire. They seemed to believe that the greatness of the British empire was founded on her army and her navy, forgetting that the greatness of the empire which promises to endure is founded not upon a navy or an army, but upon the principles of freedom and justice, which have inspired the people of that great empire. At the adjournment of the debate, I was endeavouring to show the great progress which had been made in a very few years in the construction of the German navy. I pointed out the great difficulties which met German statesmen; that practically the nation had no harbours; that the people had no savoir faire in sea-

manship and that for years it seemed an impossibility to establish in Germany either a naval or mercantile marine. But, by indefatigable zeal and by persistence, the German people have to-day a navy which has to be reckoned with in the politics of the nations. I mentioned also that concurrently with the increase of the German navy there practically disappeared the old wooden ship building industry of Canada. There came to the rescue of the Germans in their effort to found a navy the application of steam power to vessels and the utilization of iron and steel in their construction. The natural aptitude for scientific pursuits of the Germans gave them an opportunity to attain a certain mastery in seamanship. It would have been impossible for them to have become potent upon the sea if the old system of navigation had continued, and if conditions had not so changed as to render no longer necessary that expert seamanship which was required on the old sailing vessels. I referred also yesterday, with some satisfaction, to the announcement made by the Minister of Finance of the abolition of the surtax. I forgot to mention in connection with the panics of former days that they differed from the present day panic in that they were not to the same extent fostered by the yellow press. I think any one who has read the despatches containing the announcement of certain newspapers in England with respect to results which will follow from the removal of the surtax, cannot doubt that the yellow press is to-day a potent influence in fomenting these panics.

It almost leads to the suspicion that they do so for no other purpose than to increase the sales of their miserable papers. The grounds given by the syndicate of papers in England for their opposition to the removal of the surtax on German goods are in line with the remark made by Monck in 1666 when Great Britain was engaged in war with the Dutch. 'The justification of the war,' he said, 'is not this reason or that; but what we want is a greater share of the Dutch trade.' It would seem as if the gentlemen managing these papers in England care nothing at all about the fiscal relations between Germany and Canada, care nothing for the removal of those causes of friction between the two nations which have existed in the past and which to some extent continue to exist to-day. All they care for is a greater share of the trade of Germany. Let me compare the language used by these papers with the language used by gentlemen in this country to show that the surtax was removed, not in consequence of any result of the British elections, but solely in the best interests of Canadian trade. This fact is expressed in a Toronto paper by a gentleman whose opinions, I have no doubt, will be listened to with great respect by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House—Mr. W. R. Brock, of Toronto, a gentleman well known not only in that city, but throughout Canada generally, and of course also well known to hon. members of this House, of which he was at one time a member. That gentleman is reported in the Toronto 'Daily Star' as having said of the removal of the German surtax:

> It is better than ten Dreadnoughts, and to my mind it affords an excellent opportunity for this country to look into the very great expenditure on ships of war which they are about to undertake. They are always talking about a war with Germany, but it's not war that Germany is after, it is business. The fact that they have made very great concession shows that they are primarily a trading people. Broadly speaking—I like to speak broadly on such matters—it is of much greater importance to Canada to have the good opinion of Germany and the United States than to have a great expense like this navy will be. Peace and commercial intercourse are heralded by this treaty, not war.

And if you go to the root of this matter I believe you will find that it is to no great imperial reason, no idea of conquest on the part of Germany, that the difficulties between Great Britain and Germany are due, but that they are due solely to the endeavour of each nation to secure the greatest portion of the commerce of the world.

My object in calling attention to the growth of the navy in Germany was to point out, as I have endeavoured to do, that the difficulty which Germany was obliged to meet was similar to the difficulty which we had to meet in this country when our wooden ships began to be superseded on the sea by iron ships, and when we had the misfortune not to have developed our resources, nor to have accumulated capital sufficiently to enable us to turn readily from the construction of wooden ships, which required less capital and for the construction of which we had ample material, to the construction of iron and steel ships. That is not the case to-day. In the eastern part of Canada, in the province of Nova Scotia particularly, in consequence of the policy adopted by a former government of the province, of which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was then the premier, the coal trade of the province assumed important proportions and increased to a very great extent. It has since become a most important industry in that province. As the result of the adoption of that policy, we have in Nova Scotia, not only the coal, but the iron and steel and all other essentials for the construction of ships. The same thing, or nearly the same, is true of the Pacific coast of Canada. So that for the construction of iron and steel ships we are in as good, nay, a better position in Canada than

Germany was at the time of the first serious decadence of wooden ships, for securing a fair share of the trade of the world.

We in Canada are now in a position, if we so desire, to go into the construction of ships, whether for mercantile or military purposes. To my mind, the real question involved in this discussion may be subdivided into two questions: which is better for Canada, and which is better for the empire? Is it better for Canada that we should adopt the provisions contained in the Bill before the House, and endeavour to initiate and build up in this country a ship building industry; or is it better for Canada that we should take the money of the taxpayers of this country and send it to England in order that all the skill and genius in naval matters should be confined to the inhabitants of the little island across the Atlantic? I venture to say that there can be no question as to which is better in the interest of Canada. And in considering these matters we have a right—possibly a first right, certainly a co-ordinate right—to consider what is in the interest of Canada concurrently with what is in the interest of the empire. To my mind, the only redeeming feature in the initiation of a naval policy is the fact that not only will it secure in this country the ability to construct vessels of war, which can serve as a defence for Canada and as an aid in the defence of the empire, but it will also at the same time, and in the same shipyards, develop an ability in this country to construct merchant ships which can engage in the carrying trade of the world. If we pass money over to England, there can certainly be no such result as that. For my part, I can see no more justification at the present moment for taking twenty or twenty-five millions of money belonging to the Canadian people and sending it to England, and saying to Great Britain, build Dreadnoughts and do what you like with these, we do not want or expect any of it back, than there would be in sending to Great Britain a delegation from the government of Canada to say, we want you to give us twenty-five millions to build ships for the defence of the empire in Canada. This will make you and us more secure than we are at present. Such a proposition would be regarded in England as utterly absurd; but it does not seem to me more absurd than the proposition to send our money to the other side of the Atlantic.

Look at the imperial position of affairs to-day. What do we find? Great Britain never occupied a position of greater naval superiority than she does to-day. All the authorities agree in that. If you read the last annual report of the British Navy League, you will find the statement there made, that during the last year Great Britain has occupied a position of greater superiority in naval matters than she has ever occupied before. If you compare the list of British men of war of various kinds, from battleships down to submarines, with those of Germany or of any of the other European nations, you will find that that is absolutely true. From the calculations made by the very highest authorities on the subject, it is stated that if Great Britain absolutely ceased the further construction of battleships until 1919, and Germany carried out the programme of naval construction upon which she has entered, at the end of that period, the navy of Great Britain would still be superior to that of Germany.

If you look at the reports, you will find that in spite of this progress of Germany in shipbuilding, the Clyde alone produces more battle and merchant marine than the whole of Germany. And to tell us that in spite of the fact that Great Britain has nearly three battleships and armed cruisers to one of Germany, and that in the matter of tonnage and seamen engaged, she has in the proportion of almost three to one—to tell us that in spite of these facts, this is a period of emergency, that Britain is in danger from the Germans, is enough to make us despise the men who utter such sentiments. We are told that Germany can throw an army into England of 200,000 men and conquer it. Well, if the invasion by 200,000 Germans or 200,000 of any nation, can conquer England, it is about time that England was conquered and some new blood infused into her veins. England cannot be conquered in that way. The idea that she must keep standing armies and be constantly preparing for war, as though Germany and other nations had nothing to occupy them except the idea of conquering Great Britain, is absurd. Britain is not to be conquered in that way. Germany has enough to do to attend to Russia, on the one side, and Austro-Hungary and France, on the other; and it is quite sufficient for her to see that she is safe against the attacks of any of these, without making a new enemy in Great Britain. As it seems to me, the position is this. Great Britain is absolutely safe against Germany. No doubt Germany alone cannot venture to attack Great Britain, nor is she thinking of attacking her. The great thing to do is to establish a circle of protection for the commerce belonging to Great Britain and her various colonies. It is pointed out in Haslem's work 'The Admiralty of the Atlantic or the Navy League'—but each is equally strongly imperialistic, and whatever they say against any idea of contributing largely to the British navy may be taken as stronger than anything they can say in favour of it—that the only danger to Great Britain from any European combination, is the danger of having to distribute her home forces in order to protect her lines

of commerce. But if we contribute a powerful assistance and leave the navy of Great Britain in the North sea, where it can readily protect the empire against any European enemy, we will be contributing all that is desirable and can be required from us for the defence of the empire at present. The best authorities I can find on the subject indicate that the great danger to the British empire is not immediate. The danger is that Germany may secure preponderance over Britain in naval matters by becoming able in her shipyards to produce ships faster than Britain can. The danger is that in the race for superiority, by reason, as she thinks, of her workmen and iron and steel and other matters of that kind, Germany may be enabled to outclass Great Britain, and in a given time turn out a greater number of ships. For shipyards are the roots of the navy. Without them you can have no navy. By the policy of the government, we shall not be contributing to the defence of the empire merely for the day. The great objection to the policy of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is that it is a make-shift policy and contains no provision for the future. Whereas the policy of the government is one which decides the way in which, for all time, we can contribute to the defence of the empire. We certainly would be contributing immensely to the strength of the British navy if we were able, within five or ten years, to point to three or more naval yards in the Dominion, where we would have material superior in quantity and equal in quality to any in Germany, and have that material ready at a moment's notice to be utilized in building ships of any character we might require. It seems to me absurd to imagine that the whole genius and skill of the British empire are to be centred in those little islands, and that no encouragement or outlet is to be given to the genius and ability of the people of the rest of the empire. They are not to be permitted to qualify themselves at all; they are not to be permitted to utilize their own resources in the defence of the empire. No, the only people, apparently according to the leader of the opposition—if one properly reads the implication of his resolution— the only people who have the skill and ingenuity to build ships are to be found in the British islands, and those descendants of Britain who have crossed to this side, and our other people, have lost all genius and skill in that regard. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not my opinion. I believe that the best interests of the empire will be served, not by contributing to the building of ships in the British islands and the development of the skill and genius to be found there, but by enlisting the abilities and skill and genius to be found in all portions of the empire, and utilizing them in the constructing of a great system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CONGDON. This may appear inconsistent with the views I expressed on a former occasion, when my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) quoted the language of Cobden. I do not think that my hon. friend read any portion of the context, but simply took his quotation from the annual of the naval league to the effect that Cobden was ready to contribute £100,000,000 to the defence of Great Britain if he thought she was to be made the object of attack. In that regard I agree with Cobden. I agree with the whole school of England peace lovers who are willing to go to any sacrifice to guard their country against contemplated attack and secure its defence. But they do not see in every move of every nation a design and determined attempt to undermine the liberties of the British people.

There is one feature of this that I think is not worthy of attention. I believe there are promising signs that the time will soon come when there will be something approaching international peace. We have to-day an exhibition in the nations of the earth of something that did not exist in former times, and it is the glory and the boast of democracy that more than any other form of government it has contributed to the development of what may be called a national conscience. If you study the history of the world you will find that under absolute monarchy or aristocratic oligarchies, there was nothing approaching the semblance of a conscience. You have to come down to modern times when the great heart of the people is engaged in the government of the country, before you can find anything approaching a national conscience. In our own time, and within a few years, we have seen an exhibition of national conscience utterly inconceivable to warriors and statesmen of olden times. We have seen the United States, in its impulse for freedom, taking part in a war to liberate Cuba, and then, after it had succeeded and could have made Cuba a part of the American republic, restore Cuba to its own people and refuse to aggrandize the United States by adding Cuba to its own territory. That shows something approaching national conscience in the United States. We have seen something of the same in the case of Great Britain. We are proud to boast that the magnanimity displayed by the United States in regard to Cuba has been paralleled by that which Great Britain has shown in her treatment of her conquered subjects in South Africa. She has exhibited towards them none of the suspicion which some hon. gentlemen

thought she was bound to display. On the contrary, she has trusted them, and the only way you can secure the allegiance and confidence and loyalty of a people is by that mode which Great Britain adopted in the case of the Boers. And to-day, as the result of that generous treatment, you will find among those men in South Africa, who only a little while ago were fighting British troops and our own sons among those troops, as loyal and devoted sons of the British empire as can be found in any portion of the empire.

The most serious objection which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has offered to the policy of the government is to that clause which leaves to the determination of the Governor in Council when the naval forces of Canada shall take part in any war of Great Britain. One would imagine that it was an unheard-of thing for Great Britain to be engaged in a war without Canadians being in danger of having their houses burned about their heads by the enemies of Great Britain. Why, if I am not mistaken, Great Britain is at war at the present time, yet most of us know nothing about it except as we gather a few stray facts from some obscure paragraph in the newspapers. Great Britain has been engaged in scores of wars in which Canadians took no part and no interest. And, in future, Britain may be engaged in similar wars. But, of one thing we may be sure, and that is that when war becomes a serious strain upon Great Britain, a danger to the empire, there will be no lack of the loyalty which will lead to the declaration that the military and naval forces of Canada shall take part in that war. It seems to me that the suggestion that there may ever be any difficulty about that matter is a reflection upon the loyalty of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) seems to doubt himself, his party and perhaps the rest of us. He seems to think that we should bind ourselves now for fear that our loyalty may not be sufficient to cause us to do our duty later. But when a war breaks out he can trust Canadians, for I believe the people of Canada are so loyal that no government would desire or dare to withhold the forces of Canada from the assistance of the mother country when that assistance was required. That is all that is necessary.

Some hon. members of this House seem to entertain the idea that it is a sort of treason for us to question any utterance of the British admiralty. But in England they do not so regard the matter. I notice that my Lord Charles Beresford, who thought it necessary to get into parliament in some way or other, does not reserve himself in his criticisms of the admiralty. He says that the whole thing is guided by espionage, favouritism and other disgusting things. But, according to some hon. members, we in this country should be so loyal that we cannot be allowed to question any decision of the admiralty, but, when it has told us what it wants we must yield without a word. For my part, I would sooner be guided by the declarations of the leader of this government in anything regarding the relation of Great Britain and her overseas dominions than I would be by the Lords of the Admiralty, or even by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. We have in this country trained statesmen equal to any imperial statesmen of the time. The necessities of our situation, the fact that we have two races in this country, have made it a necessity that our leader should have a power, a diplomacy, a courage equal to those of any statesman. It is much easier to manage Englishmen and Scotchmen together than it is to manage Englishmen and Frenchmen together; and the fact that we have raised up statesmen who have governed the country agreeably to the wishes of their French Canadian constituents as well as to their British constituents, shows that we have developed a statesmanship in that regard which is unsurpassed in the history of the world. The checks and limitations which the leader of the government has placed upon the military forces of Canada, exactly similar to those which have been placed upon the military forces of this country are required by the whole situation not only of Canada but by the British empire. My hon. friend would carry his argument a little further, and, because we have to-day one of the greatest and best kings ever known in the history of the world, would think it insulting to continue in his case the limitations imposed by constitutional monarchy. But I do not think much support will be given to that idea. It is true that we have a great king, a king whom we can trust, in admiration and support of whom we would go to any length. But we think it a wiser principle to confine the operation of every branch of our government to its legitimate sphere and not to allow it to transgress its due limitations. And, notwithstanding our loyalty to our sovereign, notwithstanding the great love in which we have held that sovereign, no one would think of removing one of the limitations upon his absolute monarchy. And the same with regard to the imperial parliament. It is true, we have confidence in imperial management, but we have so much confidence in their management that we prefer to leave it to its own proper sphere and to retain for ourselves control of that sphere which properly belongs to us. It is absurd, in my humble judgment, to ask our people to adopt a policy which will take from the responsible governors of this country the control of any large por-

tion of our public revenue and hand it over to the imperial government. And it seems to me that the dangers that would be involved in such a confusion of authority afford the best reason for not venturing upon so unusual an experiment.

I think that the Bill introduced by the leader of the government best expresses what is in the interests of the people of Canada and of the empire. I do trust and hope that circumstances in international affairs may take such a line that it will not be necessary that we should construct any considerable number of ships. But one thing is certain—that, while we will not join in any imperial policy of aggression, while we will not back up any policy which seeks to infringe upon the rights of other nations of the earth, we in Canada will always be ready to yield up every ounce of our influence and every bit of our resources for the maintenance of the great empire to which we belong. We should be lacking in the self-respect which must be the attribute of a great and free people if we were not ready to sacrifice ourselves in order to defend our institutions.

I was struck with a statement in the work of Jane on 'Heresies of Sea Power,' to which I before referred in discussing this matter. There are some gentlemen possessed with the idea—and they hold it as though it were a political axiom—that sea power has always dominated the world, and that the nation that has the sea power is bound to be the dominating nation. Jane points out that if you follow the course of history you learn that this idea is absolutely unfounded; there are as many cases in the history of the world in which the nation having no knowledge of sea power, no possession of sea power, has conquered as there are instances in which the nation possessed of that power has conquered. If you go back to the old struggle between the Athenians and the Spartans, you find that the Athenians were the finest seamen, while the Spartans knew nothing of seamanship; yet the Spartans had the fighting qualities and they won out. Then when we come down to the wars between Carthage and Rome we find that, though Carthage had inherited the great sea skill of the Phoenicians, and, at the time when the wars opened actually commanded the sea, and though the Romans did not even know how to build a ship until some unfortunate Carthaginian ran ashore and furnished them with a model, yet the result of the Punic wars was the complete conquest of Carthage by Rome.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That did not take place until the Romans had become dominant on the sea.

Mr. CONGDON. I do not understand—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Rome first acquired the dominion of the sea, and it was for that reason that Hannibal had to march through Spain and over the Alps.

Mr. CONGDON. But does my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) mean to say that the Carthaginians had not command of the sea for the first, the second—

Mr. HUGHES. They lost command of the sea in the first Punic war.

Mr. CONGDON. I confess, I cannot understand the interruption. The assertion with which I started was that the nation that had the great sea power met the nation that had no sea power and was ultimately defeated and conquered. My hon. friend points out, in objection, that the nation that had the sea power at first afterwards lost that sea power. It lost it because the nation with which it came into conflict was the greater nation, with the greater courage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Congdon), but, on the other hand, I do not wish him to misunderstand me. What I said was that Rome did not conquer Carthage until she had acquired dominion of the sea.

Mr. CONGDON. That is quite immaterial to my argument. Of course, I do not object to the interruption, but it is quite immaterial to me to fix the exact time when the sea-power passed from Carthage to Rome. It is undoubtedly the fact that, in the commencement, all the sea-power was with Carthage while Rome had none. I am coming simply to this, that it is not the possession of ships or any of these things that determines ultimately the conquering powers of a race, fitness to win is the determining factor. As Mr. Jane says: It is not ships or the ability to handle them, it is not great commanders or ready obedience, but the sum of the sentiment of every individual combatant. What I urge is that if in Canada we conduct ourselves in such a way as to build up a free democracy, a democracy that does not need a large standing army in order to stimulate a martial spirit, that does not need any of these adventitious aids to martial spirit, we shall be able to protect ourselves, come what may in our future. I believe we should possess the spirit pictured by Caesar as possessed by one of his lieutenants. He tells in the story of the great and terrible revolt of the Gauls, how one of his lieutenants, in dire distress, had surrendered and was butchered with all his followers. Labienus was in equal straits, but, says Caesar, in splendid praise of his bitter enemy of later years: In these difficulties he took counsel from the valour of his mind. Difficulties and dangers may assail the Canadian people, but if we see that we build up in this country a vigor-

ous, a stout-hearted, a moral and a righteous people, we shall always be prepared to defend ourselves. It is this fitness to win that is the determining factor. You may get all the ships you want and all the guns, but you must have the men behind them to accomplish much.

Sir James MacIntosh has pointed out the change that has taken place in conditions of this kind since men emerged from a state of savagery and a state of despotism into the free institutions of to-day. He points out that in a despotic country it is necessary to have an army as a seminary of martial spirit, in order to prevent the despot sinking into languor and laziness; in order to stir up the best impulses and faculties of the savage, it is essential that he should be stimulated at times by the frenzy of war; but in this greatest of free communities, the British empire, we need no such stimulants as that. We have, in the habits and modes of our life, that which readily lends itself to the system and genius of war. We have a free people; the point of honour with our nation is not its army, not its navy, but liberty, and if you preserve this liberty throughout the empire, if you preserve the freedom of the individual and of the component parts of this empire, there will be never lacking, either in Canada or any other of the Dominions of Britain, a spirit that will defend that particular portion and assist to the greatest possible extent in the defence of the whole. The people of Great Britain have never been a people of soldiers, no occasion has arisen on which they have not shown themselves a nation of warriors. I believe the same thing will be true of Canada, that we have to-day in Canada enterprises that require identically the same skill, as much courage and persistence, as are engaged in the task of war. You have the pioneering population engaged in operations as serious and dangerous as any of those ever taken part in by warriors; you have our whole railway system, which requires as much genius in organizing and operating as are required in the organization and operation of a large army. And so, in all the diverse operations and business of civilized life, you find that which stimulates every faculty of the mind, which stimulates all the best qualities in men and prepares them when there is any danger, to defend themselves without having to go through preliminary drills in awkward squads. What we need is the nucleus of military and naval defence. So far as this Bill carries that out, I am heartily in favour of it. So long as it is only the legitimate and just provision for the defence of this country and contains no threat of aggression on any other nation unless we are attacked, I am in favour of it, and I mistake the spirit of my countrymen if they have not sufficient faith in our genius, to undertake the construction of all the instruments necessary for our defence without sending their money to Great Britain or any other country to be expended for that purpose.

I believe that such a policy is in the interests of this country and of the empire and therefore I shall have great pleasure in voting for the original resolution before the House.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria-Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of interest to the very magnificent essay, partly on philosophy, partly on metaphysics, with a little touch of religion in it some very badly quoted history, a eulogy of the First Minister, a eulogy of the Nova Scotia Steel Works and the natural resources of our country, an apology for every enemy Britain has had and a condemnation of everything that has gone to make up Britain's greatness in days gone by. We have listened to the hon. gentleman along this line yesterday afternoon and to-day, and I am sure he has contributed very little to the matter before the House, the Naval Bill which the government has brought down and the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). According to this luminary on military and naval matters, the opinions of Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, Lord Wolseley, Lord Charles Beresford, Hon. Mr. Asquith, leader of the Liberal government, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Haldane, every prominent statesman of to-day—and they are not old men because the Asquith government boasts of being young men—are of no value. These gentlemen are in their dotage, they are old women, to use his own expression, and they know not whereof they speak in warning Britain whereof they know, that Britain is in danger from the sea power as she is from the military power of the German empire. Dreamers are always nice gentlemen to meet but very dangerous men. Robespierre in France was one of the most beautiful types of intellect that could be found in the whole of that magnificent empire. He would weep at seeing any of the minor animals in trouble, a chicken losing its head caused him to shed tears, and yet Robespierre was the man of all others who drenched France in blood when he got the authority. Dreamers are dangerous men, Sir. My good friend has referred in contemptuous terms to the Duke of Wellington, to Lord Beaconsfield, to Charles Napier, and to numbers of other gentlemen whose names I was unable to catch as he uttered them. He has spoken of the English to-day as panic mongers, and has said that these agitations were gotten up in music halls, by half-pay officers, and that there was no falsehood that has not been

urged in creating these panics in Great Britain against Germany. He went further and condemned the journals of the city of London, the leading newspapers of the world, regarded as such in every land, as a yellow press, and he referred in eloquent terms to the removal of the German surtax as an evidence of the friendliness of Germany. We are all, I presume, more or less pleased at the removal of any trade barriers if their removal will benefit this country. But does any one suppose that the removal by this government of the surtax on German goods was not actuated by the action of Germany? When she penalized the Dominion of Canada, Canada, I say, very properly penalized Germany.

Canada, I say, properly penalized Germany; so that this new concession, this surrender on the part of Germany, is not in the interest of the British empire, not in the interest of Canada, but it is in the interest of Germany herself that this surtax has been removed. The hon. gentleman reproved my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with daring to speak of the leader of the government as a master of circumlocution and deceit. There is an old maxim that in a corrupt government there is no such thing as patriotic feeling. Its place is supplied by private interest, public fame and devotion to a chief. We found from first to last that the hon. member, in speaking upon this subject, beslobbered the leader of the government —adulation, devotion to a chief—and his only argument against the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was this: Don't send money to England; keep it in Canada and spend it among the boys. Yet this is the gentlemen who reproves my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier for having spoken in terms that did not meet with his approval regarding the first minister, and in the next moment, in referring directly to the motion and, indirectly to the leader of the opposition, he uses the terms, 'audacity' and 'inconsistency.' There is an old Scotch proverb that would aptly fit the hon. member for the Yukon. I need not quote it because he knows it:

> Oh, waud some power th' giftie gi'e us
> To see oorsels as ithers see us.

I will challenge the pages of 'Hansard' for a number of years past to find more reflections cast upon prominent men in Great Britain than have been cast by the hon. member for Yukon upon the statesmen and soldiers of the old land in his speech of yesterday and to-day. Not content with that the hon. member indulges himself in a little—what shall I say?—I must be careful and not use a harsh term —shall I use the term misrepresentation? His language is as follows:

> It does not at all depart from but absolutely carries out the conclusions arrived at by the conference of 1909.

He was speaking of the Bill introduced by the First Minister. What was the proposal of the British government as set forth at the conference of 1909? I shall not go farther back, as it has been entered into in detail before. Section 5 of the report, at page 21, says:

> In the opinion of the admiralty, a Dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit; and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war.

Then it goes on to recite what a fleet unit it is, and in section 11 it speaks of a vessel of the Indomitable type as being necessary. Then, referring to the training, it says:

> If the fleet unit maintained by a Dominion is to be treated as integral part of the imperial forces, with a wide range of interchangeability among its component parts with those forces, its general efficiency should be the same, and the facilities for refitting and replenishing His Majesty's ships, whether belonging to a Dominion fleet or to the fleet of the United Kingdom should be the same.
>
> Further, as it is a sine qua non that successful action in time of war depends upon unity of command and direction, the general discipline must be the same throughout the whole imperial service, and without this, it would not be possible to arrange for that mutual co-operation and assistance which would be indispensable in the building up and establishing of a local naval force in close connection with the Royal navy.

In not one solitary point have the wishes of the admiralty, or have the propositions made by the admiralty at the conference of 1909, been carried out by the government in the matter. Our hon. friend enlarged upon the policy of the leader of the opposition in favour of extending $25,000,000 to Great Britain, and our objecting to the construction of this navy in Canada. Why, Sir, where is the evidence that they are constructing their navy in Canada? Not only are they not constructing a navy in Canada, but they are buying British ships and spending money in weakening the imperial fleet in case of war. If they would build ships it would be all right. We have the guarantee of the right hon. the First Minister that these ships are not going to be of assistance to Great Britain in war unless his sweet will dictates that they shall go. Therefore, with Canada buying these ships as she is to-day, suppose Great Britain were engaged in a war in the course of a few weeks, what would be the position of Canada should the leader of the government not see fit to allow these vessels to go? In the first place, Canadian

money would have been spent in Great Britain, and in the second place, the British fleet would have been weakened to the extent of the number of ships she had sold to Canada.

Mr. TALBOT. Why do the English admiralty sell them if they are weakening their own strength?

Mr. HUGHES. I presume they are a lot of old things that they wanted to get rid of. They are unloading on this government a lot of old ships that they want to get rid of.

Mr. TALBOT. They are not weakening their own strength then.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Congdon) quoted some gentleman named Jane, and declared in the fulness of his eloquence that it was the right of every citizen to discuss the future of this country. We are not disputing that, but when it comes to a matter of legislating for independence, then it is time that the people of this country sat up and understood what was going on. I trust that I shall be able to show before I am through that in the Bill now before the House there is the most sinister attempt at laying the foundation of the independence of Canada that has ever been presented to the public. Our good friend made various other references, but I will discuss them as I pass on. Now, Sir, what has been the policy from start to finish of this question? A mandate was issued by the conference, in which Canada took part, for the defence of the empire. Last year a resolution was solemnly passed by this House containing a mandate to the government. The absolute unanimity of the House was behind that resolution instructing the government to act. First, there was to be speedy assistance. Does the government's Bill propose speedy assistance? To my mind it proposes no assistance whatever, and certainly there is no pretense that there will be any assistance forthcoming for the next four or five years. That resolution proposed co-operation. Is there any co-operation provided by this resolution? I fail to find it. That resolution gave the government a mandate last year to stand by the unity of the empire. I fail to find in the Bill proposed any provision for standing behind the unity of the empire. Co-operation means operating together for the same end. I find nothing in this Bill providing for the operation of these fleets towards the same end. Co-operation means mutual help. The Bill before the House does not guarantee mutual help. It is a jug-handled policy; we are always to receive the help of Britain when we need it, but Canada will help Britain according to her own sweet will. Co-operation means reciprocal assistance, and under this Bill there is no reciprocal assistance proposed or guaranteed. It means concurrent effort, and under the Bill before the House there is no proposition for concurrent effort

Now, Sir, the First Minister was even more equivocal—I hope that will not be offensive, I do not like to say anything that may offend the First Minister, I know he is in a very difficult position. He has played the game so long—appealing with one cry to certain elements in the province of Quebec, and with a different cry to certain elements in other provinces—he has played the game so long that the old adage is coming true about the chickens coming home to roost. We can all remember when in 1885 he stood on the Champs de Mars in Montreal, and stated that had he been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket to fight the loyal Canadian soldiers who went to the front. In 1895 and 1896 in the province of Quebec, where it was congenial, he stated in regard to the vote of $3,000,000 for the purchase of rifles for our volunteers, and his friends also stated it: Are you going to put the Tupper government in power and have your money sent to Britain to buy rifles to have your sons fight Britain's battles in all parts of the world? I need not refer to other agitations led by the First Minister. In 1896 the song that was sung in Ontario was: Hands off Manitoba. No coercion of Manitoba, and, quoting from Shakespeare he struck that beautiful attitude which he can so well assume and said: No Italian priest shall tithe or toll in these our fair Dominions. Then, the right hon. gentleman went to the province of Quebec and told the people: 'Will you trust Tupper, a Protestant and an Englishman, or me a Frenchman, and Roman Catholic, put me in power and I will give you a stronger remedial Bill than Tupper will.' I need not follow him down to 1905, and show his attitude at that time further than to point out that the chickens are coming home to roost, and in view of his equivocal language in the past I can see the position the First Minister finds himself in. Even though he wished to come up and do his duty to the old empire he has tied himself by his own past actions, so that I can easily make an apology for him which he finds it impossible to make for himself. Had the government brought in a proper Naval Bill, had the government obeyed the mandate of this House last year to give speedy assistance and co-operation so as to maintain the unity of the empire, there is not a single Conservative in this House who would not have endorsed such a proposal. Further, I wish to take my good genial friend the Postmaster General to task. In the speeches of the First Minister, and of the Postmaster General, and of the member for Pictou—I do

not see how the member for the Yukon happened to miss it—they all eulogized the heroes of 1837, and by heroes they mean the cowardly men who went in for misleading the poor innocent habitant in the province of Quebec, and the innocent yeomen in Ontario, and inciting them to commit crimes which led to loss of life and destruction of property. These gentlemen have stood on the public platform, and even in this House in this very debate they have eulogized the rebels of '37 and '38. Why have these gentlemen stood up in this parliament and insidiously endorsed rebellion. The hon. member for Pictou, in his remarks the other day gave a very nice touch to the leader of the government in that regard. He showed how constitutional government had been obtained in the province of Nova Scotia, and, in censuring the member for Jacques Cartier he said:

I have the same rights here as my hon. friend, I come from a race of men——

How proud these gentlemen are of the race whence they sprung.

I come from a race of men who in the little province of Nova Scotia fought the battle of responsible government just as did my hon. friend's compatriots in the province of Quebec.

And now comes the gentle slap at the Postmaster General and the First Minister:

Our people in Nova Scotia won that battle and won it a little earlier and without any particular display, but we won it nevertheless and it is just as dear to us as it can possibly be to the people of any other province in the Dominion.

Then he refers to the 'heroes' in Quebec and the 'heroes' in Ontario. Why, Sir, what does history teach about these 'heroes'? I have the facts here, if any one disputes the statement I make. The truth is they deceived and misled the poor fellows who took up arms, and I say here to-day that no man can name a solitary wrong under which these people lived at that time that could not have been easily redressed by an appeal to constitutional methods. I go further and I say that one solitary wrong cannot be mentioned that these people laboured under at that time which could have justified in the slightest a recourse to arms. What was the conduct of the leaders in Ontario and Quebec? The moment they got the poor, innocent, misguided fellows into trouble, the moment the first shot was fired the leaders skiddaddled.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Does the hon. member refer to Dr. Chenier?

Mr. HUGHES. Comment?

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Are you referring to Dr. Chenier of St. Eustache as a man who fled from the battle?

Mr. HUGHES. I am referring to Papineau, the leader of the rebellion in Lower Canada, and to Mackenzie, the leader of the rebellion in Upper Canada.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. That will please Mr. Bourassa, the friend of Mr. Monk.

Mr. HUGHES. They were leading Liberals for a great many years, and if the hon. gentleman disputes what I say I can give the reference.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I will dispute it so far as Dr. Chenier is concerned.

Mr. HUGHES. So far as the leaders all over were concerned, they made quick time and left the poor fellows whom they incited to suffer from the evil effects of the rebellion.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. That is not history.

Mr. E. ROY. The member for L'Islet will answer that.

Mr. HUGHES. These gentlemen opposite endorsed not only the rebellion of 1837-38, but the Northwest rebellions of 1870 and 1885. These gentlemen opposite, in endorsing rebels, are getting the people of this country accustomed to believe, simply because the loyal men of the country do not care to come out and oppose them on every occasion, they are getting the loyal people of the country gradually to believe that there were some wrongs to be redressed in 1837 and 1885.

Mr. PAQUET. Is the hon. member prepared to prove that the people of Quebec were misrepresented as he says?

Mr. HUGHES. Which people?

Mr. PAQUET. The people of Quebec.

Mr. HUGHES. I don't understand you.

Mr. E. ROY. Would you tell us something about the rebellion of Cromwell?

Mr. HUGHES. Cromwell's rebellion was just; the United States rebellion was just; but here in Canada we had two or three rebellions and there was no justification for them at all.

Mr. E. ROY. They won responsible government for us.

Mr. HUGHES I cannot hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman. These gentlemen have whistled that tune so long that they actually believe it. They have endeavoured so long to justify the rebellion of 1885 in the Northwest that they have actually come to believe that it was just.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the American rebels were right?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, sure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I merely wanted that admission from my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton.

Mr. HUGHES. The First Minister and the Postmaster General may expatiate on the justice of the rebellions of 1837 and 1838, and may talk about the rebels as heroes; but I am willing to let their speeches speak for themselves. I again repeat, they will search the pages of history in vain to find one solitary disability under which the people laboured at that time that would justify them in engaging in a rebellion.

Now, Sir, what are the principles at stake in this naval business? One is the question of immediate help. Does this Bill provide it? Not in the slightest. At the earliest, it will be four or five years before this little fleet will be ready, and when it is ready it will be of no use. Secondly, does this Bill uphold the unity of the empire? I maintain that from first to last the unity of the empire is threatened by this Bill. We all deplore war as much as the hon. member for the Yukon does; but, as the Scotchman said, 'Nae man can live at peace wi' his neebur unless his neebur lets him'; and before I am through I will endeavour to show that the German nation is determined that her neighbours will not live at peace if she can prevent it. Under the policy outlined by the First Minister, the wars of the future are to be easy. For instance, if the Yankees fight us, we will fight them, because they are our near neighbours; but he did not think we would be justified in engaging in a war between Great Britain and Russia, which would possibly involve the integrity of the whole empire. One plan of the First Minister is to get up a fleet here and give our boys a chance to get some good jobs in connection with it, and then not go to war at all. Another plan of his, as stated on page 3050 of 'Hansard,' is this: 'If Great Britain got into trouble, a wave of enthusiasm to assist her would sweep over this country and all other British countries.' That wave of enthusiasm would strike terror to the hearts of the Germans. That is one form of strategy proposed by the First Minister. Then, at page 3040, another plan proposed by him was 'all joining in the case of a common danger and from all points of the earth, rushing upon a common enemy.' Another beautiful plan, in time of war, when we have no fleet ready. His third proposition, which is found on page 3047 of 'Hansard,' is this: 'We would strike the enemy before the enemy would strike us.' This is an old rule in warfare, but I do not see what he would have to strike with under this Navy Bill. We require to have something to strike with or something to rush or something to be carried along by this wave of enthusiasm which the right hon. gentleman talks about. The policy of the opposition is to put something now at the disposal of Great Britain to strike with, and to make these gentlemen sit up in case of trouble.

When the hon. member for the Yukon was speaking, I thought of the old prophet Buddha, that apostle of love and peace, who on one occasion was accosted by a tremendous giant, who said to him:

> 'Lo! son of peace,' the giant cried, 'thy fate
> Is sealed at last, and Love shall yield to Hate.'
> The unarmed Buddha, looking with no trace
> Of fear or anger, in the monster's face,
> In pity said, 'poor fiend, even thee I love.'

Then the giant, becoming transformed into the form and fashion of a dove, circling around the head of Buddha, sang:

> 'Hate hath no harm for Love,' so ran the song,
> And peace, unweaponed, conquers every wrong.

I do not see how this escaped my good friend in his comments. The philosopher from the Yukon reminds me of a professor of teaching who heard this story of Buddha, and lectured his students on the proper mode of discipline. He said: 'Of course, punishment must be meted out when a wrong is committed; but when you enter your class, you should always leave your rawhide on your desk and watch the first opportunity. When a boy misbehaves, you should hand over the rawhide to the young delinquent, fold your arms and wait the result. The delinquent will burst into tears, apologize to the teacher, and there will be harmony and peace all round. A number of teachers tried the plan. One morning a pupil committed some depredation and his teacher said to him: 'My little man you have been misbehaving, and punishment must be inflicted, but inasmuch as I prefer to receive it rather than administer it, you take the rod and I will take the punishment; and to his surprise the young lad, unlike the one in his story, picked up the rawhide and belaboured the teacher and chased him out of the schoolroom'. So the fine theory of the hon. member for the Yukon about the people of England staying at home and giving out love stories to the Germans will not work out in actual practice with poor old humanity. Cicero told us long ago that 'war should be waged in order that we may live in peace without suffering wrong'. I am satisfied that Great Britain has had within twelve months provocation to go to war with Germany; but owing to that long suffering spirit which is characteristic of the English nation, she has refrained. William Pitt long ago told the people of England that war with all its evils is better than a peace in which there is nothing but usurpation and wrong; and in case Germany should carry out her intention of going to war with the British empire, no nation would ever have indulged in a more

righteous war than Great Britain would to repel the invader. Douglas Jerrold says:

> We love peace as we abhor pusillanimity, but not peace at any price. There is a peace more destructive of the manhood of living man, than war is destructive of his material body. Chains are worse than bayonets.

In regard to some of the arguments that have been advanced as to our duty to build up our material welfare, Shakespeare is my authority for saying that 'plenty and peace breed cowards'.

Now, Sir, I may be asked, why is this naval question in issue at the present time? The German ambassador to the peace conference at the Hague has published recently a curious book, in which he declares that 'the growth of the peace movement involves a national peril'. According to Baron Von Stengel, human progress has more often been the result of war than of peace. 'Athens and Rome', he writes, in his striking chapter on 'the significance of war for the development of humanity'.

> Not only in spite of, but just because of their many wars, rose to the zenith of civilization. Great states like Germany and Italy are welded into nationalities only through blood and iron. Storm purifies the air and destroys the frail trees, leaving the sturdy oaks standing. War is the test of a nation's political, physical and intellectual worth. The state in which there is much that is rotten may vegetate for a while in peace, but in war its weakness is revealed. Germany's preparations for war have not resulted in economic disaster, but in unexampled economic expansion—unquestionably because of our demonstrated superiority over France. It is better to spend money on battleships and armaments than luxury, motormania and other sensual living.

Germany to-day has upwards of 4,000,000 men that she can turn into the field at an hour's notice. She has undoubtedly the command of the land, and she aspires to the control of the sea. It is a well known fact that for ages she has aspired, and that recently, she has still more aspired, to the control of Holland and Belgium. She wishes, as she showed by her attitude at the time of the South African war, to disrupt the British empire and obtain control of the British colonies. In this connection I do not know that I can do better than quote from an address made by the hon. member for the Yukon last year, to convince this House that that is the object of Germany. In a speech in this House, reported in 'Hansard' of last session, at page 3526, that hon. gentleman said:

> I believe the object in the creation of the German navy is to obtain an outlet of that kind, but I am satisfied that that aim could be best obtained by negotiations with other nations

Where can Germany get the outlet? Can my hon. friend from the Yukon point to any area under the broad canopy of heaven where Germany can get colonies that are not already occupied. Taking him at his word, Germany's aim is to obtain colonies for her trade, and she can obtain these only in one way. They cannot be obtained by peace negotiations. The way Germany negotiates is at the point of the bayonet and the end of the rifle. As Britain holds 25 per cent of the land of the globe and 90 per cent of the colonial territory of the globe, the only way in which Germany can obtain colonies is by taking them from Great Britain. And, we have the spectacle of this great empire, the champion of liberty in every part of the globe, threatened by a nation created by herself the century before the last.

Now, I want to touch upon a point about which this House has heard from me before. At the time of the American colonies Benjamin Franklin and other American statesmen proposed the confederation of the British empire. That proposition was not taken up. In the old days French Canadian gentlemen from the province of Quebec proposed that the colonies should be given representation in the British parliament. Gentlemen from upper Canada many years ago proposed the same thing, and the redoubtable Joseph Howe, in letters and speeches, proposed a federation of the British empire, under which the colonies would have a voice and a vote in the government of the empire and be prepared to take their fair share in its defence. These men were right in assuming that in return for the privileges conferred upon us, we should take our share of the risks and dangers to which the empire may be exposed. I am satisfied that the solution of the problem is easy. A man with the genius of Cromwell or William Pitt or William III. could federate the empire in a year. I believe that if Chamberlain or Milner, or Balfour, or either of the Greys, or Mr. Amery, one of the greatest students of imperial questions, were given the opportunity, any of these men could federate the British empire in six months; and, although I have not the honour of the acquaintance of Mr. Asquith or Mr. Lloyd-George, I believe that either of these gentlemen if he had a heart and soul as broad as his ability, could do the same. The history of colonial and imperial wars proves that colonial assistance which was declared by some of the great men of Canada as monstrous, as contrary to responsible government, as impossible, was supplied in two weeks' time when the emergency arose. So let the statesmen of to-day not hesitate about the confederation of the empire, which would solve every question that might arise in connection

with armies or navies for the defence of the empire.

In connection with this Bill, it might be well for us to consider for a moment what is the condition of the dominions beyond the seas. The First Minister has said that Canada is going to become independent as fruit falls from the tree, and he told us in his Toronto speech that Canada is a suzerainty—in other words that the King is a feudal lord instead of our soverign lord. We are told, not only by the Prime Minister, but by his followers, that we must maintain our autonomy. I wonder how many of them could define the meaning of the word 'autonomy' which is constantly in their mouths. We are told also that we are 'sister nations,' with an emphasis on the word 'nations,' and the other day the right hon. the Prime Minister described us as a 'daughter nation.' Then hon. gentlemen on this side are charged with attacking the principles of responsible government and imperilling the liberty of the subject, and our friends opposite praise rebellion and use up as much nickel and silver as would furnish a mine in Cobalt or Gowganda in polishing off their expressions which, to my mind, are merely the forerunners of a movement for the independence of Canada. But what means allegiance? What is our duty to the empire? To what do we owe allegiance? In days gone by I had the privilege of running foul of a very distinguished English officer in this country, General Hutton.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That was rebellion.

Mr. HUGHES. There are just and unjust rebellions. The rebellion of the American colonies was justifiable. The Quebec Act of 1774 drove that people into rebellion by taking from them what are today the states of Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin and Michigan, and in 1785 the Americans rebelled. Had I been living at that time, holding my present views, I would have been among them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Tell that to the United Loyalists.

Mr. HUGHES. I would tell it to any man. There are mitigating circumstances of course.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are rebels and rebels.

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly, and my desire to uphold the majesty of the British empire is not actuated by any wish to rub elbows with any red tape authority across the water.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What about discipline?

Mr. HUGHES. Does my hon. friend know the meaning of the word? Discipline means polish, education, culture and upbuilding but not repression or tyranny.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The composing room.

Mr. HUGHES. My hon. friend knows more about that than any one on this side. In my regard for the upholding of the empire, I am not actuated by any red tape proclivities, but by what is required to accomplish the object I have in view. On this occasion I had taken the liberty of offering to the imperial authorities the services of a Canadian regiment and I had 23,000 men ready to enlist under me for the South African war. I did observe the proper military or disciplinary course, I did send an application to the general officer commanding, but I also took the course of offering my services to the Minister of Militia. From the latter gentleman I received a courteous answer, but from General Hutton I received a reprimand. Having my doubts as to whether my application through the military channel would go forward—I knew that to General Hutton would not be forwarded—I exercised the right, which I consider belongs to every British citizen in any part of the empire and communicated direct with the home government. I was reprimanded for this direct application. In reply to General Hutton, I used the following language:

That application to the right honourable the Secretary of State was made in order that should the plan be favourably considered in Great Britain steps might be taken by the home authorities—of course with the consent and approval, but outside of the Canadian government—to enroll such a corps here. In the event of failure of action in Canada, through the failure of the general officer commanding to bring the official military application before the Minister of Militia, or through the Canadian government not deeming it advisable to act in the premises, the imperial authorities would be aware that whether or not the general officer commanding or the Canadian government had faith in such plans, yet the imperial authorities would be made aware of the fact that there are tens of thousands of Canadians ready to assist in the up-building of the empire by enrolling for active service abroad.

While a Canadian, I am also a British subject, and should Canada try to cut adrift from Britain, I, as either soldier or citizen——

This was written away back in 1899.

—would not be disloyal in recognizing the home authority rather than the general officer commanding in Canada, or the Minister of Militia——

Although I would almost do anything for the Minister of Militia when he is right.

—or the Secretary of State for Canada. Any citizen of Canada, civilian or militiaman, can

properly volunteer to the imperial authorities direct to enroll a corps. I cannot find that I am debarred, as an officer of the militia, from any privilege which Canadian citizenship confers upon her sons. Any citizen of Canada can enroll himself in the imperial service independently of the general officer commanding or of the Canadian government. In case I, for example, undertook to enroll a corps of Canadians for imperial service, or enrolled myself alone, I could do so, merely resigning my Canadian commission before accepting the imperial, even supposing the Canadian authorities were adversely inclined to such action. Were they friendly they could and would manage as is now done for imperial officers in Canada's service that both commissions be retained.

Those are my views. They were my views in 1899 and they are mine to-day on the question of allegiance.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that taken from a sessional paper?

Mr. HUGHES. I am quoting from 'Hansard' of 1901, Vol. 1, page 394. My view on the question of allegiance is this: I regard the empire as a pyramid of which the people constitute the great foundation. Then we have minor divisions. We have townships, towns, school sections and so on. We have the superior divisions of counties, the still larger divisions of provinces, and the larger still of dominions. And over and above all there is the empire. My allegiance in minor matters goes to my own municipality as against the adjoining ones. In county matters, it goes to my own county over its neighbours. In provincial matters it goes to the province of Ontario over all others. In Dominion matters it goes to Canada over Australia or any other part of the empire; but in national matters it goes to the empire of Britain and not to Canada. There is the allegiance that I owe; and when the right hon. gentleman talks of suzerainty, let me inform him that he does not understand the question of this country as I believe the fathers of confederation understood it. We want no more prating about autonomy, no more talk about 'ripe fruit dropping off the tree', or about 'sister nations'. Each is supreme in its own sphere and should have a voice in the affairs of the empire. But the pyramid is incomplete in three ways. First, the oversea dominions, have as yet no voice or vote in the affairs of the empire. Second, the parliament of Britain is not adapted for administering, under its present constitution, an empire of this kind, and therefore should be remodelled. In Britain they have their minor subdivisions or counties and shires, but they have no provincial subdivisions and I can see no reason why they should not, according to my reading of the British North America Act as applied to Canada. Nevertheless has South Africa deemed it advisable to have any provincial divisions? But in case such should be found to be necessary, I will take the liberty of suggesting that the judicial districts into which England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales are divided might be taken as the basis of provincial division in Britain. In England and Wales there are nine judicial divisions, in Scotland three, and in Ireland there are the old provinces of Ulster, Munster, Leinster and Connaught. And, if they wish to confer upon these any extra privileges, and any extra provincial power, let us see what could be given them under the British North America Act.

The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of lieutenant governor.

Nothing wrong about that.

Direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes.

Nothing wrong with that.

The borrowing of money on the sole credit of a province.

I don't see anything wrong with that.

The establishment and tenure of provincial offices, and the appointment and payment of provincial officers.

That is necessary.

The management and sale of the public lands belonging to the province and the timber and wood thereon.

They have none, so that will not be necessary.

The establishment, maintenance and management of public and reformatory prisons in and for the province.

I do not see anything wrong with that.

The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals.

I do not see anything wrong with that.

Municipal institutions in the province.

They have these institutions already, and these could be placed under provincial jurisdiction.

Shop, saloon, tavern, and auctioneer and other licenses, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes.

No reason why they should not have that.

Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes,——

Then follows a list that are excluded.

Incorporation of companies with provincial objects.

That seems all right.

The solemnization of marriage in the province.

I do not see why that should be a provincial matter.

Property and civil rights in the province.

That might be all right.

The administration of justice in the province.

The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty and imprisonment for enforcing any law of the province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section.

Generally, all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province.

—and under our constitution—education. I do not know whether, in Great Britain, they woud take in education or not. But, if they want provincial government, I do not see where they could get a better basis than by taking the old judicial divisions.

Now, to come to the British parliament —and I wish to make a distinction between the British parliament and the parliament of Greater Britain—this parliament should be erected into the parliament of Greater Britain, and there could be a separate, minor parliament, to manage the affairs of Great Britain. If that were done, the jurisdiction of the parliament of Greater Britain could include every dominion beyond the sea, and that parliament could deal with inter-imperial matters, international affairs, defence questions, trade and commerce, a tariff for imperial purposes, and an imperial court of appeal. Each dominion should have its own tariff. The sovereign would be the King of England. The upper House would be composed of members elected for life, and the lower House of members elected for a term of years. The capital should be London, and, during the first two years of each parliament members should visit the dominions of the empire. If we elevate the British parliament into a parliament, of Greater Britain, the door would be opened for representation of the colonies. When our good friend the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was speaking on this question early in the session, he recited a very beautiful incident in connection with the agitation in Rome following the execution of the Spanish patriot, Ferrer. When a number of the clergy from Canada, resident in Rome for educational purposes, found themselves in danger from a mob, they sought protection under the old Union Jack, that 'herald of mercy, as well as of might.' And I can easily understand how they would realize the sentiment expressed in the beautiful lines of Eliza Cook:

Mr. HUGHES.

Then, then did out hearts learn how precious can be
The fair streamer of England—the flag of the free!

When he was speaking of this incident, I noticed a blush mantle the cheek of the Prime Minister. It was enough to make any Britisher, any Canadian wherever he may be, blush to think that here we are sheltering ourselves under the folds of a flag to whose upkeep we do not contribute a man or a dollar. The Prime Minister in his remarks grew eloquent, as usual, over the contrast between Great Britain and imperial Rome. He spoke of the surprise that a Roman citizen of the time of Augustus would have felt had it been foretold to him that that far-off dependency of Rome, Britannia, should attain the prominence in the world of affairs that it holds to-day. And he said the answer would be:

That is Utopia; force and force alone can build and maintain an empire.

Let me remind the Prime Minister that every empire in the history of the world has been acquired by force and by force—I was about to say, by force alone—but it is certainly true to say that every empire was acquired by force. In this connection, I am reminded of a remark of my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Congdon) who quoted the Latin maxim, Si vis pacem, para bellum, 'If you wish peace, prepare for war.' This was enlarged by Washington, who said, that the most certain way to defend a nation was in peace to be prepared for war. My good friend (Mr. Congdon) quoted from Sir Spencer Walpole, who, in this regard, said, that the world had changed and that victory now depended not so much upon the long sword as upon the long purse. Let me remind him of the case of the Franco-German war. France was worth two dollars for every dollar of Germany's, yet this rich nation was brought to her knees in a few days. Within two months of the beginning of the war, France was not only conquered, but humiliated in the dust before Germany —France, next to England, at that time undoubtedly the richest nation in the world. In that connection, let me call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a maxim of Machiavelli, that all the armed prophets have conquered and all the unarmed prophets have perished. Let me remind him also of the famous expression of one whom the hon. gentleman belittled, that the Lord is found on the side of the best disciplined, best drilled and heaviest battalions. These are standard maxims and require no further explanation. Let us get back now to the First Minister's reference to Utopia. This is not the first time the right hon. gentleman has used the word. When I approached him on the subject of sending

men from Canada to assist in the South African war, he said that my ideas were Utopian—as did others. Yet, he found his Utopia had vanished in two short weeks. Within that time colonial assistance in imperial wars became an actual fact—to remain a fact, I believe, for all time. One week carried the Prime Minister in favour of the federation of the empire in 1899, and, I believe, that in relation to the question of the navy, one week would change him as it did then.

Now, why is this Bill introduced, and why is the amendment introduced? Again, I ask, has the Bill carried out the mandate of the resolution of last session? Had it done so, so far as I am concerned—and I believe I speak the views of every member on this side of the House—there would have been no amendment. But the Bill did not carry out the mandate of that resolution. Owing to the impulse created by the old spirit of the colonies as exemplified in the war of 1812, and when rebellions were put down in 1837, in 1870 and in 1885, by the loyalty which stands true to the empire and is characteristic of Canada on all occasions, the question came up of assisting Britain in her troubles across the sea. This spirit culminated in the union of the empire's forces in the South African war of 1899-1902.

And then Great Britain learned two things; she learned the inestimable value of the colonies, and she learned that the hand of Germany was behind the scenes seeking to disrupt the empire in the South African war. Germany is after Britain's colonies. It is known that in 1896, three years before the war, she officially notified the British government that German interest demanded the independence of the Transvaal. If Germany had had a fleet then, what would have been the result of Britain's refusal to recognize that demand? War—and as Germany is always dabbling and mixing up in the foreign policy of other nations, upsetting long-established policies, when she has a fleet, the first time she is rebuffed there is going to be war. I have not one word to say against the German people. They are a credit to humanity, to the world. They are a shrewd, law-abiding, true, devoted, patriotic people. They are a peace-loving people, and when the war with France was about breaking out in 1870, not thousands but millions of the residents of the German empire petitioned the sovereign not to go on with the war against France. But the policy was laid down, the plan was to carry on war against France, because they found France in an awkward position, and the prayers of the people were unheeded. So, although the German people to-day do not want war, they are a peace-loving nation, nevertheless the policy of the German nation undoubtedly tends towards war with Great Britain. Britain found these people scattered, disjointed into a lot of principalities, where the hireling soldiers of Europe were obtained prior to the wars of Frederick the Great. Britain backed Frederick the Great and established the Prussian Kingdom, and later at Waterloo they broke the power of Napoleon for ever. Britain continued to uphold Prussia, and the great North German Confederation was established. About 1870 Britain practically coaxed Germany into becoming a colonial empire. German Southwest Africa was practically the first important colony that Germany ever possessed. She got it through a little incident that occurred near Walfish bay, when Gladstone called on Germany to police these areas and bear her fair share of the white man's burden. In other words, Germany is a creation of Britain, created as a barrier against tyranny, created for the preservation of peace, and to-day her own creation threatens the dissolution of her own empire.

Following on this period of German expansion, like others who become opulent, she became arrogant and still further grasping. Going back to an old quarrel of hundreds of years previous, she seized from little Denmark, Schleswick-Holstein in 1864. In 1866 she humbled Austria in the battle of Sadowa. Then came a period of intrigue between Bismarck, representing Germany, and Napoleon the Third, represeting France. The plan was this: Germany was to have the southern German states: Bavaria, Wurtemburg and Baden, and Holland. In return for that divvy-up, France was to have the left bank of the Rhine, including Belgium, down to the sea. When the Franco-Prussian war broke out and these plans became European property, in answer to Britain's demand for an explanation of this, Bismarck said that he did not want to unsettle the state of Europe by telling what the Emperor was always up to, that he paid no attention to his suggestions. Certainly he paid no attention, he played him, he led him on, he knew that France was being disrupted, that the Republican party was growing stronger in France, and that the power of Napoleon was not great. He listened to Napolean, he encouraged and fomented discord in France, and when the time was ripe, he struck and struck right home. In this regard, let me point out what the aims of Germany then were, and are now known to be. They practically had South Germany. They wanted Alsace-Lorraine, which was settled by Germans, they wanted the left bank of the Rhine, and they wanted French Flanders and Havre, as well as Holland and Belgium, and had it not been for the intervention of European nations in 1870, Germany would have carried out her

plan. These facts are known in diplomatic circles the world over, and yet gentlemen will tell us that this truly pacific nation has no designs on her neighbours. I see in the press this despatch from the Hague:

The Hague, Feb. 10.

In the first chamber of the states general yesterday, Baron von Heckeren asked the minister of foreign affairs if he intended to take steps to guarantee the integrity of the Netherlands in regard to Germany and Great Britain, explaining when questioned that he did so because 'a neighbouring sovereign had intimated a few years ago he would be obliged to have Dutch territory occupied if Holland had not placed herself in a state of defence against Great Britain.

The minister pressed for further details, but the Baron declined to reply and the debate thereupon closed. It is understood the Baron referred to the Emperor of Germany.

So that to-day what do we find? Germany with her iron hand on Holland, Krupp the great gun maker, by arrangement with the German government is placing his guns, made in his own factory, in every fortress in Holland and it is Krupp who lays out the plans of the forts, not the Dutch administration, so that practically to-day Holland is a German province, and if Germany should get control of Austria's and Italy's fleets should assume control of what is under her influence to-day, the navy of Holland, and should seize Belgium, where would England be, with all her double fleet against such a combination? Of course France would undoubtedly ally herself with Britain because France was the first country Germany wished to humiliate. They would humiliate France and then Britain would be an easy mark. That is the policy of the German empire, and yet we are told we must sit with our hands folded and develop our home resources and do nothing for the development of this great empire. More than that, Sir, Germany ran foul of Great Britain the moment she established her fleet. In 1879 in Samoa, the United States and Great Britain having had previous occupation were intruded upon by Germany and they had to put her in her place. Then Germany was stepping in to plant her colonies in South America, seeking to obtain control of established governments there. The United States quietly again reminded her that there were others on the continent besides Germany, and that these countries possibly could look after themselves as well as Germany. Then we know that she meddled in Persia, in Turkey, in the near east, in the far east, in China.

When the United States were at war with Spain the German fleet ranged itself on the side of Spain as much as to say: We shall protect Spain in possession of these islands, and the Yankees will keep to their own side of the water. Thereupon the old Britisher lined his fleet up alongside the Yankee fleet, and but for that Germany would have taken part in the war against the United States, and would have endeavoured to obtain possession of the Philippine Islands for herself. We all remember the Kaiser Wilhelm telegram to Kruger in 1896, and the official note of the German government to the British government that the interests of the German government demanded that the Transvaal should remain an independent republic. Then, Sir, even after the humiliation caused him by the sending of the Kruger telegram, the Kaiser stated that in the near future the trident, that is the control of the sea, must be in German hands. In spite of this and a thousand other instances that I could give, we find hon. gentlemen standing up in this House, belittling the best statesmen and soldiers of Great Britain, siding with Germany, saying that there is no cause for alarm, and that if there is any cause for alarm Britain herself is responsible for it. Take the South African war; we know to-day what the plan was. Germany and Russia, together with France, which was not too friendly then over the Fashoda affair, were to join hand in hand in establishing South African republics and in driving the British flag into the sea off the Cape of Good Hope, and from the British dominions as far as her colonies were concerned. The plan was afterwards given away by one of the Russian diplomats. But, these powers hesitated when they saw that the colonies, including Canada, in spite of the First Minister, rallied to the defence of the flag in South Africa. Only last year Germany almost precipitated a war in Europe. She sought to humiliate France in connection with the Morocco incident, although she had no more to do with it than a child, and she sought to humble her upon another occasion, but Great Britain stood behind France, France stood her ground, and for the time being Germany withdrew. Then, only last spring again we know that Austria, with Germany behind her, took Bosnia and Herzegovina and wiped them off the map of Europe, and if Russia had been prepared, war would have resulted. This was all owing to the fact that the German Emperor and his army are so all-powerful. Now we find ourselves face to face with the construction of one of the most tremendous fleets that has ever been raised up in any country. Germany wants colonies. The hon. member for Yukon suggests that she may obtain these by peaceful negotiation, but that is not Germany's mode of getting these things. She gets them with the iron hand of war. She is determined to get them and there is no nation she can get them from except from Great Britain. She wants coaling stations, she wants markets, and she wants shipping, and if she gets them she

must get them from Great Britain. By her action in connection with her reference to this surtax business, by removing her objections, she is showing that she is ready to try and cajole and dicker with the colonies. How is the British nation meeting this? What are the British people doing? They are telling us what a great people they are, they are talking of their prestige, they are recalling the days of Agincourt, but ancient history never maintained a nation. It may inspire it, but it does not maintain it. She is blowing and blustering of her own greatness. They tried the Hague conference with Germany. You have heard the story of the German ambassador at that conference. Then they tried to coax Germany. They said: We will not build any more warships if you will not, but while the British ambassadors were at the conference the Germans laid down the keels of another couple of Dreadnoughts. Then Keir Hardie, John Burns, and other British statesmen, said: We think we will try slobbering. Germany listened to them, and although Great Britain had stopped laying down keels, Germany laid another keel or two. Then she formed an alliance with France and Russia, the only sensible thing that she has done, although this had the tendency to make Germany go on and build warships. Then, a number of radical members of parliament went over, these members of parliament are splendid people to get people out at elections, but they tried their cajolery in vain on the Germans. They drank their wine, ate their bologna sausages, and toasted each other, but the Germans laid down two more keels while they were there. Then, they said we are going to strike the fatal spot; we will make arrangements with the socialists and the labouring men in England, and the socialists and labouring men in Germany, and get them to agree that they will not dig any more coal in war time. In Britain the labouring men were a unit in favour of playing the game, but in Germany the socialists mined enough coal to last five or six extra years, and that scheme fell through. Then, they tried another plan. They said: We are relatives. We have heard the First Minister at this same game. I guess he had heard of it across the water. We are relatives, we are allies, we are friends, and we are Christians with a capital 'C'. They shouted 'Hurrah for King William' and stopped building Dreadnoughts. Germany reciprocated, admits that they are relatives, allies and Christians, and they cry 'Hoch der Koenig, Edward VII. But, in the meantime they get control of the British market, get the British naval plans and lay down the keels of four or five Dreadnoughts. So that Germany has shown that she does not go duck hunting with a brass band. The Germans continue to look after their own interests and they are looking after their own interests in no uncertain way. This reminds me of an old axiom which I have already repeated to the House, but a good thing can stand repetition. It is contained in the work of one of England's finest poets, a woman in whose breast there glowed the proper spirit. I wish she had the management of affairs in Britain with the spirit which she displays in this poem. I refer to Eliza Cook:

Never trust the soft breathing that preaches of peace,
With a pledge-giving lip and a smile-lighted eye;
Hear it all with good-will but be provident still
With men that are earnest and powder that's dry.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, just before six o'clock I drew attention to the fact that last year it was rumoured that the German Emperor had interfered with Holland in regard to her defences. And in connection with that I shall read the following despatch which appears in the newspapers dated from the Hague on the 15th of this month:

The Hague, Feb. 15.—Baron van Heeckeren sent his promised statement to the Senate today in regard to his charge that Emperor William of Germany had told Holland that if she did not fortify certain points against Great Britain, he, the Kaiser, would be compelled to do so.

It will be recalled that when Baron van Heeckeren made the statement about 'a neighbouring sovereign' threatening Holland in regard to her military preparedness against Great Britain, the foreign minister demanded specific proofs. Later Dr. van Swinderen, the foreign secretary, denied absolutely that Queen Wilhelmina had ever received a threatening communication from the Kaiser.

In his letter to the Senate to-day Baron van Heeckeren says he received information from Dr. Kuyper, the former prime minister. He adds that the matter was frequently discussed between them.

It would thus appear that this peaceful nation of Germany has already Holland practically under her control. As I pointed out a short time ago, the German Krupp firm is not only making guns for Holland, but has charge of placing them in strategic positions, and you may be sure they will not be placed to the disadvantage of Germany. I understood the hon. member for Pictou to say that when the national policy was introduced, and when it was pointed out that it might be bad for Britain, Sir Charles Tupper said: So much the worse

for British connections. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) cannot find any authority for attributing that statement to Sir Charles Tupper. The hon. gentleman made another reference to Sir Charles Tupper, and that was that Sir Charles had written a letter to the leader of the opposition asking him to support the naval policy of the First Minister. But what Sir Charles Tupper said in that letter was:

I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons, which pledged parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of a Canadian navy and to support England in every emergency.

That was the recommendation made by Sir Charles Tupper, and instead of this government following that recommendation they have departed from it in its first essential 'in every emergency.' Gentlemen on the other side have complained that in connection with this question the charge of graft has been levelled against them, but I will read the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) who, if not a minister, is an embryo minister, and we will see from it the plane on which he puts the establishment of a Canadian navy. The hon. member for Pictou said:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the object of this government in proposing this policy is that this navy is to be constructed in Canada, by Canadian workmen, in Canadian workshops, and that it is to be a Canadian navy, primarily for the defence of Canadian interests.

And this afternoon the member for the Yukon told us that the only redeeming feature of the navy was that it would lead to the construction of these ships in Canada. There is no spirit of patriotism in such remarks, none whatever. Every sentence of every speech delivered from the government benches so far enunciates the maxim of la Bruyère: that under a corrupt government there is no such thing as patriotism, its place being supplied by private interest, public fame, and devotion to a chief. That is what we see on the other side of the House. No nation would engage in war unless fairly certain she is going to win, and if the British empire wants to preserve her position unsullied before the world she is in duty bound to prepare for war. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that the plans of Germany are directed towards obtaining colonies; the member for the Yukon told us that Germany wants to obtain them by peace, but the real fact is that Germany wants to obtain them in her own way: by blood and iron. Canada has a duty in this crisis, and Canada's duty is to be ready by sea and land to defend the mother country. In this connection, I may refer to an incident which occurred in the Franco-Prussian war. The French rifle in 1870 was superior to the German rifle, and although the French rifle far out-ranged the German rifle, a prominent German officer who led his corps at the battle of Weissembourg, declared that while his men came under the French fire at 1,700 yards, yet between 1,700 and 600 yards not one man was struck by a French bullet, which went to show that at the beginning of the war the French were bad shots. Later on they became better trained, and in the succeeding battles they gave a better account of themselves. In the American civil war the southern soldiers, who were excellent shots, although armed with muzzle-loading rifles, made it absolutely impossible for the northern army to advance on their position. In Canada, and the other colonies of the empire, are to be found expert shots, who, when they come to the assistance of Britain, I am satisfied will more than give a good account of themselves in any struggle in which they may take part. The hon. member for the Yukon, in his address, compared the militia law of this country with the naval law, but he forgot that there was an essential difference between the mobilization of the militia and the mobilization of the navy. It is good old English law that parliament should be called when war is declared, and that is a good sound principle in Canadian law so far as the militia is concerned. In the Franco-Prussian war it took weeks before the German army could be mobilized, although it was supposed to be the best organized army in the world, and there was plenty of time to call parliament, and as a matter of fact the German parliament was called. In the case of our militia it, of course, would take some time to mobilize them, and it is quite right that parliament should be summoned when the militia is called out, and there would be plenty of time to do that. But in the case of a naval war the clash comes like a lightning flash. A war may break out to-day and a German ship may be in some harbour, or lying outside the three mile limit, and the music begins at once. So that a navy must of necessity always be ready to take the sea for active service, whereas an army and a militia are not necessarily in the same position.

Let me draw a contrast between the two policies. The government claim that they are adhering to the resolution passed last year, whereas we take the position that they are not carrying that resolution out in any essential point. The policy of the leader of the opposition provides immediate help. In furnishing two Dreadnoughts, it gives the necessary security, whereas the policy of the government is

simply one of promise. Their fleet will not be completed, and they do not profess that it can be completed short of five years unless they buy their ships from England. The policy of the opposition is an imperial navy under the one flag, united and strong, under which Canada will have ample protection. The place where the farmers of Canada require to be protected is the North sea, because there is the danger point, although in some future day the centre may be changed and the danger point may be in the Mediteranean. Canada is not in any danger on the Pacific slope or the Atlantic sea-board, but in the North sea. Germany at the furthest is but two days sail from the British shores, and if she succeeds in taking Holland, she will be within only a few hours sail of the British coast, so that Britain has to be ever on the alert, not knowing when the German fleet may advance on her coasts and attack her navy. The policy of the opposition is one imperial navy, ready to be concentrated at a moment's notice at any given point. But the policy of the government is to have a Canadian navy acting independently and restricted to our own coasts, and which consequently could not give any effective assistance in an emergency. The policy of the opposition is to provide an effective navy and at the same time do so as economically as possible. Not that we object to proper expenditure, but we desire that every dollar should be expended where it can have the most effect; and when the time comes for a reference to the people, and the people will draw a contrast between the government policy of a Canadian navy, not acting automatically in concert with the imperial navy, and which will only go out to service when the Prime Minister of Canada gives the order, and the policy of the opposition which will provide a navy ready to take service at all times, I have no doubt as to what the verdict will be. Under our policy, while we would provide at once an effective navy, the cost to the country would be only $800,000 a year, whereas, under the government policy, which would only provide a navy in some five years, the cost will be infinitely greater —upwards of four and a half million dollars per year. Then the navy outlined by the government cannot guarantee protection to our trade and commerce on the sea because it would not be concentrated with but would act separately from the British navy. On the other hand the policy proposed by the leader of the opposition does guarantee protection to our trade and commerce; and all that we would spend on this line would be well spent, even though we had to pay the same every year for all time to come. In fact, as an insurance on our trade and commerce, it would be a very small contribution indeed. The policy of the opposition would tend to promote peace by letting Germany see that, not only the motherland, but the colonies of the empire are prepared to do their duty. On the other hand, the policy of the government has the tendency to create uncertainty and to disunite and disintegrate the nation.

The policy of the leader of the opposition is automatic—when Britain is at war Canada is at war, and our ships, trained in the imperial navy, are ready for action. Let me point out as an answer to those who criticise this aspect of the case that long before the Franco-Prussian war, an arrangement was come to by the independent kingdoms of Bavaria and Wurtemburg and the Grand Duchy of Baden with Prussia, that the moment the commander in chief of the German army issued the order, the troops of these three nations would automatically, be at the unrestricted disposal of Prussia. If then, for the purpose of the German empire, Prussia could make such an arrangement with Bavaria, Wurtemburg and Baden—three absolutely independent nations—so that their troops would be at the order of the King of Prussia, and automatically take the field under his command, the moment war broke out, why should not such an arrangement be arrived at between Britain and her colonies. Much greater is the necessity that the troops and the navies of the colonies should, when the emergency arose, be at the command of the parent government. When the parent government felt the emergency coming, no doubt we would all be consulted, but when the emergency arose our navy would automatically fall under the command of the imperial authorities, and we would have combined training as well as united strength. The position of the government reminds me of the captain of a company of Fenians down near Huntingdon border at the time of the Fenian raid of 1870. He lined his men up against the border and he said: Now boys, before you is Canada and behind you is the United States, I want to ask you one question: Will you fight or run? The answer came promptly, we will. Again, he said, I repeat the question, will you fight or will you run? Again came the answer, we will. And the captain said: I knew you would. And just the some farmers along the border who had heard the fellows were coming over, let into them and they soon knew which they would do. In like manner this policy of a Canadian navy, hedged up and kept at the disposal of the government of Canada until the Prime Minister gives his sanction to its going to the support of the motherland, possibly untrained and unequipped, with a lot of officers better posted in balls and dances, which take up most of their time while dallying around our harbours, will be about as effective as this Fenian corps who

were routed by the Huntingdon farmers. Besides our ships would be such small ones that they dare not go within range of the enemy. A small ship carrying light guns is to-day absolutely useless, because their guns will reach only five or six miles, while the 12 or 16 inch guns on the larger vessels, can be effective for a distance of 15 miles.

My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has proposed a policy which will give automatic assistance to the mother country. More than that, our vessels, officered and manned under our policy, will be trained in the British navy, whereas under the policy of the government they would not. Our policy would make them ready to fight at a moment's notice, which would not be the case under the government's policy. The right hon. the Prime Minister himself has said that the United States is the only enemy with whom we might possibly fight. But there is no chance of the United States and this country ever coming to a quarrel. Reference has been made to the fact that the Americans have training ships along the inland lake. Well, so far as I am concerned, I would be delighted to see an American training ship at every large American port on our inland lakes and a Canadian training ship at every port on the Canadian side. What difference would it make? If war came it would make no difference, but war is absolutely impossible between these two nations. When Britain and her colonies are incorporated together, I look to an offensive and defensive alliance being reached between Britain and the United States and possibly France, Japan, which will guarantee the peace of the world for years to come; and I think that the right hon. the Prime Minister was very impolitic in his suggestion that the United States is the only nation he could think of against which he would allow his ships to go and fight.

Now, I come to the great material difference between the two policies. Under the policy of the leader of the opposition, the Union Jack would fly from these ships; under the policy of the government the Union Jack would not fly from these ships.

Mr. FOWKE. What would fly?

Mr. HUGHES. I am just going to explain the position to the hon. member. In a memorandum on page 24 of the Defence Conference report is found this paragraph:

> The question of the flag was also discussed, and it was arranged that the admiralty would give the matter consideration and would communicate its views at a later date to the Canadian government.

What need was there for discussing the flag? The fact is that the old Union Jack flies over the parliament of Canada—and a number of us intend that it shall long fly there. And it would be sufficient to have the old Union Jack flying from the Canadian fleet in case one should be constructed. I should be glad if the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had been here, or some member of the government who knew something about this question, to tell us what is meant by that paragraph in this report that 'the question of the flag was also discussed.' Perhaps the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) could tell us?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not making the speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the hon. minister listening to the speech?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, every word. I know all about the old flag.

Mr. HUGHES. What we want to know is that the old flag shall fly.

Mr. FIELDING. We will look after that.

Mr. HUGHES. I can give the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a guarantee that there are lots of the boys who will look after it if he does not. If he does not do it willingly, he will do it anyhow—he will go as the fellow went with the bayonet behind him. The policy of the Conservative party is that the old flag shall fly, and the policy of the government is that the old flag shall not fly.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) knows, why does he ask me?

Mr. HUGHES. I want to commit the minister. But it seems impossible to get these gentlemen committed. They plead the equivocal. They say: We will look after that—and when the time comes they do not look after it. But, leave non-essentials aside, and let there be fair warning that, when the hour arrives, the old flag is going to fly.

Canada cannot declare war, there is no doubt about that; she is not a nation, not even a sister nation, and she cannot declare war, and rightly so. Nor can she prevent her people from taking part in the defence of the empire. No matter what the orders may be from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, neither he nor any other power in Canada has authority to prevent the Canadian who wishes to do so from serving the empire. In peace or war, the Canadian flag has no authority beyond the three-mile limit, and is not recognized beyond that. Suppose that war were to break out, and one of our ships were down in South American waters, or in the Mediterranean——

An hon. MEMBER. How could it get so far?

Mr. HUGHES. Suppose it were towed there, or engineered somehow. If war were to break out at that time, what would hap-

pen in the case of that ship? The First Minister is considering whether he will take part in the war or not. What flag does that ship fly in the meantime? The British flag? Then, if so, the first ship of the enemy that comes near her, lets into her and down she goes. But suppose those on board do not know what flag to fly—Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his cabinet have not decided whether they are going to let us fight or not. Of course, the boys are always ready to fight; but suppose even it is decided not to fight, and the flag is taken down. What is the position of that ship? She is a common pirate; and not only the enemy's ships but the ships of every nation would be bound to capture her, for that is the law of nations. In war or peace our ships must fly the Union Jack or nothing. And, as I have said, our intention is that the Union Jack shall fly. The First Minister has spoken of responsible government, and his word is being repeated. Now, I would like to point out that the policy of the leader of the opposition maintains the policy of responsible government, and the policy enunciated by the First Minister departs from that principle. A few years ago, this country freely voted a sum of money—I think it was $250,000—to the relief of the poor in Ireland. Would any one maintain that because of that vote we were under tribute to Ireland? At a later time we voted money to San Francisco—did that mean that we were under tribute to the United States? We voted money to relieve the sufferers in Sicily: were we departing from the principles of responsible government in doing so?

Mr. HARTY. And to France the other day.

Mr. HUGHES. We voted $50,000 to France the other day—a splendid country. I wish some of our hon. friends opposite had as sound ideas of freedom as they have in France in many things.

Mr. FIELDING. Have not we French domination? I have heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) say that.

Mr. HUGHES. Never.

Mr. FIELDING. I apologize. I have heard it stated that we were suffering from French domination.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a wing of the French element which is trying to make us suffer, but fortunately there is another wing that tries to keep things in proper shape. Will any one say that because of the vote given to France the other day, we are subject to the domination of France? Not for an instant. We were standing by the principle of responsible government in every one of these votes. We appropriate money for the exhibitions in foreign countries—hundreds of thousands. Are we then, subject to the domination of Belgium and these countries to which we send our officers with our exhibits? We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for lighthouses and other means of protection for the commerce of the world on our coasts. Are we subject to the nations that are thus benefited? No. The money was freely voted. In voting it, we stand by the principle of responsible government, and we seek no subterfuge, and make no equivocation. But what is the position of the government, as we find in the speech of the First Minister? They are quoted in many parts of the country as being in favour of helping the motherland, but when we come to analyse them, you find that the ship he is proposing does not fly the British flag. And what is going on in Quebec to-day? Why, it is whispered about: 'Never mind; vote this money; it is all right; it means Canadian independence.' The First Minister tells us that he is accused on both sides—accused of being too loyal, and accused of not being loyal enough. But there is no question as to our position—we are standing by the principles of responsible government, and we are not obtaining the money for our policy by false pretenses. Under our policy Canada would have a voice in the councils of the empire, because Canada, having contributed these ships to the navy, would be represented on the imperial defence committee, and her voice would be heard, not only in the management of the ships, but on the question of war or peace. Our policy is a policy for the whole empire, and not a policy for Canada alone.

There are four or five ways in which Canada could have helped the motherland in this extremity, and of those four or five ways the government has chosen the worst possible way from Canada's own point of view or the point of view of the empire. The first policy is that of the government of Canada having a navy no matter where it is bought, controlled by Canada—and we know what that means—which may or it may not be loaned. There is the policy of the government in a nutshell, and as I pointed out before, the British flag is not necessarily the flag that floats over that navy.

The second policy is that proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), a direct contribution in the meantime, and then we will be prepared to fight out at the polls whether the policy of the government is the one that should be upheld or not. That policy would fly the Union Jack.

The third policy would be that outlined by the admiralty, an imperial navy with docks, naval schools, training ships, etc., in Canada, so that whether we confederat-

ed or remained as we are, we would do something towards the upkeep of the empire. That policy, too, would fly the British flag.

The fourth would be a combination of a direct contribution and an imperial unit, working in harmony with the admiralty. Jack would fly from the masthead.

The fifth is the one to which I have adhered for many a long year and which I trust will come within a very few years, a confederation of the empire, a full partnership on a union basis. That would combine all the good that is in the others and we would have the manhood of the nation elevated, there would be no complications in the matter, and the old Union Jack would fly from the masthead.

The only one of all these policies concerning which there is any doubt as to the position of Canada is the one that the government has selected, and why is that? Why? All we can do is to surmise. I am free to admit that the First Minister is in a rather difficult position in this matter. But it is the old question of chickens coming home to roost, and he cannot complain of anybody but himself.

Let us take a little review. We have listened so long to misrepresentation of these heroes of 1885, of the heroes of 1870 and the heroes of 1837-38 and all this sort of thing, that I think it will do no harm to place a few facts before the House. In 1763, by the treaty of Paris, Britain acquired the French property in the new world. In 1774 the Quebec Act was passed. Under that Quebec Act what happened? I am not referring to any concessions given to the then province of Quebec further than to point out that the territory for which the American colonists have given their time, their money and their lives, the valley of the Mississippi and Ohio, that great tract including Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, part of Minnesota and Michigan, was taken deliberately from the British colonists in the United States and handed over under the Quebec Act to the province of Quebec.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. Why not?

Mr. HUGHES. Because it did not belong to them, because they never conquered it, because it was bought by the blood of the men of New England and of Virginia, it was captured from the French by the blood of New England. In 1775, there was the American revolutionary war brought about not alone by the Stamp Act and kindred Acts, but by the fact that this territory for which these men of Virginia and other parts of the British dominions had given their lives had been taken from them. That is why these men rebelled more than any other single cause. The American revolution was brought on by the Quebec Act of 1774 more than by any other single cause.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. That is new history.

Mr. HUGHES. Following that came the Constitutional Act of 1791. I have not a word to say against the passage of that Act, only that our French-Canadian fellow countrymen did not ask it, it was given them by the English speaking people there, many of whom had lived under responsible government in England. They had heard the name and they wanted a Constitutional Act passed in Quebec whereby they would have self-government. They got self-government, in other words representative government, the control of their own assembly, but had not control of the appointment of the ministry.

In 1783, owing to the fact that the Yankees gained their independence, the states that they had won from France, formerly, that is Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, part of Minnesota and Michigan, they again took back and they took them back from Britain and from Quebec. They then were parts of the American union, so in 1791 the province of Quebec was curtailed and was divided into upper and lower Canada. But from that time on a small party in Quebec, active until the present hour, began an agitation to sever that province from the British Crown. For a few years after they got the Constitutional Act passed, there was hardly a Britisher, only three or four, to be found in the whole assembly. British immigrants were practically forbidden to enter the province and were treated as foreigners, and when the settlers came in from the United States and colonized the eastern townships, the opposition was so strong that they would hardly build a road in there. The statement was then made: We must preserve the land for our own people, and the statement has been made in a Montreal paper within a week from to-day that we must have this province our own and must join the French-Canadian fellow countrymen of the New England states with the French-Canadians of the province of Quebec. Fortunately these views are not held by many in Quebec and they have thus far fallen on unsympathetic ears. The chief agitations were against British immigrants, English, Irish and Scotch. They also demanded that they should have an elective legislative council, and in the province of Quebec to-day they have not an elective legislative council. I believe that legislative councils and senates should not be elective for a short term, they should hold office for life or a very long period. They also demanded control of the revenues from timber, from minerals, from forests and the lands.

Then followed the rebellion of 1837 and 1838, in Ontario, in Upper Canada led by a mountebank agitator, who had been a man of no character in his own country, Scotland, and had come out here. He had heard of responsible government in the old land, he did not know anything about the constitutional methods to be pursued, he gathered a few innocent people near Toronto, and the muskets being short-ranged in those days, the bullets could hardly reach them, they ran so fast.

In Quebec another man, clever and brilliant in many ways, but a man fitted for anything in the world almost rather than for leadership, gathered together a lot of poor, innocent fellows from various parts of the province and they met with disaster also. But history records that not one of the solitary grievances has ever been put in type that could not have been settled infinitely better by constitutional means as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) pointed out the other night that Nova Scotia settled her grievances without much fuss—a gentle hint to those so-called heroes of 1837 and 1838 in Ontario and Quebec that they were wrong in their agitation was all that was necessary. The aim in both provinces was independence. But, we have heard of other grievances. I can well remember the time when I sat in this House long years ago, and when gentlemen who occupy seats in the Senate, and who were appointed before they had ceased for a year to be members of parliament, stood up at these desks and declared that a law should be passed making it illegal for a member of parliament to hold a seat in the Senate, or a position anywhere else under the government, within a year after his retirement from the House. They demanded that the land should be kept for the settler in the Northwest. They said that we should have free trade in this new land of Canada, and they declaimed against robbers great and robbers small up and down the country. They also demanded that the Senate should be reformed. Most of them are in there now and it is pretty well reformed. They demanded rigid economy. There was almost a rebellion in the country because the Conservative party had an expenditure below $40,000,000, while these gentlemen have run it up to over $120,000,000. They demanded that we should have purity in public life and we have a splendid illustration of it in the government of the day. They also demanded that the question of prohibition should be placed before the public, that the people should vote on it and that it should be carried, but their voices are dumb to-day on that question and we hear no more about it. Then we have this laudation of rebellion, but as that has been referred to before, I will not take any more time discussing it. All I will say is this, that the right hon. the First Minister and his colleagues who are ever prone to glorify the so-called patriots of 1837-38, both of Upper and Lower Canada, are the men who forced upon a free people, people accustomed to responsible government, which the people of 1837-38 were not, upon the free men of Saskatchewan and Alberta, in 1905, an iniquitous measure which should have brought about rebellion among free men in that country if anything could have done so. What was the policy of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues in that regard? One of the demands in 1837-38 was that the assembly should have control of the revenues from the land, timber, mines and water-powers. The chief thing that the government restrained the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta from was the exercise of their rights with regard to the control of the land, mines, timber or water-powers. In 1837-38 it was right to rebel because the assembly, composed of men in both provinces who did not understand responsible government, were not given absolute control of these natural resources, while it was wrong in 1905 with a free people skilled in government. They took their rights away from them and they doled them out a pittance every year the same as a remittance man here receives from his father in the old country. Under the constitution, education belongs to the provinces, and yet this government that pretends to be Liberal, took from the people of these two provinces, in 1905, the right to control their education. Yet they will talk of the heroes of 1837-38 who had not one ground upon which to base any objection to the legislation of the time, and they will preach autonomy and responsible government. I have often thought that in their hearts they must despise these free men of Alberta and Saskatchewan for tamely submitting to these iniquities, while being ready to glorify the men of 1837.

I have not heard either of the last two speakers indulge in this criticism—perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will when he goes away down alone by the sea—but the criticism has been made of the Conservative party that we joined hand in hand with the hon. gentlemen opposite in passing the resolution one year ago and then have gone back upon it. Such is the language of the First Minister. Let us examine it man to man and see what we have done. The resolution reads:

> This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

Have we gone back on that? We are standing by it to-day.

> 2. That this House reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional

relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, in so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

We stand to it to-day. We do not believe in paying regularly and periodically a contribution to the motherland. We are in favour of paying an emergency contribution to-day to keep our flag flying because it is better to be sure than sorry, in the meantime and how cheaply we would all feel if the British fleet should happen to be defeated for lack of the two Dreadnoughts which Canada could have supplied. That is the policy we favour to-day. We are not in favour though of paying that regularly because before many years shall have elapsed some systematic form of naval assistance will have been devised.

3. This House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service.

Does the government provide a speedy service? How can they have the hardihood to ask hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to support such a resolution? There is no speedy contribution about it. We are standing by the resolution. We want something done 'speedy'.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not refer to a boat going up and down grafting for hon. members on the other side; I refer to the resolution that something should be done quickly. I see that some of my right hon. friends over there think I mean the 'Speedy,' and have reference to graft, &c

This House will cordially approve any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy.

Is that the policy proposed by the government—'in co-operation'? Co-operation is something mutual. This is a jug-handled, lop-sided plan. They may say: We will not go. We, on this side, desire that the plan shall be co-operative. When Britain is in trouble we will help her, and when we are in trouble we want Britain to help us. We may think that the condition of our stomachs is such that we cannot allow the navy to go and help Great Britain when our help is needed.

Mr. J. P. TURCOTTE. You want some millions.

Mr. HUGHES. If the millions go in graft in the harbour of Quebec and in the constituencies along the shores of the counties in various parts of that province the hon. gentlemen will not kick, but so long as they go to keep the old flag flying in Quebec there is a kick.

In close relation to the imperial navy.

Our policy is that our fleet should be part of the imperial navy. There is no measurable distance in connection with it.

Along the lines suggested by the admiralty.

These gentlemen in no sense have followed the lines suggested by the admiralty. Yet, they have the hardihood to ask us to support such a resolution.

Another clause of the resolution is:

In full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the empire and the peace of the world.

But, the government in reserving to themselves the right to say whether or not that navy shall take part in a war in which Britain is engaged are departing from an essential part of the resolution of last year. The resolution concludes:

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire.

The policy of the government departs from that. How can they have the nerve to stand up and ask us to join them in such a measure as they propose to-day. We are told there is no danger for the British empire. Well, Sir, what does the history of the world show. Thousands of years before the birth of Christ there was as great a nation as Britain is to-day, a nation relatively even greater. The Phoenician nation had all the liberties that Britain has to-day in many respects. Her ships traded in every sea, Carthage was a colony, Sardinia and Corsica were colonies, the Balearic islands, the southern part of Spain and parts of the British islands were colonies. The ships of the Phoenicians traded all along the northern coast of Africa, down the west coast, around the Cape of Good Hope, and to the distant Indies; their caravans crossed every desert. It was that nation that furnished the Christian world with the religion of one God; it was that nation that furnished the world with the alphabet, the principles of mathematics, and the learning which has graced and benefited humanity. They had everything the heart could desire, and yet that nation fell. The Grecian states in succession rose and fell, other nations in the east rose and fell. In the year 256 B. C., the first Punic war came, Rome knew that Carthage had succeeded Phoenicia as mistress of the seas,

and Rome prepared a fleet in order to meet Carthage. Their fleets met off the coast of Sicily and 300,000 men were engaged in that sea fight, the greatest naval battle in the history of the world. The Carthaginian fleet was wiped out of existence by the fleet of Rome, although Rome was comparatively a new nation. Taking advantage of the system of boarding the enemy's fleet, which was not thought of by the Carthaginians, the latter were driven from the sea and disaster followed to Carthage. Nation after nation has risen in power and might and has gone down. And why? They all had liberty; they all had their parliaments. The statesmen of ancient Greece would put to blush the eloquence of this parliament here to-day. Gifted as is the First Minister, with his nickel-plated eloquence, he could not hold a candle to the orators of ancient Greece. In the Roman Senate addresses were delivered which are still the wonder of the world. These men had liberty as we have liberty, they had education as we have education, they had religions and creeds galore, they had temples and churches and colonies, they had sister nations, but they have all vanished. And why? They began to live on their past records, they became self-important, they became wealthy—and gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us that the chief ambition of a nation is to become wealthy and opulent. As they became wealthy they became impotent, they neglected the principles of liberty, they centralized, they became sister nations instead of being part and parcel of the one great nation; they did not understand the principle of decentralization in non-essentials, while retaining control in a central government over matters of great national character. They forgot that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty; they did not realize that while it takes a thousand years to form a state, an hour may lay an empire in the dust. Shall we, in these days, forget our duty to the empire and to humanity; shall we embrace the spirit of militarism which has been the bane of many nations, instead of upholding the principle of democratic military training under which every citizen will do his duty to the state, by which every boy of ten years and upwards shall be trained to shoot and every boy of fourteen and upwards be trained to command his company. Shall we not place ourselves in the position as we can easily do, of being able to put a million men in the field, each one of whom would be a good rifleman. Shall we not place ourselves in an inpregnable position in Canada, and thus become a tremendous strength to the motherland in time of war. Our duty is to unite in one great imperial federation. Oceans no longer divide, the genius of man has overcome distance, and ships can traverse the ocean as rapidly as trains can cross the land. If you want to blockade the Canadian Pacific railway between here and Winnipeg all you have to do is to blow up a bridge on the north shore of Lake Superior, but you cannot block the pathless ocean against the traffic of ships of commerce, or ships of war. I maintain, Sir, that for the benefit of humanity, and the building up of the empire, our duty is to stand shoulder to shoulder in a union of the whole empire. It is said that in the course of time the sun must go down on the British empire. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I make this prophecy; that if the sun ever does set on the British empire, it will rise next morning on the empire of Greater Britain.

(Translation.) Now a few words to the Prime Minister and to my fellow citizens in the province of Quebec. The population of that province is the offspring of a race whose name and practice are always in favour of liberty, 'La belle France' is but another name for freedom and loyalty.

As in England the Normans and Huguenots were the best citizens amongst the British nation, so the Frenchmen in Canada, at every period were characterized by all the virtues of good citizens; that is, they are characterized by integrity, honour, energy and enterprise; they are also thrifty, witty and courageous.

The political chieftains in the province of Quebec, in our two parties, do not show them the confidence they deserve.

I ask the Prime Minister to stump Quebec in order to teach the good citizens in that province that the empire of our greater Britain is to continue to give them the right they have enjoyed so far. But they must remain steady and loyal in order to maintain under all difficult circumstances and against any danger, the integrity of the British empire and the majesty of the Union Jack.

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens). Mr. Speaker, this question, which is one of the greatest questions that has ever been brought before this parliament, has been so thoroughly discussed that it is difficult for one now speaking to bring forward any new matter. I did hope that this great question would be discussed without party feeling. I did hope that the two great parties in parliament, having passed the resolution of last session, would have united in carrying it into effect. As a new member, I must say that I do not like the reflections that have been made by the hon. members of the opposition on the right hon. leader of the government and on members of the government. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen do not think

that the right hon. leader of the government is disloyal. I do not believe that members of the government party are disloyal. Since I have been here I have not heard one sentiment of disloyalty pronounced by any hon. gentleman or seen any such sentiment given effect to. I know that the members of the government party are loyal, and I know that every member of the opposition is loyal. I believe that we have in the right hon. leader of the government as loyal a man as we ever had in Canada, and a great statesman. I believe that we have in the hon. leader of the opposition a gentleman of the highest integrity and character, and a loyal man. Therefore, I say that it is beneath the dignity of any member of this House to give utterance to sentiments impugning the loyalty of any gentleman here present. I am loyal; I am a grandson of a loyalist. I may say further that I am an imperialist. I say that, because I have heard a number of members declare that they were not imperialists. It has also been asserted here—what I never thought would be said in parliament—that the right honourable leader of the government was against sending men to South Africa. Unless the government at that time had responded to public sentiment, and sent men to South Africa, so far as I am concerned, and so far, I believe, as every man in the maritime provinces is concerned, they would not have had one supporter. But I cannot find that there was any holding back on the part of the right hon. leader of the government in that matter. I find that the right hon. gentleman left on the 7th of October for Chicago and returned on the 12th. I find that the Boer ultimatum was issued on the 9th of October, that it was rejected on the 10th, and that war was declared on the 11th. I find that Sir Wilfrid on the 12th of October declared that he would send a contingent to South Africa even if his government were defeated in consequence thereof. Then I find that on the 13th of October, an order in council was passed to send a contingent; and it reflects great credit on the Militia Department that within such a very short time the contingent was recruited, equipped and sent. At that time no regular regiment, supposed to be ready for service, was able to get ready and sail any more quickly than the contingent we raised, equipped, armed and put on ship-board. But our hon. friends of the opposition, who have given expression to such ultra-loyal feelings, cannot have forgotten what was stated by Mr. Bourassa, in a debate in this House in 1906. Mr. Bourassa, who is now, one might say, the Moses of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, stated this on page 98 of 'Hansard' of that year:

Mr. H. H. MCLEAN.

My attitude regarding the South African war was that observed by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1885, when he refused to the British authorities the right to enroll men in Canada for the British army in the Soudan.

Let hon. gentlemen of the opposition take that to their hearts and what do they think of it? What a howl they would have made if that action had been taken by any man on the Liberal side! While they sat under it quietly and without a protest at that time, I am satisfied that the gentlemen who compose the opposition in this House to-day would not support a policy of that kind. Any member of the opposition who would declare such a policy to-day would be almost driven out of the party. I am sure that any man on the government side would be. But I will go on and read further what Mr. Bourassa said:

My attitude on that question was the same that Sir Charles Tupper took in 1893 when he said in Winnipeg that the idea of basing a closer union between Great Britain and her colonies upon the principle of unity in defence of the empire, was a false one, that Canada had done all she could do, all that she ought to be forced to do for imperial defence, when she fortified her own territory and developed her own resources by building railways in the Northwest and giving communication to British troops between England and Asia.

Mr. MEIGHEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he takes the responsibility of the correctness of Mr. Bourassa's statements?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. There is no doubt that the statements made there are correct. If they were not correct, why did not some of the gentlemen on the opposition side at that time get up and deny them? The statements were made on the floor of the House and were put in 'Hansard,' and have never been denied. I have made inquiries, and I find that these statements are absolutely correct. I defy any hon. gentleman of the opposition to say that the statement made by Mr. Bourassa as regards the action of Sir John Macdonald in 1885 was not correct.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Bourassa was then the Moses of the great Liberal party, was he not?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. He was not loyal enough for us, so we gave him to you. He was not loyal enough for us, because he was against our sending troops to South Africa, and so we handed him over to your party. But I do ask, why refer to irrelevant matters of that kind? Every one knows that Sir John Macdonald was a loyal man, that Sir Charles Tupper is a loyal man, an ultra-loyal man. Can there be any doubt that the right hon. the leader

of the government is a loyal man, and that the members of the government and those supporting the government, are just as loyal as any one in opposition? Can there be any doubt that, in case of emergency, in case England wanted our assistance, there would be any man on the government side who would hesitate to give it?

Mr. COWAN. May I ask my hon. friend a question? Is independence the goal of his aspirations?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. It is not. My great grandfather fought with the loyalists, and when my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) condemned the action of the loyalists in making the sacrifices they did, in fighting for their king at that time, and then coming to this new country, rather than remain under a foreign flag, I say this is a matter which has nothing to do with the subject under debate, but which I would like to discuss with him at some other time. The Union Jack is good enough, Mr. Speaker, for me, as it was good enough for my forefathers, and I hope to live and die under the old flag.

Now, will you allow me to refer to the resolution of the 29th of March, and in that connection, I want to say this. I want to say that I, as a young member, am proud of the stand which was then taken by the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. the leader of the opposition when they joined hands for the empire and agreed to a resolution whereby Canada showed her readiness to offer naval assistance to Great Britain. I listened with great pride to the speech made by the hon. the leader of the opposition in London, the 1st of July last. When he said he was true to that resolution, passed on the 29th of March, and that he hoped Canada would soon have a navy of her own, that declaration aroused tremendous applause from the very large number present. The fact that Canada was going to organize a Canadian navy was the one thing which every man you met in Great Britain seemed to approve of. I listened, with approval, to the splendid speech made by the hon. the leader of the opposition on January 12. He then said:

> We have no Dreadnought ready; we have no fleet unit at hand. But we have the resources and I trust the patriotism to provide a fleet unit or at least a Dreadnought without one moment's unnecessary delay.

I agree with the leader of the opposition with regard to the fleet unit. I say that while the providing of these cruisers is a splendid action on the part of the government, we ought to go still further, and I would like to see one or two cruisers of the 'Indomitable' Dreadnought type provided.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. But referring to that proposition, my hon. friends who say, 'hear, hear,' will not be pleased with what I am going to say now. I am in favour of the greatest assistance being given Great Britain. The reason a fleet unit should be provided is that two cruisers and one 'Indomitable' would be better than five cruisers without an 'Indomitable.' However, I am perfectly prepared to take the advice of the admiralty in this matter; and I hope that it will not be very long before we will have an 'Indomitable' and cruisers of the highest type. But, let us appreciate what is being done. First, we are providing four Bristols of the highest type of cruisers afloat. It is true that none of them have been put in commission yet. The Bristol is supposed to be put in commission this year. She is to have a speed as high as 27 knots per hour, is to be armed with 10 4-inch guns and 2 6-inch guns, in addition there will be three torpedo tubes, and as regards the cruiser type, she is to be absolutely ahead of any vessel of that class. The destroyers are to be of the very latest pattern. So that as regards cruisers, with the exception of the armoured cruisers of the 'Indomitable' type, a Bristol can handle any other vessel she may be brought up against. In case of war, we know that Germany would undoubtedly send out privateers. That great authority, Lord Charles Beresford, has said that in the hold of every tramp vessel belonging to Germany are guns which they can mount in case of need. So that having that class of the fastest cruiser, we can more than hold our own against any vessel except those of the 'Indomitable' type.

Again, as regards the furnishing of an 'Indomitable,' the proposition of the hon. the leader of the opposition to simply give money to the British admiralty to be spent as they may see fit, does not appeal to me. Here are his words:

> Giving the admiralty full discretion to expend the said sum at such time and for such purpose of naval defence as in their judgment may best serve to increase the strength of the empire and thus assure its peace and security.

Surely, the hon. gentlemen belonging to the opposition should not approve of that policy. It seems to me a cowardly thing to simply hand over our money and not our men, and not to have any vessel of our own to take part in the fight. Not having any vessels of our own manned by Canadians, but simply sending over our money to the admiralty to invest in ships, would take from us that immediate, intimate interest in our contribution to the navy which we otherwise would have. It is quite clear that the British admiralty cannot furnish the armament and the guns for

more than eight Dreadnoughts a year. It was supposed that it would be impossible for Germany to furnish the armour and guns for more than four Dreadnoughts. Krupps have increased their resources by more than double, and they are now able to furnish armour and guns for eight Dreadnoughts. Therefore when my hon. friends talk about sending over this money for Dreadnoughts, let me tell them that the naval policy of 1909, which means the furnishing of eight Dreadnoughts is the limit of the yards of England and of the power to equip and furnish armour for those vessels. Therefore, Britain would only be able to keep our money. Let us see what has been stated by the admiralty in this matter. At page 23 they state:

It was represented on the part of the admiralty that it would be difficult to make any suggestions, or to formulate any plans, without knowing approximately the sum of money which Canada would spend. The Canadian representatives then suggested that two plans might be presented: one incurring an annual expenditure of £400,000, and the other an expenditure of £600,000, omitting in both cases the cost of the present fishery service and hydrographic surveys, but including the maintenance of Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, and the wireless telegraph service, estimated at some £50,000 a year.

Then, they say:

Taking, first, the plan for the expenditure of £600,000, after discussion the admiralty suggested that the Canadian government might provide a force of cruisers and destroyers comprising four cruisers of improved 'Bristol' class, one cruiser of 'Boadicea' class, and six destroyers of improved River class. As regards submarines, it would be advisable to defer their construction because they required highly-trained and specialized complement.

There we have the advice of the admiralty as regard the cruiser class. Is there any hon. member within the sound of my voice, or is there any man knowing the position who would favour the advice attributed to the admiralty that a fleet unit if furnished by Canada should be stationed in the Pacific?

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. Did the admiralty suggest that?

Mr. HUGH H. McLEAN. They wanted suggestions, and when the matter was discussed, they say: Give us the fast cruisers, the scout type, give us destroyers; place so many on the Pacific and so many on the Atlantic because we recognize that with your double sea-board that will be better than to have the unit type. I have said, and I say it again, that personally—though I may be extravagant in this matter—I would be in favour of having a full unit on the Atlantic and, when we can afford it and can get it, an Indomitable also on the Pacific. That is a matter which, I say, will come; it is sure to come by the time we have men to put on the Indomitable. Do you think that Canada is going to build an Indomitable and have it manned by Englishmen who are hired to do our fighting? Not a bit of it. We will have a training ship and put our men aboard and have them trained. In three or four years they will be thoroughly qualified to furnish the crew of a first-class fighting ship. Then we shall have a Canadian ship, manned by Canadian seamen and manned, in case of a fight, by Canadians. That is the policy I would like to see adopted, and that is the policy I hope will be adopted and carried out. Let me call the attention of the House to a letter written to the 'Times' by Mr. Macaulay, who is an authority of naval matters. He puts very plausibly the reasons why a fleet unit on the Pacific would not be advisable. He says:

A cruising range of 14,000 miles would evidently entail an enormous expense, and very 'intermittent training' especially as regards the terminal units. . . . The method you advocate would again be better applied if the Canadian naval force were in the Atlantic, not on the Pacific.

He says also:

The nearest British port of any naval value to the west coast of Canada is 5,000, 6,000 miles away. This distance is only traversible by the largest war vessels (cruiser or battleship) at low speed. . . . The connection of the Canadian fleet with the rest of our naval forces, would be entirely dependent in war on the good-will of the only powers that, who for very many years at least, can possibly threaten her Pacific coast. In a war with the United States, a Canadian fleet, placed as you suggest, would be at once isolated. In a war with an east-Asian power, the naval defence of the west coast of North America can best be carried out by a fleet operating from Singapore and Hong Kong.

If the opinions of this gentleman, for the reasons given, commend themselves to the judgment of hon. members present, they can take them; certainly, they commend themselves to me.

Now, I wish to refer to one of the leading admiralty authorities of England as regards this question of cruisers. His article was published in the 'Fortnightly Review' for May, 1908. He says:

I advocate India and the colonies owning their own scouts, destroyers and submarines, as it would be out of the question for these types of small craft to be sent out when once war had been declared, no matter how pressing might be the need for them.

Other advantages might be enumerated as follows:—

1. Great usefulness at comparatively small expense.
2. As the professional knowledge required is much the same in all the types of vessels here advocated, the officers and men would undergo a uniform standard of training, and would be able to take service in any type of colonial ship or boat.
3. The officers would become highly trained specialists in practically one particular branch of naval warfare, and would possess an intimate knowledge of the pilotage of their own territorial waters.
4. If the scouts and destroyers were fitted with turbine machinery and oil fuel, this method of propulsion, being very simple and easily worked, would mean comparatively small complements, both below and on deck, thus enabling higher wages to be paid, and thereby ensuring a good class of men entering the service.

There is the opinion of one of the highest naval authorities in England declaring that this is the correct policy. There can be no doubt that it is the correct policy. As regards the guarding of our coasts, scouts, cruisers and that class of vessels are the kind we want for the purpose. As I have said before, they could beat any vessels below the armoured cruiser class or the protected cruiser. That being the case, I say that if we have, in addition to that, a cruiser of the Indomitable type we get practically clear of any danger through Germany sending to our coasts vessels below the Indomitable type in case of war. Take, for example, the Atlantic coast; that coast is very easily guarded. The entrance to the Gulf of St. Lawrence is Belle Isle Straits, which are narrow and 40 miles long. One or two destroyers could guard that entrance. The other entrance is Cabot Strait, between Cape Ray and Cape North, that is between Cape Breton and Newfoundland. With two destroyers or a scout cruiser it would be difficult for any privateer or any vessel, except one of the very largest class, to get through that entrance. Then practically you have, after leaving Quebec, about 600 miles of protected water before the vessel would get out on the high seas. When it was out on the high seas, as is pointed out by Mr. Hamilton in some very clever articles he has been writing in the 'University Monthly,' she would be comparatively free from attack, as to find her would be like hunting for a needle in a hay stack.

Then take the Bay of Fundy. The entrance there is only twenty miles broad. Vessels have to keep clear of Muir Ledgese, they have to pass between Gannet Rock on one side, Brier island on the other, so that the entrance there is so narrow that it can be easily guarded and protected. Therefore, I say that with a very little expense, because Halifax with the guns she has is well protected, our eastern coast could be defended. We found at Santiago at the time of the war between Spain and the United States that a few guns on land were more effective than four or five times their number at sea. The obsolete guns which the Spanish had at Santiago were able to keep at bay the whole American fleet. Therefore, I say that we will be able to do what the admiralty want us to do, that is to effectually protect our own coast line and effectually guard our commerce until the ships get on the high seas.

A great deal has been said about the 'German Scare.' I may say that I do not agree with many of my friends on the government side that this is a scare. As far as I can find by looking into this question the action taken by Germany is a very serious one. Unless England now carries out the policy she has adopted, Germany would in a few years become strong enough to force the issue with England, and perhaps might make it very doubtful. But the result is that England is aroused now, last year four vessels were laid down and this year eight will be built. I want to call attention to the class of vessels England is now building. We have heard about the Dreadnought class, that is a vessel of 17,000 tons, with 21,000 horse-power, armed with ten 12-inch guns. Now they have the super-Dreadnought type, a vessel of 22,000 odd tons with greater horse-power, and some of them are proposed to be armed with 13·5-inch guns. They are laying down this year four of the largest class of super-Dreadnoughts. Let me call your attention to one vessel that England is laying down this year, that is what is called the Capital cruiser type. This vessel has over 80,000 horse-power. Think of that! She will have a speed of over thirty knots, and as you all know, a knot is one and one-eighth miles. She is to be armed with twelve 13·5 guns, the largest now being made. She is to be armed also with a number of 10.6-inch guns and a number of 4-inch guns. A vessel of that class with 80,000 horse-power, armed as she is and with her great speed would be practically invincible.

Another type that England is now laying down is called the Destroyer type. It is called a destroyer of destroyers. Vessels of this type have a speed of over thirty-eight knots. The 'Tarter' lately made a record of over forty knots. She is armed with four 4-inch guns, and has a torpedo tube. Here is a vessel capable of doing tremendous execution in case of trouble. These are the newer types. We remember that since the time of the 'Admiral' class every type of battleship has been made larger until we came to the Dreadnought type. Since then, we are go-

ing on to a still larger type. The Dreadnought type was 17,000 odd tons. We have come now to the super-Dreadnought type. After that we come to the Capital Cruiser type, an improvement on the Indomitable type. The 'Indomitable' is, as you know, a cruiser with great speed. She has lately made a record of twenty-nine knots. She can maintain a speed of twenty-seven knots. Three of that type have been built and the fourth, the Indefatigable, will be completed next February. The 'Lusitania' and 'Mauretania' were built with a speed of twenty-seven knots. They are capable of carrying 40,000 tons. In case of war these vessels, with the two Indomitables would be practically free from any danger of capture, and would be able to keep up ocean communication with England. We know that England, in case of war, will depend for her supplies on the colonies, or on Canada. Her position is something like that of a lighthouse, supplies must be taken to her. She has not at present supplies sufficient to keep the people there for more than three months. Therefore the lines of communication must be kept open. You will thus see the necessity of our furnishing the necessary naval protection, not only to ensure the safety of our commercce, but to keep open the line of communication with Great Britain in case of war.

Speaking of the German scare, I shall not discuss the recent German Naval Bill. It will be sufficient to refer to the Naval Bill of 1908. That provided for three battleship and one armoured cruiser to be laid down each year, and from 1912 to 1917 one battleship and one armoured cruiser, from 1908 to 1917. two protected cruisers and twelve destroyers each year. We know that in the event of a fight it is necessary that we should have at least as many as Germany, but England must have more Dreadnoughts than Germany. You can call it a scare, or you can call it what you like, but these are facts that have to be met, and there is the further fact that there is a strong feeling in Germany at the present time against England. People are assured, and I feel convinced of the fact, that when Germany feels she is strong enough to quarrel with England there will be one of the greatest wars that has ever been known. There is no use of blinding ourselves to these facts. There is no use of singing the Swan Song and saying that there is no danger. I hope there will be no danger. I believe that England, now being thoroughly aroused, will be able in this ship-building war to build the highest class of vessels faster than Germany can build them, and in greater number. We know from the German naval policy exactly what she is going to do and exactly what she will have by

1917. As regards Germany building these vessels there can be no question about it. She has demonstrated her ability not only to turn them out according to her naval programme, but she will turn them out before the time specified. Therefore, it is fair to assume that her naval programme will be carried out by the time she states it will be. We cannot rely on the good nature of the Germans. Germany is a business nation; Germany is a warlike nation. Germany will be prepared like England to take any advantage she can. If England got into trouble Germany would be there to take advantage of it. Nothing could avail with Germany if she thought she could succeed in a war with England. The Emperor of Germany is acting now on the principles laid down by Frederick the Great. Frederick the Great laid down for the future guidance of the Emperors of Prussia this maxim:

> Constant attentions must be paid to hiding as far as possible one's plans and ambitions. Secrecy is an indispensable virtue in politics as well as in the art of war.
>
> If possible the powers of Europe should be made envious and be set against one another in order to give occasion for a coup when opportunity offers.
>
> It is one of the first political principles to endeavour to become an ally of that one of one's neighbours who may become most dangerous to one's state. For that reason we have our back free as long as it lasts.

Reference has been made by some hon. gentleman who has spoken to the fact that Germany strikes with secrecy. She strikes when her victim is believed not to be ready, as witness Silesia, Denmark, Austria, France. The pretext may be a forged telegram as in 1870. The ambitions of the Kaiser are boundless. He seeks to dominate the continent as a first step to dominating the world. When hon. gentlemen speak of the peaceful intentions of Germany, let them remember what has taken place within the last four years. Thrice in four years has Germany threatened war, and in two of these instances she has achieved her aim. In 1905 she told France that the affairs of Morocco—a country in which she had only the vaguest interest—must be submitted to an international conference. Delcasse, the foreign minister, refused; finally he was forced to resign and France gave way. Later in the same year Great Britain's support enabled France to withstand Germany's threat in the Cabsablanca incident in Morocco. The latest instance of German aggression was the seizure of the two Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzogovina by Austria without the consent of the signatory powers. Austria is in the Triple Alliance, and Italy is called the cork leg of the alliance. Austria will have to participate in case of war with Germany, and she is given this additional territory

as the price of her alliance. We know also that when the Navy Bill was being discussed and the British government tried to come to an accommodation with Germany, the Kaiser and his ministers would not negotiate. By way of reply to Great Britain's overtures looking to a scaling down of armaments, Germany enlarged her naval and military appropriations. These appropriations still increase. For 1910 they are $312,000,000, or $43,000,000 more than last year. The outlay on the navy alone for next year will be $111,000,000, by far the largest in the country's history. The Germany government stands pledged to a policy, by Act of parliament, to add four Dreadnoughts a year up to 1912. That is the adopted policy of the nation.

I wish to refer now to a statement made by the gentleman who represents the 'Times' in Paris. I am told that he is a gentleman of the highest standing and one who would not make a statement which he did not believe to be correct. He says:

> Politicians observe that whenever the question is raised of reducing armaments, whether on land or at sea, and whether the initiative comes from the Tzar of Russia, or from the British Prime Minister, Germany is always the first to refuse, with a shrug of the shoulders, and a loud German laugh.

The doctrine of English naval supremacy is one that William the Second is determined to overthrow. It has been said, and I have heard it stated, that Germany could not afford to build these vessels, that she could not afford to go to the enormously increased expense. I have a statement here made by her Finance Minister. He says that the expenditure on the army and navy per head in Germany is 18·95 marks and in Great Britain 29·23 marks. That means that Great Britain's army and navy expenditure is almost 60 per cent larger than Germany's. Germany's military and naval burden is carried by a larger number of people. The vastness of her unexercised resources may be seen from the fact that Professor Conrad tells us she could raise an additional £50,000,000 per year by increasing only her indirect taxation to Great Britain's level, leaving her more direct taxation unchanged. It is only necessary to refer to this financial statement to show that the position of Great Britain is serious. Her taxation is the heaviest in the world. Reference has been made by the hon. gentleman who has spoken to the position of Germany's great army and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) told us the other day of the Kiel canal that he saw when he was in Germany last year. The Kiel canal is 60 miles long. That canal is being enlarged so as to accommodate the largest battleships. An enormous amount of money is to be spent so that she can have communication between the North Sea and the Baltic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in considering the causes which led to the rise and fall of nations, we find that the first requisite to ensure national greatness is the national sentiment, that is, a patriotic feeling in the individual, and a general confidence in the future of the state. This spirit naturally exhibits itself in military powers, in the determination of placing country first, in being willing to undergo hardship, privation and want, and even to lay down life on behalf of the nation. There is no record in history of any nation obliterating itself and giving up its nationality for the sake of making a few cents a dozen on its eggs or a few cents a bushel on its grain. The fallacy that peace and progress are synonymous, that war is retrograde, has lately been in vogue. This doctrine is peculiar to a section of the British race, but it has found few followers in any other great nation. We find around us nations armed to the teeth, watching an opportunity for dividing among themselves this, our empire, and it is the preacher of this galling, senseless doctrine that may yet open the door for them. Wherever civilization has found its way, there it has been carried by the sword, and nurtured by Christianity. Every nation that has risen, has carved its way up by the sword, and retained its position only by a preparedness with force of arms. When once its weapons have been laid aside, then has been the signal for decadence. Ruskin puts it as follows:

> We talk of peace and learning, and of peace and plenty and of peace and civilization, but I find that they were not the words which the muse of history coupled together:
>
> That on her lips the words were: 'Peace and sensuality, peace and selfishness, peace and death.' I find in brief that all great nations learned their truth and word and strength of thought, in war; that they flourished in war and wasted by peace.

Trained by war and betrayed by peace. In a word, that they were born in war and expired in peace. The pages of history show the following nations have expired in peace: Portugal, Holland, Sweden, Norway, Greece. Japan, a nation born yesterday, she could to-day, by force of arms, encompass the overthrow of the whole five combined.

Thus were these nations betrayed, standing as beacons to guide us, the proud possessor of an empire, an empire entering upon a period of peace adoration which is foreign to the clime of military races. Other nations have recognized that the greatest evil, attendant upon civilization, is the abhorrence of war, and they have, in time, taken the steps necessary to counteract the dislike for fighting, by getting ready to fight. Germany, through her

thrift, intelligence and the prosperity of her people, illustrates to mankind the advantages of training her citizens, in their youth and manhood, to the use of arms. The habits of discipline and the order and cleanliness of person. It is recognized today as a national characteristic, that the womanhood of that nation look with reproach upon men ignorant of military training. Germany is well to the fore in all that belongs to the twentieth century civilization. The greatest lesson of all we learn from China. There is a nation of 3,000,000,000 to 4,000,000,000 of people. Honest traders, inoffensive, and unaggressive. A nation which, from its physical character, the industrious habits of its people, and its natural resources, should have been the last to arouse hostility. It neglected its defence on water, and we now see the result. The nations in possession of navies are trying to tear it to pieces and divide the spoil. Do we hear of any of these nations being worried by honest scruples? No. The whole dispute is over the division of the spoils.

Reference was made by the Minister of Railways to the splendid internal canal system of Germany, and all that has been done within the last ten years. But, now that England is aroused we need not fear any danger. We know very well that with England's resources she is now building at the rate of eight ships per year, and that she will never again allow Germany to approach near the danger point.. The statement of some hon. gentlemen that there will be a war in a year or two seems to be absurd. It has never been stated by any naval authority in England that Germany could hope to enter into successful war with England even in the year 1912. Up to that date Germany would certainly be far outclassed. We must further remember that although Germany may be building these new ships she has to take men from the farms to man them. Germany has no large coast line to support a maritime people, and the men for these ships are taken by a system of what we would call force. They are forced to serve in the German navy, as they are forced to serve in the German army for a number of years, and while there is no doubt that after a time they do make good seamen, yet it is fair to say that even after these new ships are built it will take some years before the men are trained and before she is able to go to war with England. Now, let me point out to the House that in the year 1912, which it is prophesied by some may be the year of danger, Britain will have 22 Dreadnoughts, super-Dreadnoughts and Dreadnought cruisers; her naval programme for 1909 provides for the building of eight of the super-Dreadnought

type. The Navy League annual shows that in 1912 England will have 22 Dreadnoughts, super-Dreadnoughts and cruisers, as I have already mentioned. But look at the improvement in these ships. The first Dreadnought was 17,900 tons and the last four ships of the super-Dreadnought class are to be of 25,000 tons. The first Dreadnought had 23,000 horse power, but the super-Dreadnoughts are to have 45,000 horse power and a speed of 23 knots instead of the Dreadnought speed of 22·4. They are to be armed with ten 13.5 inch guns and fourteen 6 inch guns. I might give a short description of these guns as follows:

The 16·25-inch gun.

The principal details of the 110-ton gun are as follows: It has a bore of 16¼ inches in diameter, and is 43½ feet long. Its projectile is 1,800 pounds in weight, and is propelled by a charge of slow-burning cocoa powder weighing 900 pounds. This gun can only be fired at the rate of one round every seven minutes, and the life of it is not estimated to exceed 100 rounds. Now obselete.

The 13·5-inch gun.

The 13·5-inch gun throws a projectile weighing 1,250 pounds, with a muzzle velocity of 2,016 feet per second, and with a firing charge of 630 pounds of powder has an energy of penetrating 25 inches of wrought iron at 3,000 yards.

The 12-inch gun.

Next in order we come to the 12-inch gun, which, with various modifications of design, remains the standard heavy British naval gun of the present time. The total length of this magnificent gun is 617·7 inches. The initial velocity of its projectile is 3,010 foot-seconds, which gives a muzzle energy of 53,400 foot-tons; the effective range against an average modern armoured warship is computed roughly at about four miles, and the extreme range is 25,000 yards, at which limit the remaining velocity of the shell would be so relatively small as to render it comparatively harmless save by virtue of its own weight.

When we remember that the latest British Dreadnought type of battleship are armed with ten of these mighty pieces of ordnance apiece, the tremendous concentration of their powers of aggression makes contemplation of the future naval battle simply appalling.

The 10-inch gun.

The 10-inch gun is a weapon that has been fitted to a few of our battleships, although it has never found particular favour amongst the gunnery experts of the British navy. The Vickers' pattern of this weapon, which is largely used in the Russian, Italian, Japanese, and United States navies, is 34·5 tons in weight, has a length of 45 calibres (464·9 inches, including breech-chamber), and throws a projectile of 500 pounds, with a muzzle velocity of 3,000 foot-seconds, and a muzzle energy of 30,990 foot-tons.

The 9·2-inch gun.

Continuing to follow the category of primary weapons in the order of their size, we come now to the 9·2-inch gun, which is the most popular and in its way the most useful piece of artillery in the British fleet. It is

to be found alike in our battleships and big cruisers, and, whilst it lacks the shattering power of the heavier weapons against modern armour, yet its remarkable penetrative qualities, coupled with its rapid fire delivery—three rounds per minute—renders it a deadly effective gun. The Woolwich pattern, Mark X, of this type, weighs 28 tons unmounted, is of 46·6 calibres in length (extreme total 442·35 inches), and has a muzzle velocity of 2,800 foot-seconds with a muzzle energy of 20,685 foot-tons. The projectile weighs 380 pounds, and has a striking power at a range of 3,000 yards equal to carrying it through 25 inches of wrought iron.

The 7·5-inch gun.

The 7·5-inch gun, of Vickers' wire-wound pattern, weighs 16 tons without mountings, is 50 calibres long (extreme length 386·7 inches), and has a muzzle of 3,007 foot-seconds, giving the projectile a muzzle energy of 12,540 foot-tons.

The 6-inch gun.

The 6-inch gun has been said, not inappropriately, to mark the strict limit to the quick fire series, although not officially so regarded. But its projectile of 100 pounds in weight is the heaviest that can be man-handled, and the result is that the weapon can be fired at the rate of twelve rounds per minute. Indeed, nothing but the necessity of waiting for the recoil to spend itself restricts the rapidity of fire delivery with the 6-inch piece. The latest (1908) Elswick pattern weight 8¾ tons, is 50 calibres in length (total over all 315 inches), and has the remarkably high muzzle velocity of 3,050 foot-seconds, with a muzzle energy of 6,492 foot-tons.

The 4·7 inch, the 4 inch and Small Q. F. Guns.

The biggest and most familiar type of naval 'mosquito' armament is the 4·7-inch. gun, immortalized by the memorable part it played in the salvation of Ladysmith. This weapon in its latest type weights 3·27 tons, is 45 calibres in length, and throws a shell 45 pounds in weight, with a muzzle velocity of 2,925 foot-seconds, and an energy sufficient to penetrate 8·6 inches of wrought iron at a range of 2,000 yards. But excellent as this gun has proved itself, it has been quite supplanted as a light quick-firer by the 4-inch, wire-wound pattern. This is a piece of ordnance of extroardinary range and penetrative powers for its size. Its weight unmounted is 2,018 tons, and its length 50 calibres (giving an extreme measurement of 208·45 inches). It discharges a projectile 31 pounds in weight at a muzzle velocity of 3,030 foot-seconds, and with a degree of energy equal to penetrating 16 inches of wrought iron at the muzzle. The fire delivery of this gun is estimated at 15 rounds per minute. The 3-inch. naval gun is, strictly speaking, the smallest weapon which can legitimately be classed as big warship ordnance. Below this we come to mere popguns, throwing 6 pound and 3 pound projectiles, and machine guns, which rattle forth a hailstorm of 1·457 inch. bullets at a rate of 300 rounds per minute. These weapons are really designed to repel boat attacks, and within the limits of their effective range would prove very deadly. The 3-inch. gun referred to above, in its latest pattern (1908), has a length of 50 calibres (156·9 inches over all), weighs 19 cwts. unmounted, and throws a projectile of 12·5 pounds in weight, at the rate of 25 rounds per minute, with a muzzle velocity of 2,700 foot-seconds, and a penetrative energy equal to passing through 9·65 inches of wrought iron at the muzzle.

The four super-Dreadnoughts and capital cruiser ships are to be laid down in April, 1910, and they are to be put in commission in March, 1912. I wish also to refer to another authority, and it may fairly be said that this authority is not prejudiced. The authority to which I refer is Pulsifer, who, in the United States navy book for 1909, gives the following as the comparative strength of the navies of Great Britain and Germany at the present time.

Great Britain.	Number.	Tons.
Battleships (10,000 tons and over)..	60	941,450
Coast-defence vessels..		.....
Armoured cruisers..	40	506,350
Cruisers above 6,000 tons.. ..	18	176,250
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons.. ..	48	214,700
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons.. ..	24	51,675
Torpedo-boat destroyers..	168	81,356
Torpedo boats..	69	15,014
Submarines..	67	19,078
Total..	494	2,005,873

Germany.	Number.	Tons.
Battleships (10,000 tons and over)..	32	436,424
Coast-defence vessels..	8	32,378
Armoured cruisers..	12	151,693
Cruisers above 6,000 tons..		.....
Cruisers 6,000 to 3,000 tons.. ..	26	105,293
Cruisers 3,000 to 1,000 tons.. ..	17	37,626
Torpedo-boat destroyers..	97	49,859
Torpedo boats..	33	5,819
Submarines..	8	1,600
Total..	233	820,692

When we come to the total number of ships and the total tonnage we find that England has of first-class battleships, armoured cruisers, torpedo boat destroyers, all effective 494 with a tonnage 2,005,873, and Germany has a total of 233 ships with a tonnage of 820,692.

From this it will be seen that at the present time the British navy is superior to the German navy by more than the two to one standard. It is therefore, fair to say, that at the present there is no danger from Germany as regards her navy, either now or in 1912, when these vessels are built, and that in 1917, England will be better prepared than ever to cope with Germany if the need should be. But, the point I want to emphasize is this: That in 1917, Canada, instead of adopting the policy propounded by the opposition of giving money and doing nothing else, Canada in 1917 will have at least 800 first-class, thoroughly trained men for these cruisers of ours. In addition to that we will have

our naval reserve. We have in the maritime provinces a large number of fishermen who go to sea during the summer months, manning our fleet and manning largely the Gloucester fishing fleet as well. These men are half mechanics, they live at home in the winter, they are handy with tools, they are the very finest class of men for the making of a naval reserve. But hon. gentlemen may say: Oh, you cannot get these men; you cannot pay them the wages. Well, for three months in the winter these men have no employment and during these three months we can take them on a cruise to Bermuda and train them so that in four years they will be thoroughly competent to take their positions on a warship. They are skilled now in seamanship, they are hardy and brave men, and all they need is technical training to fit them for duty on a man of war. Is not that better assistance to England should she ever come to a time of stress and emergency, than it would be for us now to hand over $20,000,000, and as the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says: Let England do with the money what she pleases. Is it not better that we should provide first for the highest type of coast cruisers; next, that we should be training that large body of men to take their place in the fighting line; and third, that we should then be able to have one or two of the highest type of fighting vessels? I do not know but that the government are right in the policy they have adopted of not spending a large sum of money now in buying an Indomitable. It is fair to say that we should wait now until the highest class of warships is developed, and we can get the best; because when Canada purchases a war vessel, she must have the very best afloat. If a Dreadnought or super-Dreadnought of 25,000 tons, or a capital cruiser with a speed of over thirty knots, is going to be the highest type, that is the vessel we want for Canada, and the vessel we will get. We hope this great war will never occur, but if it is to come off, we must be prepared. We shall have the men trained and cruisers of the best type. Surely that would be more effective aid for England in a great struggle than to give a certain sum of money and then lie back on our oars and wait for an emergency to arise in the future. Surely that is not the stand which gentlemen with love for Canada and loyalty for the mother country should take. It is a cowardly thing for us to expect Englishmen to do our fighting. It would be like Canada saying to England at the time of the South African war: 'Here is $50,000,000; go and do the fighting for us.' Sending out our own men was the effective way of showing England that we were in earnest, and that our assistance was to the point. Some of the naval men of England absolutely believe that we could not furnish men to man or equip a battleship, no matter what training they received. That is the same old story that General Hutton put forth when he was here. I heard him say at a dinner in the city of St. John, in June, before the South African war broke out, that it was absurd to suggest that Canadians could go to South Africa and assist in that war. 'They have not had the training or the discipline,' he said. 'Why, it takes from three to five years to give the necessary discipline to a man before putting him in the fighting line. All Canada could do would be to send out these small contingents to guard the base of supplies.' The then Chief Justice of New Brunswick, Chief Justice Tuck, rose at the table and said to General Hutton, 'You do not know what you are talking about,; our men will go to South Africa, they will be in the fighting line and will be among the best fighting men there, and more to the same effect; and any one who knows Chief Justice Tuck, knows how forcible he would be. He was so forcible that General Hutton felt insulted. That was the opinion of the English military men of that time, and I have no doubt the naval men of England have a similar opinion to-day. England does not want our money; it would be a mere drop in the bucket if she had it. What she wants is trained men, and that is what we propose to give her.

Now, I have heard hon. gentlemen talk of what they call our tin pot navy. What do these gentlemen mean when they talk in that way? There is one thing sure: they have never made any reflection, nor could they make any reflection, on the men whom we propose to put on board those ships. There is not a man of position but will say that the men we propose to put on board those ships will be the best fighting material England has. In the course of a few years, not only will they be efficient, but Canada, will be proud to be represented by them in the event of trouble. Let us see what ships we propose to have. There is the Bristol, which is a new type. There is no Bristol yet in commission; but it is expected to be in commission next July. The matter of its equipment has been kept very secret; but we do know from the Navy League Annual, that she has a draft of 15 feet, turbine engines of 22,000 horse-power, that she can steam from 25 to 27 knots, that she will be armed by two six-inch quick firing guns, and ten four-inch quick firing guns. The Bristol was launched in 1909 and is to be completed in 1910. Four more of this type were ordered in November last, and are to be delivered in July and August, 1911. Of the Boadicea type four vessels are built—the Boadicea, the Bellona,

the Blanche and the Blonde. The Boadicea is in commission. She was laid down in July, 1907, and was commissioned in July, 1909. On her trial she attained a speed of 27·9 knots. Her length is 385 feet, beam 41·6 feet, draft 13·6 feet and tonnage 3,360 tons. She will be a most efficient vessel for cruiser purposes, one of the most efficient that could possibly be built. She is fitted with turbine machinery on the Parsons system, of 18,000 horse-power. Her cost will be £284,000. The ship's company numbers 263 officers and men. Our hon. friends of the opposition could not say anything against the Bristol type or the Boadicea type, the most efficient of the stout cruiser class yet built for the British navy; and when we are making a start by getting five of the best type of cruisers possible and six of the latest type of destroyers, surely it is a very good commencement. Of course, many of us would like the government to go a little faster; but one thing this government deserves credit for—this is the first time any government in Canada has ever made a step in this direction. It is the first time that the naval forces of Canada have been put into commission, so to speak. This is the first time that our great sea-faring class, the raw material of a navy, will be trained and ready in case of war. We have our land militia and know they are efficient, and now we shall have our naval militia as efficient as any class of seamen in the wide world.

Mention was made about destroyers—what are called the river class. They are fine powerful boats of from 500 to 550 tons, with a speed of 25½ knots, also armed, and the most effective class known. They will be most efficient for guarding the entrance to the Gulf and Belle Isle straits and the Bay of Fundy. Nothing could be better for coast defence than vessels of the class the government have ordered. Lord Tweedmouth, at the naval conference of 1907, said:

> You can have the most magnificent ships, guns, armour, and everything else, but if the human element is not very properly trained, your guns, your armour, and your ships are absolutely useless.
>
> The history of our navy shows that the self-sacrifice and endurance of British sailors has been beyond compare, and we believe they have reached a higher state of efficiency than has ever been known in the history of our country.

I say we have these men on our coasts, we are rich in seamen of that class, and with proper training they will be as efficient as any in the British navy. Of course we know that warships need highly trained specialists, such as gunners, engineers, wireless operators, and signal men. But, with the exception of the engineers, all that other class can be well trained in five years. In the meantime, while our young men are being qualified, we can get British officers, and we will in five years have a full complement on board these ships of Canadians, well trained men.

It is well to call the attention of the House to the sea trade of Canada, of which I have the figures here. In the year ending March 31, 1908, our export trade in home produce stood as follows:

To Great Britain..	$126,000,000
The rest of the empire..	13,000,000
The United States..	90,000,000
Other foreign countries..	17,000,000
Total..	$246,000,000

In other words:—

Total overseas..	$156,000,000
Trade by land..	90,000,000

Thus over 63 per cent of our trade is maritime. If we were to include the proportion of our trade with the United States which is done by Atlantic and Pacific coasting vessels, it is evident that fully two-thirds of our trade with the outside world is ocean-borne.

I read in the London 'Times' a speech made by Mr. Smithers, chairman of the Grand Trunk railway. Dealing with the resources of Canada, he said:

> Her railway mileage was now 24,100, exceeding that of Great Britain and Ireland by 1,000 miles. The wheat crop of western Canada last year was a record, amounting to 144,000,000 bushels, as compared with 64,000,000 bushels in 1905, and a very remarkable feature was the rapidity of the extension of wheat growing in Saskatchewan. If we took the crops of all Canada, wheat had risen from 84,000,000 bushels in 1901 to 168,000,000 in 1909, oats from 122,000,000 in 1901 to 355,000,000 in 1909, and barley from 24,000,000 in 1901 to 57,000,000 in 1909. It was calculated that the actual cash value of wheat alone to the farmers of the three western provinces in 1909 was 106,000,000 dollars. According to the president of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, the total bank clearings of the fourteen Canadian clearing-houses for 1909 were 5,204 million dollars, against 4,142 million dollars in 1908. The total value of all minerals produced in 1908, as shown by the preliminary government report, was 87,000,000 dollars. He left to the imagination the value of the timber, cattle, dairy produce, and fruit and fisheries.

In case of war, we therefore would be able to supply England with all the food she requires. And by the aid of these cruisers, we would be able to guard and protect our coasts. What a great panic would there be caused should there be any interruption of our trade with England. We know that at the time of the Spanish war, just a few vessels, obsolete vessels, created a panic, and we know that unless England could send us out coasting vessels, a privateer or armed merchantmen could simply paralyze our whole trade.

I want to call attention also to our mercantile marine. At present, Great Britain stands first in the world with 12,000,000 tons odd, Germany comes second and the United States third, and Canada at present stands ninth. But, with 70,000 more tons, Canada would pass Italy and stand sixth.

Criticism has been made regarding the building of these ships in Canada. Well, it does seem to me that that is the very best thing the government of this country could do. It excites one's ire to hear men talking about our not being able to go into this line of business. Why, we have had to bring skilled operators from other countries to start our manufactories, and Canada, in the old days of wooden ships, was able to build the best ships in the world. Scotland could not compete with her. We know that the fastest skipper ship ever built, came out of a St. John shipyard—the 'Marco Polo.' And now when steel plate has taken the place of wood, we know that we have all the raw material necessary for steel ship building and all that we require is the plant and trained mechanics. Of course, it is not possible for any private individual at present to establish a plant large enough, but on looking over the register, I find that over 600 steam vessels now on our register were built outside of Canada and that practically very few have been built here. Take the one firm in St. John, Wm. Thompson & Company; they had fourteen steel steamships—ocean steamers—built on the other side. But as against these croakers who decry our capabilities, let me point to the example of Germany, and let me point out that Japan 18 years ago did not have a steel vessel. But Japan started to build up her navy, she got one of these big contractors from Scotland and started a plant, and she is to-day not only building her own ships of war, but also her mercantile vessels, and she is doing this to such an extent that she is now eighth in the list of countries owning ships. Germany's example, however, is still more marked. The first liner built in a German yard was built in 1887. To-day, in the German yards, are built not only her own ships, but also ships for foreign powers. They have built 757 steel ships besides four warships for foreign nations, and yet only fifty years ago, her whole navy was sold at auction.

When you think that, in 1887, her first vessel was built, when you think that it was not till 1898, that she commenced really to put down the keels and build her own steel vessels, and when you find these results, this great development of steel shipbuilding, and when you remember also that German plants were started by Scotchmen—of course the Germans rapidly learned the business, and they are able to carry it on now—why should any man say that

what Japan has done, what Germany has done, what other nations have done, in establishing these building plants, we cannot do in Canada? And it is a frivolous, childish objection, it seems to me, to say that it is going to cost you more to build your ships here than in England, and it is going to take you a year longer. But is it not a great thing to know that the establishment of a steel building plant in Canada, and the building of these war vessels, eleven in all, will start the steel building industry and shipyards, providing new employment for thousands of skilled men at big wages—for these men do get big wages? We shall be starting in Canada the biggest industry we ever had. For we are a maritime nation. Men who live by the sea, as do a number of the gentlemen present, know the enormous amount of money that is made by carrying freights. They know that for us to pay out the best part of our money to foreign ships to carry our produce is not Canadian, it is not business. Surely it would be better for us, with the enormous amount of our export business, that we should carry it in Canadian ships? A further fact is that which I have already mentioned—that over 600 steam vessels on the registry were built outside of Canada. Then, there is the point that made a great impression upon me, that nine-tenths of the cost of a steel vessel goes out in wages. Of course, you understand, there is the ore to be taken from the mines. Then it has to be smelted—and we can do that at Sydney. Then there is the work to be done on the hull, and all the rest, so that nine-tenths of the cost goes in wages to those employed in connection with it. That is a marvellous fact. It shows, when this industry is started, what a great thing it will be for Canada. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the day will come when we shall be united in one great power, forming a federation of great nations, a confederation for the purpose of consolidating power against foreign countries, and a moral influence on all international questions. Nations can only enjoy their freedom by being able to defend it. The true policy for us is to be closely united, to be thoroughly organized and equipped, and to be able to use our whole strength to the greatest advantage for the common safety of Great Britain. Canadians desire to be free and safe. It must be in an empire to which we are attached by every tie, to which we must render effective service, if necessary give our all, for the common defence, if we are to expect the forces of that mighty empire to be at our back when our lives as free people are threatened, we should show a square front to any enemy that may attack us. We must be ready to play our part towards the security of our country, and if occasion offers, be ready to defend. For de-

fence, because every great thinker, and every man who has studied the subject, knows that we may have war upon us at any moment. Take the last words of that great statesman, Lord Dufferin, when he says:

> Nothing, neither a sense of justice, nor the precepts of religion, nor the interests of humanity, would prevent any nation from attacking us at the first favourable opportunity.

And Joseph Howe, forty years ago, wrote in his essay on 'The organization of the empire':

> Security for peace is only to be sought in such an organization and armament of the whole empire as will make a certainty of defeat a foregone conclusion to any foreign power that may attempt to break it.

Something has been said about the Monroe doctrine. Let me say one word about it. It seems to me that the plea of the Monroe doctrine has been effectually answered and the doctrine shattered. We must not forget that for us to depend on the protection of the United States would be a cowardly position for us to take—that we should wait and ask the United States to keep away any bad people that want to come against us. It would be very doubtful whether the United States would be able to do it. But what would be her price? It would mean that we should give up our independence. We should go into the United States to bear a part of the enormous expenses they are under. Our provinces would not receive the subsidies they are receiving; our industries and manufactures would no longer flourish, and perhaps she would take away from us all our raw products to manufacture them over there. That would probably be the price she would ask.

We have not received from the United States very much consideration in the past. In 1785 we had trouble with them—an invasion. In 1812 there was another invasion from the United States. Then, there was the Fenian raid in 1860, and of the enormous sum of money that we had to pay for the defence of Canada, not one dollar did we get back from the United States. There was the Trent affair; there was the New Brunswick matter, the Aristook war, when our friends in Nova Scotia volunteered to send us 10,000 men to help us. That, of course, is not a matter mentioned now, but it was very acute at that time. That trouble was over a little bit of territory they wanted to get away from us. There was also the Venezuela affair. About the 1st of January, 1896, President Cleveland issued his message in reference to a dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela. It was couched in the most hostile terms, most insulting in its character. Among European nations it would have been accepted as a declaration of war. This was approved of by the United States as a whole. From 42 out of 45 States messages of approval came to President Cleveland, with offers of the services of their militia to be used in the invasion of Canada. It shows you what we could expect from the United States in case we got into a tight corner. But we hope, of course, that we shall be able to get along in peace and quietness with the United States. We shall be able to get along with the United States while we respect ourselves and while we show that we are able to defend ourselves. I am not one of those who believe that, in case the United States attempted to invade us, she would have an easy time. With a smaller number of people we have been able to hold our own in every invasion and to beat the United States in every fight that has come up. I am not saying this as a rag to the United States, or a chip on the shoulder or anything like that, but it is fair to say that since 1785 every invasion of Canada was brought on us not by our fault, but by the aggression of the United States and without excuse. The Venezuela affair, of course, was the worst and latest. But we ought to dwell in peace with the United States, that is our desire, we have never in the past given any occasion for offence, we do not in the future intend giving any occasion for offence. We hope to live with them as friendly neighbours should live. But I repeat that I believe if it did come to an invasion by the United States they would find that we could hold our own as our fathers did before us and would be able successfully to defend ourselves.

And now in conclusion let me ask you to support the establishment of a Canadian navy, so that we can quote with truth the words of Kipling:

> Carry the word to my sisters,
> To the Queens of the East and the South,
> I have proved faith in the heritage
> By more than the word of the mouth.
> They that are wise may follow
> 'Ere the world's war trumpet blows,
> But I, I am first in the battle,
> Said Our Lady of the Snows.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House at this hour of the night, but I do not care to give a silent vote on this question, which I consider of such importance to the country. I must say in reference to the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, that I do not intend to criticise his speech very much, because it has been a speech most of which could very readily be credited to this side of the House. I must say that those who have spoken of what may be considered a crisis, in the light and jocular manner that some gen-

tlemen opposite have spoken of it have received their answer from the hon. gentleman. I must attribute to my hon. friend a good deal of courage. I can see by his speech and by his training that he is a fighting man and he has had a good deal of courage to charge the fighting man of the government, the Minister of Militia, with cowardice. I think that the Minister of Militia has said that the Munroe doctrine was of great interest to us, that it was a great protection to us and the hon. gentleman (Mr. H. H. McLean) says it is cowardice to say that. He has a fighting quality about him. He criticised the statement made that it will cost more to build a navy in Canada. To whom can we attribute that statement? His leader was the first man who mentioned that in the House, and he said it would cost 30 per cent or one-third more to build a navy in Canada than in England. I think he is a good honest critic of the other side of the House.

I do not think long speeches will build a navy, I am rather inclined to think they will delay it, but some things have been said in this House with which I do not agree. A good deal has been said about launching the country into militarism. A navy is just the opposite of militarism, and if you wish to go back in history, you will see that the battle of Trafalgar hindered the greatest military organization that this world has ever seen. What did Pitt say? That England had saved herself by her exertions and she intended to save Europe by her example.

They say that we want to build this navy in Canada. That is a laudable object, but perhaps it is the lowest possible ground on which you could put this question to-day. If there is a crisis then the most effective way of meeting that crisis is our duty, wherever it may be. I shall not endeavour to prove whether there is a crisis or not, but the prominent public men of England, of both political parties, men not apt to lose their heads in a crisis, have indicated to the world that there is a crisis. Then the duty of Canada is to assist in thwarting the purpose of whoever intends to bring to England that crisis. Does any one pretend to say that the proposal of the government will in any sense meet that crisis? Does any one pretend that a navy or dock-yard started this year in Canada for the purpose of building war vessels in the next five or ten years will meet that crisis? Does any one pretend to say that if we had our navy ready to-morrow and fully equipped it would in any sense assist to meet the crisis? If there was trouble between Germany and England—and God forbid there ever shall be any such trouble—a great naval battle would take place and that battle would not last more than fifteen or twenty days at the most, then where is your Canadian navy to assist England? The result would be that England's ports would be blockaded. If Germany became victorious, England's ports would be blockaded, and the Canadian navy would be as helpless as an infant in the cradle to help England in the crisis. The bounden duty of Canada is to rise in her loyalty to the empire and to British connection and to do her the most effective service if there is a crisis as we are told there is.

We have heard a good deal from the opposition side of the House from the right hon. leader down to the smallest singer of the song, and what has it been? The 20th century for Canada! Look at our great resources, look at our great revenue. The 20th century is Canada's. They would thus lead England to great expectations and hopes in reference to Canada's assistance to the empire and when they come to offer their gift, what is it? In the first instance it is a flat refusal. Who makes that refusal? The right hon. gentleman who leads the government of this country. He said in this House a few days ago, as an answer to the proposition from the leader of the opposition, that the matter should be submitted to the people, he said it had been before the country. How has it been before the country? In 1907 the right hon. gentleman in the conference absolutely refused to do what he is proposing to do to-day. I am not asking him to take my statement, I shall read what the right hon. gentleman did say in the conference in answer to a resolution moved by a gentleman from South Africa. I shall read the resolution and shall show that the Premier of Canada flatly refused to vote for it, and out of respect to his refusal that resolution was withdrawn. Then he went to the country in 1908, making this refusal and the country endorsed him; hence, they must have endorsed his refusal. Then, it is necessary that we should go to the country with his present proposition. Let us see what he says: Dr. Smartt, a colleague of Dr. Jameson, moving the following resolution:

> That this conference, recognizing the vast importance of the services rendered by the navy to the defence of the empire and the protection of its trade, and the paramount importance of continuing to maintain the navy in the highest possible state of efficiency, considers it to be the duty of the dominions beyond the seas to make such contribution towards the up-keep of the navy as may be determined by their local legislatures—the contribution to take the form of a grant of money, the establishment of local naval defence, or such other services, in such manner as may be decided upon after consultation with the admiralty and as would best accord with their varying circumstances.

That embodied the proposition that is before the House to-day in a sense. What did the First Minister say in answer to that only two and a half years ago?

I am sorry to say, so far as Canada is concerned, we cannot agree to the resolution. We took the ground many years ago that we had enough to do in that respect in our country before committing ourselves to a general claim. The government of Canada has done a great deal in that respect. Our action was not understood, but I was glad to see that the First Lord of the Admiralty admitted we had done much more than he was aware of. It is impossible, in my humble opinion, to have a uniform policy on this matter.

The disproportion is too great between the mother country and the colonies. We have too much to do otherwise; in the mother country, you must remember, they have no expenses to incur with regard to public works; whereas, in most of the colonies, certainly in Canada, we have to tax ourselves to the utmost of our resources in the development of our country, and we could not contribute, or undertake to do more than we are doing in that way. For my part, if the motion were pressed to a conclusion, I should have to vote against it.

What was before the country was his flat refusal to do anything in any respect. Then he says that this matter, having been before the country, there is now no necessity of submitting it to the people. We hear a great deal with reference to the right hon. gentleman's attitude by hon. members of this House, who endeavour to square it with his past record; we hear him eulogized by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who say that his name will go down through the annals of history when hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are not heard of. Well, it is to be hoped as he lived in history and ceases to act, his record will appear more consistent. Why, is it necessary that we should have some interest in the navy? They say: You are going to give $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 to England, and you will never see your money again. Is it not right that Canada should do something in recognition of the service which England has rendered this country in protecting her shores with her navy? Oh, well, they say, we want everything done in Canada. A few years ago hon. gentlemen opposite were not very anxious to have everything done in Canada. Now, they have changed their minds. We remember that a British shilling was not worth as much as an American dollar to hon. gentlemen opposite. British connection has been our protection and a contribution of $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 will have a wonderful moral effect upon the world. We will have for our protection more of a navy than we can build in Canada in the next twenty years. It will be a notification to the world that the mother will be protected by the children that surround her in recognition of her past service. We talk about Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia, &c., but there are no people in this country who are more interested and I believe more sincere in their wishes to maintain British connection than the French people of Quebec. Why? They realize that British connection means the continuance of the solid liberty which they possess. They do not wish to run the risk of having any change in that respect. Is there any necessity of our recognizing our obligation to British connection if you wish to speak of it in that way? I believe that it is the great bond that holds us together and gives us our security, liberty and permanence. What does it mean? The British navy means the great police force of the world. It does not mean militarism. It means that it has made it impossible for piracy to continue on the high seas. It means that it has been made impossible for the slave trade to continue, and it means that no citizen is so well protected and guarded in his rights as the man who is able to call himself a British subject. For these reasons, if for no other, and there are no higher or more consistent reasons, Canada ought to recognize the obligations which she owes to British connection and show that she is prepared to stand to the utmost against the world and do her duty to the empire to which she belongs. Is there a man in whose breast it does not awaken pride and respect to realize that he belongs to the British empire? Lord Rosebery said that it was the greatest secular force that the world had ever seen in the interest of peace, harmony and good. Are we not to lend our assistance and aid, our moiety and our arms, if need be, to continue that great moral force which secures to Canada and to all the people of the British empire that peace and prosperity which every one now enjoys under the Union Jack? The navy of England is regarded as one of the greatest factors contributing to the public peace. Are we to have no share in it? That is the simple question before the House to-day. We are going to have a navy which is going to be built in Canada. When are you going to construct the guns in Canada with which to equip these great vessels? Has the Minister of War any idea when we will be able to build these guns in Canada? When will you be able to make the plate to put upon these vessels in Canada? You talk about putting Canadians on these vessels, and rightly so, but the quickest way of putting Canadians on these vessels is to put them on British training ships on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, drill them there and have them ready for your navy when your navy is ready to float. The Minister of Militia and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken have talked a great deal about

manning these vessels with Canadians. How many of our permanent militia are native born Canadians, can you tell me? Why, the Minister of Militia stated to-day that only twenty per cent were Canadian born and yet we hear a great deal about putting Canadians upon these vessels. What did the right hon. gentleman say when he went on to talk of the navy and our fighting qualities? He turned round to his friends and he said: You need not fight if you don't like, you have to volunteer first. I suppose he intends that for the province of Quebec. The probability is that the right hon. gentleman does not intend to fight and his friends don't intend to fight. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind about that, because, I believe he made that statement with the express intention that it should go abroad that some one else should do the fighting, while the government built the navy. Well, I think that is about what we will get. There is a great deal said about Germany and I am not going to pitch into Germany. I think Germany is able to take care of herself. There is no doubt a great deal of activity in Germany in shipbuilding, but a great deal of that shipbuilding has been for her inland waters, and she carries to-day four-fifths of her inland commerce by water instead of by rail. She has trained her men in the inland waters and she has given to her people cheap freight, and in that way a great impetus to her industries. That is a legitimate purpose for Germany to pursue. Her object is to get colonies, in which she can place her people under the German flag, and that is commendable. England stands prominently in the world as a great colonizing nation, and the only successful colonizer, and other nations are no doubt jealous of that. That jealous feeling must permeate the German people to some extent and the example of England in that respect is no doubt a legitimate example for Germany to aim at. There is no doubt that Germany desires to secure possession of the Rhine to its mouth, including Holland, but there is no room for German settlement in Holland, and the great object of Germany is to get room for her people under her own flag. There is another question that has not been much talked about—and you would think after the talk we have had in this House for the last three or four weeks there could not be a subject in theology or history that has not been touched upon—but, we have not talked much about the position of the American people in regard to their maritime affairs. When we hear the government and their supporters talking about war vessels, and what they are going to do and all that, it reminds me of some people who were getting ready for war and who declared: We will hang our colours on the outer wall and if the enemy comes we will run away, but if the enemy does not come we will bleed and die for our country. The Americans are a great people, 80,000,000 of them; aggressive, energetic, wealthy, ingenious, but what about their shipping? When you take away the lake shipping of the United States they have very little left. It is possible to have a navy, it is possible to have all that accompanies a navy, and yet not have that shipping and commerce which a nation should have. The Americans have no continuity in their naval policy, and in that they are different from England or Germany, or the other European countries. They will bring in a large estimate and reduce it, and they will bring in a small estimate and increase it, and the strange thing about shipping in the United States is that while 50,000,000 bushels of wheat are shipped from Baltimore yearly, only 10,000 bushels of that is shipped under the flag that sheltered the grain while it was growing. They have 1,200 ships leaving New York every year, laden with American commerce for the ports of the world, but only seven of these ships carry the American flag. No wonder that one of the American senators said: Just think of it, ten cruisers, eight Dreadnoughts, and nineteen battleships, guarding eight merchant ships in the Pacific. That is a beautiful picture is it not? Is that the kind of thing we want in this country? You talk about war and of sending your navy over to help England, why, England would have to send an escort over to help your navy to cross the ocean to get ready to fight. If we were a small country surrounded by water, and having a population of 7,000,000 we might build a navy, but we are a sparsely settled country with an enormous area of land and we are proposing to do what there is no necessity for doing in the interest of this country and which is not in the interests of British connection and the empire either. It means that you will spend $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, or $5,000,000 this year and two, three, or four millions next year, and you have got to continue doing that or your navy will become obsolete. That is a serious question before this country to-day. If we had 20,000,000 people it would be a different question altogether. Now, from all I can learn, far and near, the verdict of the Canadian people is: We don't want a navy built in this country to-day, if there is necessity to do something to help the motherland in the crisis, and let the matter end there for the present. That is the opinion of the Canadian people. We have heard a great deal about this country, and that country, and the other country, and before I sit down I want to say that the strongest card we can play for the assistance of the empire and for the maintenance of British connection is to show to the world that we

will be ready to act and act promptly, and if we do that, hostile nations will stay their hand before they think of attacking the motherland.

On motion of Mr. Warburton the debate was adjourned.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply to take up the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, February 18, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.—Mr. Boyce.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That from Monday next, the 21st instant, inclusive, government orders shall have precedence immediately after questions to be put by members.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL AGREEMENT WITH GERMANY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to remind the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) of the statement that he proposed bringing down with respect to the German tariff as applied to other portions of the empire. In that connection, I would like to point out that the memorandum laid on the table of the House enumerates certain articles as they are enumerated in the German conventional tariff. It omits, however, certain information which was submitted to the House in the papers brought down with respect to the French treaty. It does not disclose the duties applied to these articles under the conventional tariff, or the maximum tariff. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be good enough to have a statement made conveying that information, so that we can more easily appreciate what will be the effect of the arrangement which has been entered into.

In addition to that, I observe, that, by the third article of the agreement which has been entered into with the imperial German consul for Canada, the agreement itself is a provisional one, and that the question of a general convention for the regulation of commercial relations between Germany and Canada should be deferred for consideration at a time that may be found mutually convenient. I would ask if such negotiations are now in progress, and, if not presently in progress, whether it is the intention of the government to embark upon such negotiations immediately?

Mr. FIELDING. Answering the last question first: no such negotiations are in progress, and no immediate negotiations are contemplated under that clause. It is intended that, as the clause itself says, at a time mutually convenient, such negotiations may be taken up, but there is no immediate intention to deal with the matter in that broader form. With regard to the papers brought down, they were necessarily, having regard to the time when they were prepared, confined to the agreement itself, and in the agreement was not necessarily furnished the information the hon. gentleman suggests. But it is proper that the information should be furnished to the House, and I will have such a statement prepared and brought down at an early day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps it would be better to show in the statement both the maximum and conventional rates.

Mr. FIELDING. I have already given directions to have such a statement prepared, converted approximately into Canadian currency as the most convenient method of conveying the information to the House. The first part of the hon. gentleman's question was as to a statement which was to be brought down. I have not contemplated bringing down any document; it was rather a question of a general inquiry, and while the inquiry is not complete perhaps, I think I might say that so far as it has gone it has confirmed the impression which I expressed the other day, that the other portions of the British empire do share with the United Kingdom in the privileges of the conventional tariff of Germany, share, as I understand, to the fullest extent, but which receive that consideration in return for the most favoured nation treatment which those various portions of the empire are obliged to grant to Germany. That is the information and the impression that I have. I have every reason to believe that we could obtain the same consideration on the same terms, that is, if we are willing to give to Germany at this moment what is called the most favoured nation treatment, that is, the best treatment that is granted to any foreign

country, we could receive in return the full conventional tariff, just as it is to-day enjoyed by other portions of the empire. But in order to do that we should be obliged to reduce our duty on German goods to the schedule of rates set forth in the French treaty; and whatever may be done in the future, for the present we have not thought it expedient to take that step. I think that is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is quite satisfactory so far as it goes, but it does not clear up one matter I had in mind, and I am not at all sure that the other day I made my meaning quite apparent in that respect. What I desired to know above all was whether, in consideration for receiving the advantages of the German conventional tariff, the other dominions of the empire are bound to concede to the German empire any tariff concessions which such dominions might make to the United Kingdom?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I think not. At the time of the difficulty between Canada and Germany, Canada was the only portion of the empire which had granted a preference to Great Britain; consequently Canada was the only portion of the empire which was brought into antagonism with Germany. My hon. friend had the impression that immediately after the denunciation of the old treaty a new treaty was made, giving to the various portions of the empire, except Canada, all the privileges that the former enjoyed. So far as I can ascertain, there was no treaty, but in another way the same result was brought about by an exchange of correspondence. Privileges which had formerly been extended to the British empire were extended to the British empire except in the case of Canada, and the reason for that was that Canada was the only portion of the empire which at that time granted a preference to Great Britain; consequently Germany had no quarrel with the rest of the empire, she quarrelled with Canada, and the result we know. So I have no doubt that in consequence of the contest with Canada, in consequence of the contention which Canada set up, and successfully set up, I think it is correct to say that Germany no longer insists upon the right of receiving the same treatment as other portions of the British empire; consequently to-day the other portions of the British empire would be receiving the full conventional tariff of Germany. That is my impression.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Although granting tariff concessions to Great Britain which were not extended to Germany?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, these tariff concessions which have been granted in more recent years. As I have pointed out, at the origin of the trouble Canada was the only country which granted such concessions, and it was several years afterwards before the concessions were granted to Great Britain by some other of the overseas dominions. In the meantime Canada had made a fight on that question, and I think it is not too much to say that the German government began to take a different view, and that to-day they do not insist as respects the other portions of the empire on that or which they contended a few years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. While dealing with this matter I would like to ask the Finance Minister if there was any special reason why such important grains as peas and rye, rye especially, should not be included in the German conventional tariff.

Mr. FIELDING. I might have difficulty in giving a reason as to particular items. If we were dealing with a permanent treaty, a comprehensive treaty, it would be important that we should contend for every item. This only professes to be a provisional agreement. We could not expect to get the whole conventional tariff from Germany, because we are not prepared to give what others give. As to the merits of a particular item, I might have difficulty in answering my hon. friend. Those items which we have received we think are important. I have no doubt there may be others which some hon. gentleman might also think important.

Mr. HENDERSON. Especially rye.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not answer as respects a particular item.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister along those same lines, why dairy products are not included, also bacon and flour, and a number of other articles, in which farmers have a direct interest.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be pleased if hon. gentlemen desiring information on a particular point like that would be good enough to let their questions stand, and I will make inquiry. I do not pretend to give reasons why any particular item is not there. We could not obtain the whole earth, but we think we have obtained our share of it.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if it is too late to make any representations in regard to the item of hay. I have received a large number of communications from extensive hay dealers in Montreal, and they have requested me to ask the government if it would not still be possible to have that item included. It seems to me that there is a possibility of a large trade with Germany in hay. I

was asked to bring this question to the notice of the government at once, in order to find out if it were possible to include that article in the temporary arrangement.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid it would be too late. By the terms of the agreement, as my hon. friend will see, the document is complete and signed. However, it is only at best a temporary arrangement; and if it has the effect of bringing out suggestions as to other items which it seems desirable should receive consideration in connection with negotiations with foreign countries, I should be happy to receive such suggestions, and we will profit by them in due course.

Mr. LALOR. I would like to ask if Canada enjoys the same rate of tariff that the United States enjoys with Germany.

Mr. FIELDING. I think negotiations are at present in progress between Germany and the United States. The German government has taken authority to grant to the United States its full conventional tariff. Whether they have actually by treaty at this moment granted the full conventional tariff, I do not know. But upon the items mentioned in our schedule, the rates will be the same as those enjoyed by the United States.

SAULT STE. MARIE DRY DOCK COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works whether any decision has been arrived at as to granting the subsidy applied for in June last, or thereabouts, by the Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Company in support of their undertaking?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have written my hon. friend on the subject, I presume he has not received my letter, But no decision has yet been arrived at.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the cause of the delay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to state that to my hon. friend. The matter has not yet come before council.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Harbours and rivers, Ontario—River St. Lawrence—improvement of Canadian channel between Kingston and Brockville, $60,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This is to continue the work of improving the Canadian channel between Kingston and Brockville. There was a vote for it last year of $75,000, of which we do not expect to have expended more than $15,000 by the end of the fiscal year, so that the total amount we are asking now is a revote.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nature of the improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is entirely the blasting of rock. It is the straightening of the channel by blasting off the points of islands along the route. The object is to make the Canadian channel navigable for the larger vessels which are now obliged to use the American channel.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is this the total estimated cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total estimated cost is $125,000.

Mr. LENNOX. This is as much as you expect to be able to expend this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. We have only spent $15,000 during the current fiscal year, but the work did not proceed as rapidly as we had hoped it would.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What depth, width and length of channel do you expect this improvement to give you there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps I could give the information better if I gave a full description of the work. The first working is 18½ miles east of Kingston, and will be the removal of the three shoals lying about 500 feet north of the 'Punts Islands.' The first and largest shoal is about 170 x 100 feet in area on the 16-foot depth contour, with a minimum depth upon it of 5 feet. The second, a small shoal to the north-east, being a continuation of the above larger shoal, and which is about 30 x 40 feet on its 16-foot depth contour, with a minimum depth upon it of 12 feet. The third shoal is 500 feet west of the two above-mentioned, and is about 90 x 30 feet on its 16-foot depth contour, with a minimum depth upon it of about 10 feet. The total amount of material in these shoals will approximate 2,610 cubic yards measurement in place.

The next location for improvement lies ¾ miles to the east and is a submerged point which forms a part of the north-west end of Camelot island. This point is approximately 100 x 40 feet, sloping at an abrupt angle from a depth of from 5 feet to the line of 16 feet depth. The quantity in this point will approximate 200 cubic yards in place. Excavated material at this point may be wasted in the main channel near by. A shoal 300 feet from the northwest end of Myers' island, which is 5¾ miles below Camelot island, will require to be removed. It is about 160 x 60 feet on its 16-foot depth contour, has a minimum depth on it of 9 feet and contains approximately 725 cubic yards in place.

One half mile below the Myers shoal is Lyndoe island, the submerged point of the north-west end of which will require to be removed, and is that part between the shore line and the 16-foot depth contour. The slope of this point approaches mid-channel at a very abrupt angle. It will approximate 250 by 60 feet, with a minimum depth of that part nearest the shore of the island, of about 6 feet. The quantity to be removed will be about 2,005 cubic yards in place.

At Fiddler's elbow proper, about ¾ mile below the Lyndoe light, are five locations to be improved.

A part of the island known as Morris point will require to be removed to a depth of 16 feet low water. The part to be removed being that which lies on the channel side of the red line, part of which is above and part below the water surface. The material there will approximate 7,300 cubic yards in place.

To the south of Wood island there is a small island which will require to be removed. The quantity here will approximate 9,275 cubic yards in place.

To the north of Wood island are three submerged locations, all within a distance of one-half mile. These will require to be removed to the depth of 16 feet. These locations will approximate 3,300 cubic yards.

In mid-channel at the upper entrance to Brock's group of islands, and about 3½ miles above the railway dock at Brockville, is the Hillcrest shoal.

This shoal will require to be removed to a depth of 16 feet at low water. It is approximtaely 300 by 130 feet, and contains about 3,500 cubic yards in place. We hope to obtain a depth of 16 feet at low water.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Gilbert, who is connected, I think, with the Gilbert Dredging Company of Montreal.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has he sublet the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Gilbert, or the Gilbert Dredging Company, has lately assigned the work.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He has assigned it to another contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Was any work done except at Fiddler's Elbow last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work done during the present fiscal year has been confined to the improvement of the channel through Fiddler's Elbow.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. All that was done there was the letting of a sub-contract to some persons to blow the top off an island down to low water mark.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know as to that.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I am passing it every day, and there was practically nothing done except putting in a few shots and blowing the top off the island. None of the other work was proceeded with, and I certainly think that the government, if it is the intention to deepen the channel, should let it to another contractor. This contractor fooled away all the summer, and did practically nothing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the work proceeded very slowly, and a great deal of fault was found with the contractor. He was notified that unless arrangements were made for more speedily going on with the work, the contract would be cancelled. An arrangement was made, and after that, I believe the work went on more satisfactorily.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When does the minister expect the work to be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We expect it to be completed in 1911.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the rate per cubic yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $3.95; it is all rock work.

Mr. DANIEL. What for the other?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no other, it is all rock.

Mr. DANIEL. This department is doing a very large amount of dredging all over the country, and I understand that the department has under its control some dredges. I would like to ask the minister how many dredges the Public Works Department has? I do not know whether it is the intention of the government to increase the number rather than to have so much of the dredging done by private contractors. We find all over this country that dredging is done at very varying rates per cubic yard, and I have no doubt that if the government did this work itself, it would be done very much cheaper. Where there is so much of this work to be done, I think that the government could get it more cheaply done if the department had its own dredges and did its own work. I would like the minister to give us an idea of how many dredges there are in his department, and where they are. Then we could judge whether we should advise the minister to have more dredges, so that his own department could do more of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed that a return which was asked for last session

will be brought down in a few days, giving a list of the government dredges and their operations for the past three or four years. When we come to the dredging vote, I shall be glad to give to my hon. friend a statement of where the government dredges are at the present time; I have not the information available at the moment. In my opinion, there is a great deal in the suggestion that the government fleet of dredges should be increased. Of course, we cannot always judge of the proper cost of dredging in one place from what it is in another. The prices vary greatly by reason of difference in the locality or in the quality of the soil, the quantity to be removed, the depth of the water, the liability to storms, and other considerations; but, speaking generally, I am inclined to think that the government is able to get dredging done by its own dredges at a lower rate than by contract. On the Pacific coast, where we have four dredges at work, we are doing all the dredging with our own dredges. In the eastern provinces we have recently somewhat increased the government dredging fleet, and I anticipate that we shall continue to increase it with reasonable rapidity.

Mr. DANIEL. Are all the government dredges employed at present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, during the past season every government dredge has been kept vigorously at work.

Mr. LALOR. Can the minister give us the cost per yard of dredging by the government dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I have just stated, the cost varies so much that it is only possible to give the cost in each case. It may be ten cents in one case, fifty cents in another, a dollar in another. In order to get the information for myself so as to have it for the committee, I asked the deputy minister to have a statement made, as near as might be, of the cost of dredging with the government dredge at Gaspereau during the season just passed; and I find, taking the cost of operation, and making a fair allowance for interest, maintenance and sinking fund, that it cost about one dollar per cubic yard. There are other places where the government dredges do the work at fifteen cents, twenty cents or twenty-five cents. When the return comes down, my hon. friend will be able to see the cost of dredging by government dredges at the various places where they have been employed.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the minister's attention to that Gaspereau work, because it gives at a very recent date the estimated cost of the work done by the government itself and the cost of the work done by contractors. In 1907 an estimate was obtained by the department for certain dredging work at Gaspereau, and the minister's own engineer on the spot estimated it at from fifteen cents to twenty cents per yard. In the following season the minister let that work by contract at ninety cents per yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After public tender.

Mr. BARKER. When the chief engineer of the department was examined on the subject, he said that twenty cents was the estimate made by the departmental engineer of what the work would actually cost the government, and in the face of that the government let the contract to the Maritime Dredging Company of St. John at ninety cents a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad my hon. friend has mentioned this matter, because it will afford me pleasure to give to the committee all the information I can in regard to the Gaspereau dredging. The estimate of the probable cost was made originally by Mr. Day in 1903; Mr. Day was an engineer of the department. Mr. Stead evidently followed his estimate and the chief engineer with no knowledge of the locality, never having visited the spot, accepted the estimate of Mr. Day who evidently was of the opinion that it could be done by the government dredge at that price. As to letting the contract—there has been very strong pressure for a good many years by the people of Port Elgin and by the people of Gaspereau that the work should be done. When I became minister, the member for Westmorland urged me very strongly to have the work done with the least possible delay. I knew from inquiry that there were no government dredges in the vicinity and that it probably would be difficult to get a contractors' dredge. I was aware that the maritime dredging company was bringing a dredge down from the St. Lawrence, in the vicinity of Chicoutimi, to the maritime provinces, and on the route down it would pas Port Elgin and could go through the straits of Canso around the Nova Scotia coast to the Bay of Fundy. I asked the manager of the Maritime Dredging Company if he would be willing to have his dredge stop on the way down as the work was urgent, and, pending the calling for tenders to go to work, and agree to accept for the work which would be done pending the reception of tenders and only that, the price of the lowest accepted tender. He agreed to that and when the dredge reached Port Elgin it stopped there and the engineer was notified it was ready to go to work. Tenders were called in the ordinary way and there was only one tender, that of the Maritime Dredging Company at 90 cents per cubic yard. The chief engineer, having that

estimate of Mr. Day though it had been made several years ago, and also the estimate of Mr. Stead based upon Mr. Day's estimate, thought that the tender price was too high and before deciding he made further inquiry. I say that Mr. W. J. McCordick, who had been for I think 30 years superintendent of dredging in the maritime provinces—I do not know whether he was appointed by the late Conservative government or by the Liberal government between 1873 and 1878, but at all events he remained for 18 years in the employ of the Conservative government enjoying their confidence as he enjoyed the confidence of this government to the most marked degree. My hon. friend from St. John knew the late Mr. McCordick, and I think he will agree with me that it will be difficult to find an official of the government who was ever more careful to guard the public interest than that gentleman. If he ever erred at all with regard to accounts it would be on the side of protecting the government and against the individual claimant—Mr. McCordick was directed by the chief engineer to go to Gaspereau and examine into the work which was being done, with a view to giving his opinion as to whether the tender price was fair and reasonable. There was no man in the lower provinces better qualified to give an opinion than Mr. McCordick for the reason that he had been for 25 years in charge of the government dredges. He knew just what a dredge would do, he was familiar with the weather conditions and the effect of gales upon such an exposed coast. He went to Gaspereau, saw the dredge at work, saw the conditions, and he reported —and my hon. friend must have seen that report because it was on file before the Committee on Public Accounts. He reported that in his judgment 90 cents per yard was a fair and reasonable price. I was not content with that and I directed that Mr. J. K. Scammell, the resident engineer in St. John in charge of dredging work, should also be sent to Gaspereau independently of Mr. McCordick to make an examination and give his opinion as to whether the tender price of 90 cents was fair and reasonable. He went and reported and his report was on file before the committee. In his judgment 90 cents per cubic yard was fair and reasonable. Then Mr. Stead, the resident engineer, who had adopted Mr. Day's original estimate of 20 cents per cubic yard for work done by the government dredge, also reported that 90 cents per cubic yard was fair and reasonable, and the chief engineer having those reports before him also certified that in his opinion 90 cents was fair and reasonable. Therefore, before the formal contract was entered into agreeing to pay to the Maritime Dredging Company their tender price of 90 cents per cubic yard, we had the reports of Mr. W. J. McCordick, of Mr. J. K. Scammell, of Mr. Stead, and of the chief engineer Mr. Lafleur, that the price was fair and reasonable. With all these certificates I sent a recommendation to council that the tender price be accepted. Now then, the Maritime Dredging Company continued the work during the fall of 1908, but as it got along towards November the weather became very rough and they took the dredge away to St. John. Last year, in order to continue the work I endeavoured to arrange as early as possible for one of the dredges to go there to continue the dredging operations. I asked the president of the company or one of the directors, or I think both of them, if they would go back and they said they did not care to do so because of the heavy storms which frequently prevailed there and they also referred to the fact that one of their scows had been swamped, entailing considerable loss.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the president of the company to whom the minister spoke?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. John E. Moore.

Mr CROCKET. And the other director?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. George McAvity. The pressure was continued by the people of Port Elgin and by the member for Westmorland to go on with this dredging. I was urged in the very strongest way to continue it because there are large interests at Port Elgin, there is considerable shipping, large quantities of lumber are shipped from there, and it was urged upon me, and I was impressed by the fact, that it was very important to continue the dredging as early as possible. I was able later on in the season, to remove the dredge 'George McKenzie', one of the government dredges from Nova Scotia and bring it to Gaspereau for the purpose of continuing the work. I have had a statement made up showing the actual cost of bringing the 'George McKenzie' and taking her back, the actual cost of operation while she was at work, and after allowing a reasonable amount of interest and wear and tear and sinking fund, besides a reasonable profit, the cost is as near as may be $1 per cubic yard as against 90 cents paid the contractor. These are the facts with reference to Gaspereau. The place is very much exposed, the depth of water is not very great at low tide or even at high tide, and the circumstances attending the dredging are very unusual, so that I am satisfied that the engineers exercised a fair judgment when they placed the cost at 90 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. minister is correct in his story, then the chief engin-

eer did not know what he was talking about, because his account contradicts almost in every particular what the hon. gentleman has given us. The department directed that Mr. Stead, the local engineer, should report; his report was obtained, and then the department directed that advertisements should be published for tenders. While those advertisements were being published, and within a week or ten days before the tenders were to be received and opened, the department handed the work over to this Maritime Company of St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Under the agreement I spoke of.

Mr. BARKER. The work was placed by the department in the hands of the company, the only condition being that whatever the lowest tender might be, the work should be done at that price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has misunderstood me. I thought I stated clearly that the understanding with the company was that if they were not the lowest tenderers, they would leave the work and would only be paid for the work done up to that time at the price of the lowest tender.

Mr. BARKER. As the understanding was in writing, I know that the minister is wrong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman does not.

Mr. BARKER. I do. The condition of the letter was that the work was to be placed in the hands of the company on the condition that they would carry out the contract at the price of the lowest tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BARKER. No other tender was received, except the tender of this company. While asking tenders from the public, the department put this company in possession of the work, under a direct message from the chief engineer instructing Mr. Stead to put them at work and specifying distinctly the condition that they were to be allowed for the work, whatever the lowest tender would be. There was only one tender of course. No man of ordinary common sense would ever suppose that there would be any other. Why should any people tender to do that work when this company was already in charge and had written authority from the office giving them the work. The minister was placing that work in the hands of the Maritime Company at whatever price they chose to tender for themselves. The hon. gentleman makes the statement, probably on the recollection of a year ago, but there are numbers of gentlemen on both sides who heard all this evidence given forty-eight hours ago and who have read the papers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I can read and understand documents just as well as my hon. friend, and I tell this committee that the understanding—not only verbal, but written—was that the company should be simply given the work temporarily until tenders were received, in which case we would accept the lowest tender and they would be paid for what they had done at the lowest tender rate. That is not new. It is not a practice inaugurated since I became minister, but one which has prevailed a long time—probably ever since confederation. Where there is urgent work to be done, tenders are called, and the person who does the temporary dredging is paid simply for what he does at the price of the lowest tender and then has to quit. In this case if any one else had tendered for even 85 cents per cubic yard, the company would have had to accept that for the work they did and then they would have had to take their dredge away, and the dredge owned by the lowest tenderer would be put in its place. The hon. gentleman says that the fact of the company having been set to work, prevented other people from tendering. I do not believe it. I do not believe my hon. friend can produce the testimony of any dredge contractor who would say that he was deterred from tendering by reason of another being put to work. But I know perfectly well, by reason of the isolated position of Gaspereau that it was possible, if this company did not put their dredge to work, which they were bringing down through the Straits of Northumberland, we would not get the work done, and it was work which the people of Gaspereau and Port Elgin represented as work of the most urgent character.

Mr. BARKER. The dredge was at the work before you gave them the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On its way to St. John, the dredge stopped as I had recommended. Why should it not stop, it was arranged with the responsible head of the department that it should. They notified the engineer that they were ready to go to work and they went to work upon the arrangement I have mentioned. That was a fair and reasonable and businesslike arrangement. It is one only come to in cases of urgency. It would not have been come to, under these circumstances, but for the fact that this dredge was brought down and passed this very spot, and, on account of the urgency, it was not unreasonable to give it the work temporarily. What should I have done?

Mr. BARKER. You should not have let that work within ten days and awaited the opening of tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How has the country suffered by that? My hon. friend says that if I had not done that, somebody else might have come in and tendered. But he cannot find the slightest evidence that any contractor was prepared or would have tendered for that work, whether the dredge was at work or not. Is not this the important thing, that I advertised for tenders and nobody evidently wanted to go there to go to works. And is it not an important fact that, the next year, these people, the Maritime Dredging Company, having the opportunity to go there to work, did not want to go? If it were the 'soft snap' my hon. friend would have the committee believe, would not they have been anxious to go there? But they had had enough of it; they had worked there under most disadvantageous circumstances. And, when we actually put the government dredge to work, we found that a fair and reasonable cost was $1 per cubic yard. Now, does the hon. member think the price is too great? Does he think that the late W. J. McCordick gave a fictitious valuation for that work? Will my hon. friend who represents the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) rise in his place and say that he would not rely on the statement which the late superintendent of dredging made? I do not think he will, for he knew W. J. McCordick as well as I did, and he knows there was not a more careful and conscientious official in the employ of the Dominion than that gentleman. And will he say that Mr. Scammell, an engineer of ability and integrity, would go up there, and, having examined the work, make a false certificate? And would he say that Mr. Stead, who also saw the work, had to go on it day after day, made a false report when he said that it was worth 90 cents a yard? Surely, these hon. gentlemen who have taken up days and days of the time of the Public Accounts Committee——

Mr. LALOR. May I ask the hon. minister a question?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LALOR. Is the Mr. Stead of whom he speaks, the same gentleman who reported that the price paid for the saw-dust wharf was a fair and reasonable price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The same gentleman. And may I say that not a man from the town of Richibucto, the county of Kent, or the province of New Brunswick, has ventured to come here before the committee, except Mr. Richard O'Leary, and impugn the valuation, and——

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Richard O'Leary sold the property for $700.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY—he is a violent partisan, one of the most violent——

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. He sold the property himself for $700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These hon. gentlemen incurred the expense of summoning a very prominent man, a resident of Richibucto, Mr. James, a prominent lawyer, who has lived in Richibucto all his life, and who drew the deed of this property to Mr. O'Leary, yet not one of them ventured to ask Mr. James the fair value of the property. On the other hand, disinterested witnesses testified that it was fairly worth from $5,000 to $10,000. And I will say this to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) who asked this question, that the Crown can dispose of a part of that property, retaining the portion which we require more immediately and which is most necessary for the purpose of the Crown with a view to extending the railway wharf, for $3,500.

An hon. MEMBER. Better do it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And, with this sold, we shall have a most valuable property, which, when it is improved, will be not only of advantage to the general trade, but will greatly promote the interest of the town of Richibucto.

Mr. LALOR. Does the hon. minister intend to dispose of that property for $3,500?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I may say, I do. I can sell the whole property for $5,500, or $500 more than the Crown paid for it. I can retain 200 feet frontage——

Mr. GOODEVE. May I ask the minister —can he sell it at the advanced price without improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, without spending a dollar.

Mr. CROCKET. To whom?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To A. and R. Loggie.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some hon. members laugh, but let me say that A. and R. Loggie are men whose reputation will not be questioned, in the province of New Brunswick at all events, and they have made us a distinct and business offer of $5,500 for the property. I have declined it, because we require 200 feet to improve the wharf and give the necessary railway facilities to——

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Chairman, I——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend (Mr. Owen) will permit me one moment——

Mr. OWEN. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Last session, I brought up some matters relating to Ontario when the committee was considering the estimates

of the maritime provinces, and I was told I was out of order. Now, I think we ought to consider Ontario estimates this afternoon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member (Mr. Owen) is quite right. But I was asked a question by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who entered into a discussion, and another hon. gentleman asked me about the resident engineer of the wharf at Richibucto.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In discussions on the estimates, I am always disposed to give a wide interpretation to the rule, and allow as free and broad a discussion as possible. In the present case, I think the discussion has gone beyond what is relevant to the item. The item of Gaspereau can be referred to to illustrate or apply to the present item. But the discussion has not taken that form, and the point of order is well taken.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. member (Mr. Lalor) asked me a question about Richibucto wharf, and I felt that it would be discourteous of me not to reply to an hon. member who is always so courteous as my hon. friend. He will be glad to know, I am sure, that we can keep 200 feet of the Richibucto property, which will give us 400 feet on the Richibucto river, and afford good railway and terminal facilities, and sell the remainder of the property for $3,500. We have a positive and distinct offer of that amount. I shall not further trespass upon your consideration.

Mr. CROCKET. I regret very much to be compelled to say that the statement the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) has made of the arrangement with the Maritime Dredging Company in regard to Gaspereau is incorrect. I challenge proof.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot be allowed to re-open the question unless he specifically applies it to the item under discussion.

Mr. CROCKET. This refers to dredging, and the dredging work throughout the country——

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be an item for dredging generally.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the discussion has proceeded further than it ought to have done, and is declared to be out of order, it will not do to refer back to the words of one particular speaker and make those words a reason for continuing the discussion. At present, the item under discussion is the river St. Lawrence. Any reference to similar work elsewhere that can be brought to bear upon this item is in order, but the discussion of other items for the purpose of considering whether the expenditures under those votes were well or wisely made will not be in order. I have ruled that the discussion on Gaspereau or other items for that purpose is not in order. I hope the hon. member will not discuss it in that sense. If he can apply his argument to the item under discussion, it will be received.

Mr. CROCKET. I did not hear the whole of the present discussion, but I understood that the item was one for dredging in Ontario. We are discussing the policy and practice of the department with regard to dredging contracts, and we have a very illuminating case in the province of New Brunswick which I think the House should be fully seized of, so that hon. members may determine precisely how these dredging works are being handled by the Public Works Department. I had not intended to intervene in this discussion at all, and would not have done so but for the statement that the Minister of Public Works made with reference to the terms of the contract under which the dredging at Gaspereau river was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) think that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was not equal to the question. I spoke in answer to him.

Mr. CROCKET. I am referring, not to what the hon. member for Hamilton said, but to what the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) said. He stated that the arrangement with the Maritime Dredging Company should—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CROCKET. I think I am perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must rule in this sense—that when an hon. member has been called to order for speaking of matters that are not relevant to the question before the committee, it is not allowable for others to discuss what that hon. gentleman has said, and which has been ruled out of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) may, perhaps, take up Gaspereau or some other item in a way to make it applicable to the item under discussion. But he is not at liberty to discuss what the minister said since what the minister said has been declared to be out of order. The point of order having been raised and decided, is not open to discussion.

Mr. CROCKET. I understood the objection was taken only to the matter of the Richibucto wharf. I was confining my remarks entirely to the question of dredging,

which is involved in the item before the Chair.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Owen) to the effect that last year when some items for another province were under consideration, he rose to speak with reference to an Ontario item, and he was shut off on the ground that the discussion was to be confined to the item under consideration. I think it is better that that rule should be observed. I will say to the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) that he will not be precluded from an opportunity of discussing dredging in the maritime provinces, because there will be a vote for dredging in the maritime provinces.

Mr. EDWARDS. As a representative from Ontario, I feel that the Richibucto wharf matter is one that interests us, because the Ontario members desire that the money on all these wharfs shall not be wasted.

Mr. CROCKET. On August 4, 1908, the chief engineer of Public Words had telegraphed to the resident engineer——

Mr. CARVELL. I rise to a point of order. If the hon. member for York is going to be allowed to discuss this matter, let us know. He has been ruled against twice. I would like now a positive ruling from the Chair, as to whether the member for York is going to obey the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. When a subject like dredging is under consideration is it not competent for any member of this House to give a history of any transaction in the same department, or under the same government? He must give a history of a transaction in order to make a comparison, and is he not within his rights in making a comparison with regard to what has been done elsewhere? I would like a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I have expressed the rule with regard to such matters. The discussion on the item before the House should naturally be confined to the St. Lawrence itself, and the improvements between Brockville and Kingston. It is proper, however, by way of illustration, either of the work of the department or a work of a similar kind, dredging for instance, to quote other items of work that have been done by the department. But to quote these it is necessary that the argument should be applied from them to the item before the Chair. It then comes to be a matter of judgment with the Chairman whether the hon. member is doing that. If it appears to the Chairman that he is merely discussing this other item for the sake of deciding whether it is well done in itself, or for any other purpose than to apply it to the item before the Chair, then the Chairman would rule him out of order. Until the argument has proceeded a certain distance it is not possible to know whether the discussion is out of order or not. I am not in a position to rule as out of order a reference to Gaspereau the moment the hon. gentleman mentions the name. His argument must proceed a certain distance before I am able to judge whether he is discussing that merely for itself, or to apply it to the item before the Chair. I may ask the hon. gentleman, however, if he touches on any other item than that before the Chair, to apply his argument as rapidly and clearly as possible to this item. Otherwise I will be forced to rule him out of order.

Mr. CROCKET. I was referring to a statement the minister made with reference to the terms of the contract that was entered into with the Maritime Dredging Company, and I wanted to prove to the House that the minister's statement was incorrect.

Mr. CARVELL. What has that to do with the question under discussion? I want a decision.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. In that case I will have to decide that such a discussion is out of order. The minister himself was ruled out of order for prolonging an irrelevant discussion on the possibility of executing some other class of work. The item before the Chair is the St. Lawrence, Brockville item.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I want to inquire from the minister who this contract was sublet to? Mr. Gilbert was the contractor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware of any contract being sublet. One was assigned to Mr. E. G. Evans.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. At what price?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was $3,95 per cubic yard. It is marine blasting, to the depth of sixteen feet under water.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. It is merely blowing an island out. You have to blow the top off, and that is all they have done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Tenders were called for, and there was a large number received, and this was the lowest, at $3.95.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much has Gilbert been paid on his contract, and how much work has he done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure to the 1st of January was $8,253. It has been paid over on certificates of the engineer.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. How much work has been done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 2,000 cubic yards.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. What report or certificates does the engineer send in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. He gives certificates from time to time according to the quantities.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has the minister the certificates there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but I can get them for my hon. friend.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Has there been a yard of blasting under water done, of marine blasting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell my hon. friend as to that. But I can get the certificates which will show exactly. Perhaps I may be able to bring them down this evening.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In what way are the measurements taken? Does the engineer examine the work and make his estimates, or does he measure the amount of material excavated?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have a man constantly on the work, who makes his certificate, and then payment is made. The engineer in charge of the work, Mr. Chapleau, makes an actual survey, showing how much has been excavated. There was a survey made originally in situ, then he makes a new survey, and determines what quantities are removed; and upon those certificates payment is made.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When did the work commence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The contract was let on the 1st of February, 1909, and the work commenced early at the beginning of the season.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much does the man who has charge of the work receive?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You mean the engineer?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, I mean the other man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $2.50 per day.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Who is he?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Bullock.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems to be absurd that a man and an engineer are necessary to take charge of a work involving an expenditure of $8,000 in a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer is a member of the regular staff. We had expected that the work would proceed more rapidly and next year I have every reason to believe that it will go forward with reasonable rapidity.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In this case you have expended $1,000 to look after the expenditure of only $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does my hon. friend make it a thousand?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. $2.50 a day for a man in the neighbourhood of a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, from the opening of spring to the close of navigation which would not be over 100 or 150 days. Instead of $1,000 it would not be over $300 or $400.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then there is the engineer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The engineer is on the regular staff and he has other work under his charge.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would like the minister to bring down the engineer's returns at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will have them here at eight.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. The minister made the statement that work commenced immediately upon the opening of spring and went on during the whole season.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say 'immediately.' I said that it commenced after the season opened.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They went out in April last to this island, but the only work that they did was some time in August.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. My deputy informs me that he was there in May and that they were working at the island then.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. They hauled an old dredge out and she lay there till August.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We only pay by the cubic yard.

Mr. OWEN. $125,000 is a large amount of money, and from the way the work has been proceeding it seems to me that it is hardly necessary. I would like to ask the minister if there has been any trouble in navigating this part of the St. Lawrence channel recently, how he came to find out that it was necessary, and why they have been so slow in proceeding with the work if it is really necessary?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As long ago as 1901 representations were made to the department urging that this work should be done, and even as early as 1901 a survey was made under the direction of Mr. Chapleau, who is now in charge of the work with the view of having it done. But, nothing was done until last year. When I became minister the matter was urged strongly upon my attention by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) who gave me certain facts which convinced me that it was a work desirable in the public interest. It was also urged by the hon. Minister of Railways

and Canals (Mr. Graham). The channel which is used by the larger vessels is the American channel. I think that, if there was no other reason for that improvement, pride in our own country ought to induce the desire that we should have a channel on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence river which could be navigated by steamers ordinarily using that route. There is another thing. There are communities growing up on the Canadian side, and it is desirable, in the interest of these communities, that the Canadian channel should be improved so that the steamers ordinarily navigating the river might give accommodation to them.

Mr. J. HAGGART. What depth of navigation will this work give?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sixteen feet.

Mr. J. HAGGART. The same as the canals?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. This work has been going on for several years, if I remember correctly?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not this work.

Mr. HARTY. There never was a vote for it until last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it was commenced last year.

Mr. SPROULE. We have been told on former occasions of the importance of getting a certain depth of water along the river channel there. I remember distinctly the Hon. Mr. Tarte telling us what was intended to be done, and the work was to be continued for several years until it was accomplished. What I desire to ask is how much of this work has yet to be done, and if, when done, it will give a uniform depth of water in the St. Lawrence channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Kingston gives me a bit of information which had escaped my memory. This also shortens by six miles the round trip between Kingston and Brockville. In answer to my hon. friend from East Grey, I may say that during the past year the work done cost $8,253. The total estimated cost is $116,260.35, in addition to which there are superintendence and contingencies, making, in round figures, $125,000. That will be the total cost of the work, and will give us a comparatively straight channel upon the Canadian side of a depth of 16 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. It will give you a channel between Kingston and Montreal of at least 16 feet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is one company given the whole contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole contract at $3.95 per cubic yard.

Toronto harbour improvements, $250,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood that some gentlemen might possibly want to speak on this item, and it stood over.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) desired to speak on it, but he has the misfortune to be absent to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose it had better be carried?

Mr. SPROULE. What is that work for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For a considerable time there has been pressure to make a new western entrance to Toronto harbour, and this is to continue the work and to complete that western entrance. It will be a great advantage to the city of Toronto. Some of this money may be expended upon improvements at the eastern entrance.

Mr. SPROULE. As there is a good deal of diversity of opinion in regard to what should be done in the best interests of the city, I think it would be better if the minister would leave the item for the present, seeing that there is no member for the city of Toronto here to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the only item left in the Ontario list, and we cannot pass any resolution at all if we leave one item. Would it do to have it understood that when the hon. member for North Toronto returns, if he desired to do so, he can discuss it upon any other item? It is not a new work, and it was discussed last year. It is under contract. I do not think the hon. member for North Toronto would want to have it delayed, but upon any other item we can give him the opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before we leave the Ontario items, I would ask, has the government purchased the land for the approach to Grand Bend Pier in my county?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not yet. This vote is to purchase the land to complete the approach to the wharf.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why was not the land purchased last year when the minister had a vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That vote was two years ago and it lapsed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the cause of the delay in purchasing the land?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We could not agree as to the price and we had to expropriate it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This pier has been built for a number of years, it stands out in the lake and the only possible way to get on or off it is by a ladder. The approach has been obstructed by the owners of the land for several years. What is the use of spending $25,000 on this pier and allowing it to stand out in the water as a momument?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entirely right. When the pier was built it was supposed the government owned the land between it and the shore but private owners made a claim to the land and the Department of Justice reported their claim well founded. We were finally obliged to expropriate the property.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does it take two or three years to do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It took considerable time to arrive at a conclusion as to whether the claim was well founded. I agree with my right hon. friend that it is desirable to get this adjusted as quickly as possible.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is a useful pier and because of its incompleted state the people have suffered great inconvenience for years. The department has not acted in a business-like way. Will the approach to the pier be completed withn the next few months?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the intention to proceed as soon as possible. We cannot do anything until we get the money.

Mr. MARSHALL. Has the mnister any idea of establishing a life saving station at Port Stanley?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a matter for the Department of Marine.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was my intention to discuss on the Ontario item for harbours and rivers the question of constructing piers or groins along the shore of the western end of Lake Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is an item in the British Columbia estimates under which that discussion might more properly come.

Mr. HENDERSON. The British Columbia item is the only parallel case in the estimates, but I fear I may be precluded from discussing the matter under that item because of the recent ruling of the chairman. If it is understood that I will be permitted to raise the point on the item for the Fraser river I will not delay the committee now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be understood all round that the hon. gentleman could do that. He might argue that this item should not pass for British Columbia unless similar work were done in his constituency.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not much more regular to discuss an Ontario matter such as this under the public works items for the province of Ontario?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would much prefer for myself that the discussion should take place on the items now before the Chair.

Mr. HENDERSON. Very well. The Minister of Public Works is aware that along the north shore of Lake Ontario adjacent to Burlington Beach, and at another point distant two and a half miles to the east, the waters of Lake Ontario are causing the erosion of the shore and the indentations are now very deep. The roadway along the lake shore was established fifty, or it may be 100 years ago, and it is practically now put out of use. The farmers are suffering from the fact that their land is being washed away. In one instance near the town of Bronte a gentleman who owned a farm there 25 years ago, told me that at that time there was an apple tree growing on the lake shore 120 feet from the lake, and that now that apple tree was gone and the waters of the lake washed over the spot where it grew. Thus, 120 feet of that farm has been lost in 25 years. This is too serious a matter and too expensive for an individual or for a municipality to deal with, and I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to do something to prevent this washing away of the land which I believe can be easily done by building groins or piers out into the lake so that the waves may wash up the gravel and sand in such a way as to form new accretions of earth. I drew the attention of the minister to this last year but he was not disposed then to give me any great encouragement. However, I am pleased to say that since then he has been good enough to send an engineer to the village of Burlington to examine these erosions and see the damage that they have done. I had the pleasure during the Christmas recess, of accompanying the engineer over the ground, and I invited him to visit a point two and a half miles east of the village. Though he told me he had no instructions to go beyond the village of Burlington, he was good enough to visit that point with me, and there he saw where the county council of Halton had built a pier about 75 feet long out into the lake opposite one of these erosions. But this work is too expensive for either the township or the county to undertake. I think it is a matter that the country should deal with. It is the navigable waters of Lake Ontario that are doing the damage, and therefore the country as a whole is bound to see

that something is done to prevent the great damage which must otherwise accrue to the shore. The county of Halton has already spent, I think, $500 or $600 to build the pier I have spoken of. It was recommended that they extend the pier 25 feet further, which would probably cost another $150 or $200. But there ought to be at that point three or four or five piers to prevent the rapid washing away of the land. The erosion is gradually encroaching on the roadway, and will compel the municipality of the township to buy another roadway to take the place of what has been in use probably 75 or 100 years. My argument is that it is the navigable waters which are under the control of this government that are doing this damage, and I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to take some steps to prevent it. I think I am making an appeal for an appropriation of public money which can be justified. In many parts of the country public money has been expended in less advantageous ways. A year or two ago a British Columbia municipality, I believe, spent money on protection works on the Fraser river, and I find in the estimates of the present year an item which reads thus:

Fraser river—to refund to the municipality of Delta one-half their expense of constructing emergency works to protect the south bank of the river near Ladner's Landing, on condition that the government of British Columbia will refund the other half.

I understand that this municipality went to the expense of building a groin or piers, and the government now proposes to refund to that municipality the amount of money they expended. I have no authority to speak directly for the county of Halton on this question, but I know what the county have done and what they are willing to do. They have not asked, and I do not think they are going to ask, the government to do the whole thing. They have done something themselves to meet an emergency, and I think the government can well afford in this case to help people who are trying to help themselves. If the county is willing to spend a certain amount of money on this understanding, I think the government can well afford to come to the rescue and assist them. I may be told that this point, 2½ miles from Burlington, is not a harbour, and that, therefore, there is no just claim on the government to assist in this work on the ground that it is their duty to look after the harbours of the country. But in the village of Burlington, where there is a harbour, damage of this kind is going on every day, and it is becoming there a very serious question. The erosion is now very close to the highway, on the other side of which stands the drill hall, and I would not be surprised if in the course of 10 or 12 years the Minister of Militia were obliged to have his drill hall removed to another site. I was pleased to know that the minister went so far as to send an engineer to examine the location of this erosion in Burlington, and if he inquires of his engineer at Toronto, I am sure that he will get information in regard to the erosion 2½ miles to the east of Burlington to which I have made reference. I do trust that the minister will do something to assist these people who are willing to help themselves. I ask him to give me a promise to that effect, and I will be very happy to convey it to the people of the county.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it were possible to give my hon. friend a very satisfactory promise, I should be glad to do so, because he always presents his requests in a very reasonable and fair manner; but I find very great difficulty in making a promise to my hon. friend. This question of protecting the shores of navigable waters, whether upon the ocean or upon the lakes or upon navigable rivers, is one which has given me a good deal of concern since I have been minister, and has caused me a good deal of difficulty. When I became minister, I found that there were certain protection works going on in different sections of the country, more especially in the province of British Columbia, where the government had been paying one-half the cost of protecting the banks of certain rivers. The soil of the banks of those rivers, such as the Fraser and the Columbia and some others is of an alluvial character, and in many cases the banks are being eaten away, very much to the injury of people owning land along those banks. In several cases the Dominion government contributed one-half the cost of the protection works and the British Columbia government the other half. I had applications from many other localities—from Fort McLeod, from the city of Edmonton and from a point on the St. Lawrence, where a portion of the bank had fallen, or gave signs of falling, into the river unless it were protected, and in case it did, would cause damage to an important village. Some protection work has been done in the maritime provinces, but I came to the conclusion that if this government were to admit its responsibility in a general way, there would be no end to the liability we would be called on to assume. I have taken a course somewhat at variance with that taken by some of my predecessors, and which they took only to a limited extent. Lately we have declined to contribute one-half of the cost of protection works in British Columbia; we have also declined to engage in protection work on the Macleod river, and we have de-

clined to do some protection work in the province of Quebec, which we were asked to do. If we were to admit our liability to do this work, there would be no end to the work we would be called on to assume. In Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta the population is growing rapidly. Towns, cities and villages are springing up along the banks of these navigable rivers, and there will necessarily be a considerable amount of work required in the near future to protect those communities from the erosions of their banks by rivers. I am not prepared to hold out any inducement that this work will be done by the federal government, much as I sympathize with the individuals who are suffering in the way my hon. friend describes. My hon. friend says that this is a navigable water. That does not throw the responsibility on the federal government. All the federal government has to do with it, is the control of navigation, and this has nothing to do with the control. The federal government has to do with the improvement of navigation, but this is in no way connected with navigation at all. The soil of the lake is either owned by the provincial government or by the riparian owners, and the federal government has no more to do with the protection of the banks from erosion by navigable rivers than with the building of highways. The work is purely of a local character.

Mr. SPROULE. Why, then, do we spend so much year after year down the St. Lawrence to prevent landslides into the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At what place?

Mr. SPROULE. I could not say from memory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that was done, it was not done under my administration. It has been done in some places before my time, in the eastern provinces as well as in Ontario and the west, but I have felt that we were going from precedent to precedent; and if we recognized the obligation, our responsibility would grow to a very large amount, and instead of having money for improving harbours and navigation, and building wharfs, we would be forced to spend a great deal on local protection works of this character. It seems to me that this is a work rather for the municipalities themselves and the provincial governments. My hon. friend says that the highway is likely to be washed away. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the highways are looked after by the provincial governments. There is a local tax, but the provincial government attends to the building and repairing of highways, exacting a local tax from the people to assist in this work. If this work be needed for a protection of a highway, the provincial government might very well join with the municipality in paying for it. I do not wish to be considered as throwing the liability on the provincial government, but it is a fair matter for consideration whether they should not join the municipal authorities in doing this work. I do not know whether my hon. friend's voice would be potent in the legislative halls of Ontario or not, but it would be well worth his while to suggest the matter for the consideration of the provincial authorities. In British Columbia, the provincial government is doing a good deal of work in preventing the banks of navigable rivers from being washed away, just as in the case referred to. For these reasons, I regret I cannot give the promise my hon. friend asks.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret very much the hon. gentleman's decision. He thinks that we should look to the provincial government, but the provincial government may say that they have nothing to do with Lake Ontario and that they are not responsible for the damages done by that lake.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither are we.

Mr. HENDERSON. I disagree with the hon. gentleman. Lake Ontario is a navigable water under the control of this government. And I notice there is a Bill on the Order Paper which would practically prohibit either the Ontario legislature or the municipality in question from constructing these piers without the consent of this government, and this government might not give that consent. This government is assuming control anyway by this Bill which will prohibit the county of Holton from extending a pier out into the lake or building a groyne to prevent those erosions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They need have no fear on that score. They will get permission very readily.

Mr. HENDERSON. That very fact is an evidence that this government has assumed the responsibility. I think that there is an admission in that statement, that the government has something to do with the whole matter. But let us go to the village of Burlington alone and leave the other. Surely, the hon. minister does not intend to throw off responsibility for the care of harbours, and the erosions at Burlington have everything to do with the harbour. At any rate, they take place so close to the harbour that they interfere with the harbour at that village, and, therefore, I do not think the minister can escape responsibility. He certainly should instruct his engineers to give him a special report on the subject and see whether he would not regard this damage at Burlington as an interference with the harbour. True, the government has never spent any money on Burlington harbour. The wharfs

there are private docks and the water is of such a depth that no demand has been made for any dredging, although some may be required. Perhaps if that harbour happened to be in some other part of the country there would be some dredging done. However, it is getting along very well without any. I am not saying that it is not needed, but I do say that if this continued washing is allowed to go on—the washing of clay out of the bank into the harbour—it will be necessary for the minister to do some dredging or erect some structure to prevent the washing away of the land. The property of the Militia Department will very soon be in danger, as it is only just across the street, and in ten or fifteen years we may find that the drill hall is being washed away, unless something is done to protect it. I think there is very strong reason in this case for invoking the assistance of the department. In these very estimates I find an item, which we may be asked to pass to-night, as follows:

Fraser river—to refund to the municipality of Delta one-half their expense of constructing emergency works to protect the south bank of the river near Ladner's Landing on condition that the government of British Columbia will refund the other half.

Now, if we are going to give that to our friends in British Columbia, why not do the same in the case of the county of Halton? I am not asking the government to do the whole thing. I believe the county council will be quite willing to assist. Yes, and without authority, I would say that they would be willing to do half if the government would come to the rescue and do the other half. I think we have an excellent precedent in this case of British Columbia, and I hope the minister will not disregard that precedent. If he asks the House to vote that item, I think he is bound to do the same for the county I represent, for the cases are very similar. I trust the minister will instruct his engineer, if necessary, to make another survey of Burlington. I hope he will not allow it to be lost sight of. And, while he is doing that, I believe he might extend his observations two and a half miles further east, and do something to assist the county, who are constructing one groyne or pier, to put out three or four more and so prevent the destruction of property and the washing away of the land and roadway which is going on constantly. I understand that along that shore the farmers are throwing out groynes or piers in an inexpensive way. They have been doing this for years. But outside of Burlington only in the two cases I have specially mentioned has the damage been very great. One is in the township of Nelson, and the other in the township of Trafalgar, where 120 feet of a man's farm have been washed away in twenty-five years. I am not speaking of that so particularly, because I have not had an opportunity to examine it. But I am sure these are matters worthy of serious consideration. The minister may say that it is not the policy of the government to take up this matter, but I am inclined to think that these are serious matters which he will find, as time goes on, that he will have to give his attention to. New things crop up, and I believe there is a great deal of public money of this country spent in matters that are less worthy than these to which I refer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid I have a very unhappy way of expressing myself if the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) has derived comfort from what I said. I did not intend to hold out hope that his application could be complied with. In the case of the Fraser river, it was put upon the ground that the erosion was the result of dredging operations which the federal government had carried on. That was what the municipality stated, and we were satisfied that the claim was not unreasonable. With regard to Burlington, application was made to build a wall along in front of the property of about thirteen different people, in order to protect the property from erosion caused by the wash of the lake. We could not justify doing it upon that ground. But the hon. gentleman has made the statement that the harbour is being affected by reason of this silt being washed into the harbour——

Mr. HENDERSON. It is my impression that it would be. I gave that as a reasonable conclusion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And it is the most reasonable thing the hon. member has said. For he puts it upon a tangible ground, and one that appeals to me. I will have the matter looked into and see whether the harbour is being affected by this erosion. In that case, we might do there the same as we are doing at Toronto island, where we are building protection works which will incidentally protect Toronto island from being washed away, but the direct object of which is to protect the harbour from being filled with the silt being washed from the island. I will have a further report made on the harbour, and see if this erosion affects the depth of water.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the minister have a report made on the erosion two miles further east? Better say yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think that would be of advantage at the present time.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. Is it the intention of the government to take steps looking to the improvement of the channel south of Fighting island, one of the most dangerous

spots, I think, between the head of the lakes and the foot of Lake Erie? A great many accidents have occurred there, accompanied with considerable loss of life during the past few years, owing largely to the enormous increase in tonnage. I think that last year, no less than seventy million tons of freight passed that point, a tonnage greater than the combined tonnage of London, Liverpool and the Suez canal. That comparison gives an impression of the immense traffic there. And this is being added to by the rapid growth of the Canadian tonnage. Last year, Canada added 30,000 tons. This matter is of all the more importance by reason of the fact that the Americans are spending this year no less than $83,000,000 for the improvement of waterways and harbours, much of which is being spent to the advantage of Canada. I merely call the attention of the minister to these facts. Right in the vicinity to which I refer, millions of dollars are spent to deepen the Lime-kiln Crossing, and I think the government might well look into the matter. I understand that an expenditure of from $250,000 to $300,000 there would render navigation much more safe.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I agree that the matter referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. D. A. Gordon) is of great importance, and I am glad that he has brought it to the attention of the committee. I can assure him that the subject is receiving the earnest consideration of the department. So far, we have not felt able to go on with the work in view of the very numerous demands made upon the department. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is receiving earnest consideration, and I trust that before very long we shall be able to undertake it. The United States government is doing a work of great importance of which Canada gets the benefit in the improvement of the channel, and I think it but reasonable that Canada should do its part.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is there any intention to make improvements in Port Bruce, between Port Stanley and Port Burwell?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at present. The matter is being considered, but it is not our present intention to proceed with the improvements during the present season.

Mr. MARSHALL. Will there be anything in the supplementary estimates for this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say what the supplementary estimates will contain, or whether there will be any. I shall not know until they are brought down.

Mr. M. Y. McLEAN. May I ask permission to say a few words with reference to the work to which my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) referred a little while ago—Grand Bend harbour or pier. Although this work is situated in the hon. member's constituency, I think it is of greater service possibly to a portion of my constituency than it is to his. I fully agree with him that a very considerable additional expenditure there is necessary before the wharf will be in anything like the shape it should be. But I did not press the work upon the minister this year, and for this reason. There are some two or three railways projected, all of which are pointing in that direction. One of them was incorporated by this parliament last session, and is making a terminus at Grand Bend. If all of these railways should reach that point, then much greater improvement will be necessary in that harbour. I may say that there is a natural harbour at Grand Bend, and with a comparatively small expenditure it could be made one of the best and safest harbours on that shore of Lake Huron. At present, however, it is comparatively valueless except for fishing purposes. Owing to the peculiar action of the water at that point, the sand drifts in and fills up the mouth of the river, and sometimes there is a sand bank across the mouth of the river so high that you can almost cross over it dry shod. A few weeks hence possibly that sand bank will have drifted all away. If a moderate expenditure were made there to build an additional pier so as to protect the mouth of the harbour and dredge the harbour, we would have a very safe and efficient harbour the year round. Should any of these railways come to that point, a considerable additional expenditure would be necessary to make the harbour useful for their purposes. I mention these things so as to prepare my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, and to warn him that possibly we may make a raid upon him for that harbour next year.

Harbours and rivers — Quebec — Angers (L'Ange Gardien)—wharf on River Ottawa—revote of $4,950 lapsed, $5,700.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. None of the hon. gentlemen representing Quebec on this side of the House are present. I have just sent upstairs to see if any of them are there. I presume the hon. gentleman will hold over some items in Quebec, so as to allow them to discuss any other items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will leave one item at the end on which they can discuss any other item.

Aylmer—wharf on Lake Deschenes—revote of $2,500 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For a considerable time a public wharf at Aylmer has been asked for. There is a possibility that we may buy the Ritchie wharf; if we do, we will repair it with this money. We can get

the Ritchie wharf for about $2,000, and if we bought it we would spend the other $3,000 in repairing it. We may however, build a new one.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Why should the government build a public wharf at Aylmer more than at any other town on the St. Lawrence?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Aylmer is an important town, and the people are strongly urging us to provide a public wharf. There are reasons why a public wharf is of much greater benefit to a locality than a private one. If there is a public wharf all parties will have the same right to use it, steamers, tug boats and scows; whereas a private wharf is under the control of the private owners.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Then we might just as well buy all the private wharfs along Lake Ontario and the river St. Lawrence. There is not a public wharf in the city of Kingston, they are all owned by private individuals. The same way at Gananoque, Brockville and Prescott, they are all private wharfs. Why should the government go and build a public wharf at Aylmer, and not build one or buy one at any of these other places? There is more shipping done, ten times over, at any one of these towns I have mentioned than there is at Aylmer, yet not a dollar has been spent on any of them, or on any place along the St. Lawrence. Yet here the government goes to work and builds a wharf in opposition to a private wharf there now, or buys it. I think this thing ought to stop—either take over all the private wharfs in the country, or build others, and stop spending money in such little places through some favour or pull of the member for that constituency. I think it is an outrage to use the public money in this way, and cannot be justified from any standpoint that I know ot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend did not claim that the building of a wharf at Gravenhurst was an outrage, yet there is a private wharf there owned by the Grand Trunk railway. There are evident advantages to a community from a public wharf rather than from a private wharf, the owners of which would have a right to show favours to individuals, particularly where there is no harbour master to see that the wharf is used for the benefit of the public instead of a private owner. Now this wharf is reported to us as being in very good condition, and if we buy it and put it in repair it will certainly be a public benefit. In other places we have done the same thing. Down on the St. Lawrence some wharfs which were owned by the Richelieu Navigation Company have been purchased by the Crown, and some were purchased before I became a minister. This is not at all an unheard of thing to do. I do not know the circumstances at Kingston. Probably the wharfs there are under the control of a harbour master.

Mr. GEO TAYLOR. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a harbour master there, and harbour masters have the right to locate vessels at private wharfs and determine the turn those vessels shall have. In a place like Aylmer there is no harbour master; therefore there would be great advantage in having a wharf owned by the Crown.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. There is a private wharf there now. If the owner of that wharf does any shipping, or receives any goods, no doubt he does as they do at Kingston, Gananoque, Brockville and Prescott, charge a wharfage, and makes a business venture of it. Why should the government take it off his hands? At Kingston, if a person ships goods he has to pay a wharfage on every package; the same at Gananoque. It is done by private individuals. Why should not the government say: We will own this wharf and give it to the public free as they are doing at Aylmer, or at Hull, where there is not a pound of freight shipped during the year or a steamer tied up. It is simply a waste of public money and not in the public interest. If the government do that for one place why not treat everybody alike? The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) will bear me out when I say that in that city there is no government owned wharf that any steamer can go to.

Mr. HARTY. Not for steamers, but there is one at the barracks.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. That is at the barracks and it is for government business only. But, there is no other wharf and we pay wharfage both on goods coming in and going out. They might do the same at Aylmer. If the wharf at Aylmer is owned by a private individual and it is a private speculation why should we take it off his hands?

Mr. BRADBURY. I am not going to object to the idea of building a public wharf. Up in our country we need these things. I was going to say a word to the minister regarding the city of Winnipeg. If the principle is a good one of building a public wharf at Aylmer, and I am not objecting to it, it is all the more reason why a wharf should be built at Winnipeg. We expect to have navigation on the Red river to the head of Lake Winnipeg shortly and there

will be an absolute need of a first-class wharf at that city. I hope the government will take into consideration the idea of building a wharf there. I do not approve of the idea of the government taking over an old wharf. I think it is a mistake. If the government is going to do anything in the way of assisting the people at Aylmer to have a wharf it should be a new construction altogether because then the country would likely get value for the money. Spending money on repairing an old wharf will never give as good a result as the construction of a new work. I hope the minister will not forget Winnipeg.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If Winnipeg makes application to the department for a wharf it will receive very careful consideration.

Bécancour river—wharf near mouth—revote of $5,000 lapsed, $8,000.

Mr. MONK. What is this wharf to be used for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be used in the ordinary way for river steamers. It is in the county of Nicolet and the wharf is near the mouth of the river.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I remember the circumstances connected with this wharf. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier is aware that the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company has built as far as St. Clement in the county of Lotbinere and it has built a branch to the wharf at Becancour. It is in order to take timber coming from the St. Maurice river that it has extended its line to Becancour. The Delaware & Hudson does a big business in timber which is exported to the United States. That is the reason the wharf is being built.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to enter into a separate criticism of each of these public works because this is the system sometimes adopted in the province of Quebec: You ask why is a wharf required at Becancour in which an expenditure of $8,000 is involved. The next thing you know is that you are denounced in the locality for having objected to the construction of a wharf through some particular animosity to that particular locality. You are very fortunate if you escape being taxed with being opposed to the rights and religion of the province. That is my experience. We are told every year that the construction of great and necessary works is deferred because there is no money. Quite lately we were told by the Prime Minister that it would be perfectly impossible to begin the construction of the Georgian Bay canal because there is no money and when we speak of the equipment of our principal port, which has been recommended by the Transportation Commission, which everybody admits is necessary and which is clamoured for by the commerce of the country, we are told the same thing. We have here a lot of small works half of which are absolutely useless—no use whatever.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Including this?

Mr. MONK. I do not mention any particular work—oh, no—but I have little doubt that Becancour itself would be twenty times more benefited if the national port of Quebec were properly equipped and the Georgian Bay canal were begun. I say that with respect to Becancour itself, and I know something more about that particular locality than my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works does. Every year this government has systematically laid aside the completion of these great works. Why? For the purpose of patronage, for the sole purpose of putting up small works in little places to gratify some local man who wants a contract—

Mr. E. ROY. Where?

Mr. MONK. Where is my youthful friend?—wanting to get me to say that this is an instance. I see there are a great many wharfs in the county of my hon. friend the Postmaster General—a great many. If I were to say that putting up a breakwater at L'Anse des Femmes or Descente de Femmes, or some such place, was not justified, I would be denounced there next week. But, that is what we do every year. Young members want to put up a little public building and mark their names on the door of some post office at a cost of $10,000 or $15,000 which is absolutely not needed at all. Or, they want to dredge a channel across the river, as they did $50,000 worth of dredging across the St. Lawrence at Batiscan. Go down to St. Pierre-les-Becquets and ask the people and they will tell you that they cannot understand what the government is doing it for. They are dredging in quicksand across the river and as fast as they dredge it fills up. If they kept on dredging for generations they would never make a permanent channel there. That is what they told me when I went there. If the government were to take the people of my own province and of other provinces into their confidence and say: Look here, we have finished spending $8,000, or $9,000, or $10,000 here and there on public buildings which are not required, or on wharfs which are never used, and we are going to do something better than that, we are going to build the Georgian Bay canal and develop those immense undertakings connected with a line of national communication, the result would be much better for the country at large. But, what is more than that, if we carry out the recommendations of that commission, the benefit will spread for a distance of 100 miles around Montreal, and for 100 miles around Quebec. If you continue this sys-

tem, which began before we had the great question of transportation thrust upon us, and which the Conservative government we must admit for a long time after confederation carried on, of putting up these little public buildings throughout the country, we will never be able to provide for the needs of transportation in Canada. I do not know how it is in the other provinces; I suppose it is the same; but in the province of Quebec the first thing a member elected to support the government thinks of, is getting a public building or a wharf in his county, no matter whether that public work is necessary or not, and he will put it in a place where he got a majority or where he expects to get one. The funds of the country go for such purposes. I do not want to take up these items for Quebec one by one, but I can say that beyond question more than one half of them are intended for that very purpose. For instance, my young and active friend from Berthier (Mr. Ecrement) no doubt has a wharf for his county.

Mr. ECREMENT. No.

Mr. MONK. Well, he must have a public building; he could not escape having one or the other. I notice that in many instances we are putting up wharfs for the Richelieu Company; we have been doing that for some years, and I do not know if the government has any arrangement with regard to these considerable structures we are building for that company. I think it was our industrious friend (Mr. Ames) who last year got an estimate of what the revenues are from these different wharfs we are constructing, and I think it was found that we sometimes spend $10,000 on a wharf from which there is no revenue. In the same way we have in a small town a post office which serves its purpose and which costs us only a few hundred dollars a year, but we erect a large public building costing $25,000 from which there is no revenue commensurate with the expenditure. We will never be able to carry out the system of transportation outlined by the commission until the government has the courage—and I venture to say such a government would have the support of the whole province of Quebec—to say, we will have done with these little recompenses here and there to please members who do not see beyond the limit of their counties. When the government comes to that conclusion then we will have the Georgian Bay canal and proper transportation facilities afforded for the trade of the country, and I believe the people would endorse a government that is courageous enough to take that stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has caused me a great surprise when he says that he will not criticise any public work in the province of Quebec, because if he did so an opponent would go into the constituency and charge him with having tried to prevent the erection of a public building.

Mr. MONK. That is the fact.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend were a young and timid member, one who had grave doubts as to his strength and influence with the people of his province, I could understand him taking that attitude, but for an old and experienced parliamentarian, the first lieutenant of the leader of the opposition, the leader in the great province of Quebec, for him to decline to give the Minister of Public Works the benefit of his judgment on these various works for fear it would injure him and his party in a particular constituency, that gives me the surprise of my life; I am amazed.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the minister has put it exactly as it should be. The trouble is this: If, for instance, I want to know why there should be any expenditure on a wharf at Isle Verte, and if I inquire about the traffic in connection with the remarks I made a moment ago as to the continued delay in carrying out our scheme of transportation—and I have made protests every year almost in the same terms for many years—then my hon. friend from Berthier, if the criticism applied to his county, would go down next Sunday and denounce me as a fanatic for endeavouring to deprive his county of necessary improvements. I do not think my right hon. friend would say that I proposed as an alternative a work which would be of great advantage to the whole Dominion and to the whole of the province of Quebec in particular, and it is very disagreeable that one should be denounced in that way for making a perfectly legitimate criticism. No man in his senses who has studied the problem of transportation would say that it is better for us to spend annually three-quarters of a million dollars on these little two-penny-half-penny works when we could with that money provide for a great national scheme.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which of these works do you designate by that happy expression of a two-penny-half-penny work?

Mr. MONK. Ah, the minister is always setting a trap for me to fall into. Now, although I may be exposed to criticism I might take the liberty of asking why we want these landing piers at Lake Massiwippi, it is an inland lake to which American tourists come in the summer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are now at Becancour.

Mr. MONK. Well, what is the urgency for a wharf at that ancient seignorial or

feudal place named Becancour. I know a great deal about Becancour—if we are to fall let us fall at Becancour. I know that it is in the county of Nicolet and that the Postmaster General has done a great deal for that county. I think he was the author of the dredging across the St. Lawrence there which so mysteriously disappears every year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has singled out Becancour as an example.

Mr. MONK. Of course my hon. friend will admit that I am acting in a spirit of justice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh certainly, it is the right of the hon. gentleman to ask for information. It is true that when I was member for Nicolet I recommended the Department of Public Works to expend that money for the construction of that wharf. The circumstances are these. The Delaware & Hudson railway was formerly constructed only as far as St. Philomene in the neighbouring county of Lotbiniere—and I may say this railway will be constructed to Quebec, as soon as the bridge is completed—and there was no necessity for a wharf at Becancour, but when they reached the parish of Becancour which is one of the wealthiest and largest in the county of Nicolet, the company decided to build a branch line to reach the mouth of the river Becancour, and they had the harbour deepened so as to allow barges from the St. Maurice laden with lumber to come to the railway at that point. I may say that the lumber trade there is carried on by large American companies, but still they are adding to the prosperity of Canada. The object of constructing a wharf was to help the company and also to enable the trade of the St. Maurice river to reach the railroad.

Mr. MONK. Does the trade of the St. Maurice river go across the St. Lawrence?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed that the lumber for export crosses the river. So it is a most necessary and urgent work, in the interest not merely of the company, but also of the entire lumbering industry of the county. Besides, nothing has been asked before for this parish. It was only when the railway was built to Becancour that the wharf was asked for.

Mr. MONK. Becancour is on the south side of the St. Lawrence, and Three Rivers is on the north side. I know that back of Three Rivers there is a large lumber region, but it is new to me that the shipping of lumber from the northern side of the St. Lawrence is going to be done by crossing the St. Lawrence at Three Rivers and loading the lumber on the railway at Becancour. The Canadian Pacific railway goes to Three Rivers.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It does not go to Berlin Falls, where this company has its mills.

Mr. MONK. What shipping has been done at Becancour to justify this expenditure? It is one of those staid old places, wealthy and well-to-do, and how is it that a wharf is required there? Has there been a petition for it? It would be an advantage to have the member for the county here to give us the details of this matter. Not that I find fault with him for being absent, but we would be better able to discuss it if he were here. Has there been an estimate, not only of the cost of the wharf, but of the prospective trade?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A petition was not needed. It was self-evident that a wharf would be required as soon as the railway was completed.

Mr. MONK. The railway runs all the way to Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It has not reached Quebec. Owing to the accident to the bridge the railway stopped at Ste. Philomene, and about 40 miles will have to be built before it reaches Quebec. But it was self-evident that as soon as the railway reached Becancour, and the company built a branch line to the mouth of the river, a wharf would be needed and the harbour would have to be deepened. My hon. friend says: Who asked for it? The railway company asked for it; but it is not in the sole interest of the railway company; it is in the interest of trade and transportation. Barges will ply between the St. Maurice river, which is right opposite Becancour, where the mills are situated, and they will unload their cargoes at the Becancour wharf, and they will there be put on the trains. The Delaware and Hudson River railway is an American road running partly in Canada and partly in the United States, but it is a great feeder of the mills, and our people get the benefit of the money it brings to the country.

Mr. BUREAU. I may tell my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier that the reason of the lumber going across the river was that the Canadian Pacific railway does not run to where the Quebec Industrial Company has its mills, and it could only send its lumber across the river to Becancour and Doucet, shipping it from there either by the Grand Trunk or the Delaware and Hudson.

Mr. MONK. What is the estimated cost of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The cost, as estimated by the departmental engineer, is $12,000.

Bic harbour—repairs to old wharf, $1,000.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I would like to know where Bic harbour is, and the nature of the traffic carried on there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in Rimouski county. There is a lumber business there, and it is a very popular summer resort, and also the centre for the pilots of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. The reason I ask is that I find in the annual report of the Minister of Public Works that some very extraordinary works were carried on at Bic during the past year. In deference to the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, I wish at the outset to absolve myself from any desire to make an attack on any body's race or religion or nationality. I simply wish to know whether we can have in the district I represent the same kind of expenditures as are made in this fortunate district of Bic. I read in the report of the chief engineer that Bic is a favourite summer resort, and that it has a harbour that affords good natural shelter for vessels. For the year covered by this report there was an expenditure of $7,103 at Bic, and that expenditure was carried on by day labour between September 22 and November 30. It is only a coincidence, of course, that the general elections were going on during the same period. The dates are September 22 to November 30. While this place is most famed as a summer resort, the expenditure in that year was carried on after the summer resort travel had disappeared and at a most unfavourable season. In fact, there is an apology in the report by the engineers for doing the work at the season when it was done. Here is something to which I would call the attention of the minister, because I would like to secure in the district of Chiliwack some expenditure of this precise nature, because of course, when the department made it at Bic, they cannot will dney it at Chiliwack.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. Wait until the elections are on.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. No, we want it before the elections. We did very well at the last elections and are entitled to some reward. Here is a description of some of the work done at Bic:

> A good deal of work was also done to improve the roads leading from the village to the wharf. A large quantity of rock was blasted, and the roadway was finished by the addition of a layer of sand six inches thick. Ditches and culverts were built where found desirable.

I would point out that the government wharf at Chiliwack is what might be termed a moveable feast. Owing to the lack of dredging there, we often have to move the spot of gravel which is called a wharf a mile further out than where it is located in favourable seasons, and it is very difficult to get teams out there for freight and passengers. Would the hon. minister say whether we might expect at Chiliwack a liberal expenditure for an approach to our wharf or if not why one locality should be favoured and not another.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been no application, since I have been minister, for an approach to the wharf at Chiliwack. If there should be, it would receive due consideration. This work at Bic was done very properly for the purpose of giving a suitable approach from the village to the wharf. The land around Bic is very picturesque, but somewhat hilly, and it was difficult to make the road, and I have no reason to suppose that the road cost more than was absolutely necessary. When the Crown builds a wharf, it is not unreasonable that it should build an approach from the public highway to that wharf. If the case at Chiliwack is as strong as that at Bic, I shall give it proper consideration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Price) were here, he could assure my hon. friend from New Westminster that this work was much needed. As my hon. friend probably knows the member for Quebec West is at the head of the very important firm of Price Brothers.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I am not opposing the work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am simply explaining the circumstances. Price Brothers practically own the whole of Rimouski county. They carry on large lumbering operations there and Bic is one of the chief places. If the hon. member for Quebec West were here, he would say that this work was much needed.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association —Mr. Harris.

On section 2 as amended—powers to hold real estate.

Mr. LENNOX. This is the matter to which I called attention the other night. I do not know who takes charge of this Bill on behalf of the government, but I urge again the point I mentioned. Instead of 'for the purposes of their business,' it

should read, 'for the purpose of their undertaking.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think 'business' is rather more applicable to a company of this character than 'undertaking,' particularly as, in other sections of the Bill, 'business' is the word used. For instance, section 3, subsection (a) authorizes the association to carry on the 'business of purchasing, selling,' and so on.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot see it in that way. What I called attention to the other night is that in the case of railway Bills, the object is to confine them to the business they undertake, and in these Bills we say 'for the purposes of their undertaking.' This form of words has acquired a definite signification in connection with railway charters, and it seems to me very much better to adopt the same form of language in connection with a Bill of this kind. Of course, if the government think otherwise, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is like chips in porridge.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, chips in porridge are uncomfortable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But they do not change the taste.

Mr. LENNOX. Very true, but they are very inconvenient. For my part, if it is legislative porridge, I would rather have the chips out. And, if I may express an opinion on the subject, I think we are not quite as particular as we ought to be in reference to legislation that we pass. The observations I offer from time to time—they are very infrequent as it happens—are with the object of making legislation better where possible. However, I recognize the fact that the government take the responsibility. Still, I do not regard this as a 'chip in porridge,' but as a matter of substantial importance. We should bear in mind that our legislation gets into the courts from time to time, and, if we have one phraseology in one statute and another in another statute, in cases in which the meaning is substantially the same, we inevitably lead to litigation and to confusion. And that, as I say, is not a matter of 'chips in porridge,' but a matter of substantial importance.

Mr. NESBITT. I agree with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), of course, is quite right when he says that we use the word 'undertaking' in relation to railway matters. But this is a different thing, and I think what we wish to say is better covered by the word 'business.' It is a technical point, and really it would be hard to tell the difference, but there is a difference. The railway is an undertaking; this says: 'Business or businesses.' I think the words: 'For the purpose of its business,' covers the object better than the words: 'For the purpose of its undertaking.'

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, why do they put the same words in a power company? Because we passed one or two Bills last year, and we have one before us now, and the same words are in them.

Mr. NESBITT. That is also a power company, it is an undertaking, and it defines the undertaking. The charter defines the undertaking.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an undertaking that proposes to do the same thing. It is to have a wharf, docks and vessels. If you went before a court with two statutes, one for a power company and the other for a millers' association, surely the court would decide that there must be some difference of meaning between a business and an undertaking; and if they both mean the same thing, would it not be better to have one phraseology applying to all? Then there would be no doubt, it would be understood both by the people and by the court.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Section 3, paragraph (a) says:

> Carry on the business of purchasing, selling, storing, shipping, &c.

If you were to say, ' carry on the undertaking of purchasing, selling, storing, shipping, &c.' the word ' undertaking ' would not be apt, it would not be a proper word to use in that connection. Therefore we are, in the first place, authorizing this company to carry on the business of selling, —that is ordinarily spoken of as a business; we do not speak of a railway undertaking as a business in the same sense as merchandizing. Then when you come to paragraph (b) you provide that for the purpose of enabling the company the better to carry on its business, which by the previous clause it is authorized to carry on, it may charter vessels, &c. Therefore the word ' business ' is much more apt, it seems to me, than the word ' undertaking ' in a Bill of this character.

Mr. ROCHE. I would ask the Finance Minister in reference to subsection (a) of section 3, the latter part:

> May construct, acquire, operate, hire, lease, sell or otherwise dispose of elevators for elevating wheat, grain or other products, and acquire, lease, and utilize hydraulic, electric or other power for the purpose of the said business, and generally may carry on an elevator or storage business.

I desire to ask the Finance Minister, who is aware that the grain growers had a delegation here lately waiting upon the government in regard to the government taking over terminal elevators, and operating them under government control, would this Bill, under that clause, confer certain rights on this company, that might prove embarrassing to the government in carrying out that policy, and entail expense? Are you giving rights under this Bill that would have to be purchased by the government should the government decide to accede to the request of the grain growers?

Mr. FIELDING. My impression is that we would not. This is simply an enabling Bill which authorizes them to do certain things which an individual might do for himself, and which they are permitted to do in their corporate capacity. I do not think the Bill would create any vested rights that we would have to purchase. Possibly the company might think they would have such rights.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to have an explanation of the provisions of this section 3.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the Bill had better stand.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 140) for the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—Mr. A. Haggart.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—Mr. J. D. Taylor.

Bill (No. 112) to incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—Mr. Verville.

SUPPLY.

House resumed in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. I did not understand that the Becancour wharf item had passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was carried.

Mr. MONK. Well, my hon. friend invited me to criticise each one of these items, a task which I did not feel disposed to undertake, but we asked a couple of questions in regard to this wharf at Becancour. My hon. friend knows that we found out that this wharf was being built to accommodate the Delaware & Hudson railway. I asked who had petitioned for this wharf, and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) told me that it had been asked for by the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works knows the country well enough to know that at Three Rivers we have three of our own railways, the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway and the Transcontinental railway, built by ourselves, the others having been largely subsidized by the country. It is in order to permit the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company to get the wood of the Three Rivers district across the St. Lawrence, put it on its cars and take it to the United States, probably pulp wood, that this wharf is being built. In reality we are building the wharf to accommodate an American railway which is depriving these three railways at Three Rivers of their wood freight. I just submit to my hon. friend whether this is a carefully considered and wise policy. My hon. friend the Postmaster General—I do not say it to blame him at all—is one of the directors, I believe, in Canada of the Delaware & Hudson Railway Company. I give that as an instance of how far we might go in our criticism if we brought the same examination to bear on each one of these items. I have no desire to delay the minister, in fact, my desire is to abridge what concerns my own province of Quebec, not only for the reason I gave my hon. friend, but my hon. friend knows that there are very few of us from Quebec here to-night; in fact, I feel like one who treads alone a banquet hall deserted, because, apart from the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Dorchester—

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend argued very strongly against an item he might persuade me.

Mr. MONK. I do not like, in the absence of these gentlemen, to criticise items that they have obtained the insertion of in the budget. Since I have been a member of this House I have tried hard, but in spite of every effort I have never succeeded in getting an item into the estimates of the department of my hon. friend, and I am therefore in a very different position from those who can get items in without even having the trouble to be present to explain them. This manner of criticising the estimates is a most unsatisfactory one, and I had hoped that the committee to amend the rules of the House would have given us an opportunity this year of suggesting some change in the way of proceeding with the estimates. I do not believe there is an assembly voting Supply in any part of the world where estimates are put through in this way. There is no such method adopted in any other deliberative and legislative assembly. If I did what I suppose we

used to do in connection with these estimates I would put the same questions as I have put in regard to Becancour with reference to all these other items covering more than two pages, and I would detain the minister here until very late. Apart from the other objections which I mentioned before the committee rose at six o'clock, I have no desire to do that, and the question suggests itself to me as to whether there would be some easier way of going through these estimates of the province of Quebec, because I cannot assert some things here in the absence of those representing the counties, because what I might say would be open to objection and might very well be corrected if they were here. These two pages of the estimates involve an expenditure of nearly three quarters of a million and, as my hon. friend will admit, lay the foundation for a very much larger expenditure indeed, because many of these undertakings are really beginnings. I do not know if the suggestion I am going to make to my hon. friend and the committee is an acceptable one, because we have sitting now for the last time the very important committee on race track betting, we had all agreed to be there, and it was quite unexpectedly that I was called down here. Does the minister think he could lay upon the table a short statement which might be placed in 'Hansard' giving answers to the questions that are usually put in connection with these estimates, that is, the date and the amount, the original estimate of the work for which he asks a vote, the amount of the original contract, the name of the contractors, the tenders if called for, when tenders were called for, if called for in the public papers, the expenditure to date, the amount required to finish the work, the revenue received last year, and the amount expended for maintenance last year. All the questions that could be put in this committee, constituted as it is this evening, could not go beyond that. We have to take up the time and employ the whole paraphernalia of the House to elicit answers to these questions. It seems to me that if the minister could reserve one of these Quebec items, and at some future sitting of the committee lay that statement on the table of the House and place it in 'Hansard' I would be perfectly satisfied, and I think it would greatly abridge the work of the committee and of my hon. friend. There are two items in these estimates for Quebec to which I would like to direct my hon. friend's attention. One is an item of $60,000 for improvements on the Richelieu river. That is a considerable item, and it will require some discussion. There is a further item for a deep water wharf at Sorel, for which $86,000 was voted last year, and for which $42,000 is asked this year. As my hon. friend is no doubt aware that wharf was built and slipped into the river, we are building it over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In a different way.

Mr. MONK. Yes. It seems a pity not to go a little into the discussion of these two items. In regard to the others my hon. friend will see that there could be no other questions asked than those I have jotted down in this memorandum. As my hon. friend is not familiar with the province I might be tempted to extend the discussion unduly. The members who represent these counties are not here. I make these suggestions with the desire of abridging the work of the committee and not taking up my hon. friend's time. If this suggestion is practicable, I would not take up the time of the minister and of the committee by asking the self same questions on each item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is proper to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend with regard to the province of Quebec; I think we should have the same rule as to public works in all the provinces. I think it is a good deal of benefit to discuss items; I receive benefit myself from criticisms by both sides of the House. These gentlemen who are familiar with the public work under review are able to advance arguments in favour of it when criticism is offered. There is the other objection also that the suggestion would mean the postponement of the items for Quebec, because so long as one item stands the resolution cannot be adopted and we are not much further ahead. I am desirous of going on with the Quebec items to-night, because I informed the members from Quebec these items would be under discussion, as I informed other hon. gentlemen that Quebec, Manitoba, and British Columbia items would probably take up the time of the committee. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has to go to the race track committee.

Mr. MONK. I have made the suggestion for the convenience of the minister and the committee. This is the last meeting of that committee, we all agreed to be there and I really must attend.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is any particular item my hon. friend will wish to discuss he could do so on the vote for the dredging plant in Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. MONK. My suggestion was with the idea of facilitating the passing of the estimates and not to delay them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well, then we will go on with the Quebec items.

Cabano—landing pier on west side of Lake Temiscouata, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to cost $3,500, and we expect to finish it with this vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it by tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably, but I am not sure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is not the minister sure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where the amount is under $5,000 and the resident engineer is of the opinion that the work can be done better and cheaper by day work we sometimes do it that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has there been any report as to whether it is advisable to do it by tender or day work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who judges that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer, subject to the decision of the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what does the chief engineer make up his decision?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would depend perhaps on the remoteness of the locality and the likelihood of persons wishing to tender.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this a remote locality?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not very.

Mr. MICHAUD. It is quite a large manufacturing place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are a good many who are of opinion that where cribwork is to be done, if you get a good foreman who will look after the work and get good timber, you can do it better than by contract. Under the law we have not the same discretion where the work costs over $5,000.

Mr. LENNOX. Are you guided by that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, very largely.

Mr. LENNOX. Are there not a great many exceptions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a great many, quite a number. In case of emergency or in cases where it appears that work such as repairing an old wharf can be better done by day work, we do it.

Mr. LENNOX. There always have to be exceptional circumstances?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what the minister says?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I so interpret the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister is guided by that, there must be exceptional circumstances or else the minister conforms to the Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what the Act says.

Mr. LENNOX. I know what the Act says as well as the minister does, but I want to know what you do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister is guided by, and conducts himself under, the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. As a matter of fact, unless exceptional circumstances justify departure from the Act, the minister is controlled by the Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the minister would not think of violating the Act.

Mr. DANIEL. See him smile.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not heard anything so far which would lead me to believe that this work ought not to be done by tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that I can give any reason why it should not be done by tender in the usual course.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister says it is somewhat less expensive to do it by day work with a foreman or inspector; is it the foreman or the inspector the minister relies on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We usually use the term 'foreman,' the words are interchangeable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was not a tailor once employed to superintend some public work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Which tailor?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I forget his name, but he was a tailor by occupation, and the scene was in New Brunswick.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a long time ago. Under the old Conservative government, there was a foreman who was an undertaker.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. His occupation would seem to fit him better for the job than if he were a tailor.

Mr. DANIEL. The leader of the opposition is referring to the building of the armoury in Sussex, where a tailor was put in command of the work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) ought not to butt in on this; how long ago was that?

Mr. DANIEL. Since this government has been in power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a long time.

Mr. LENNOX. Altogether too long.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I have in mind the gentleman the hon. member refers to. He is a thoroughly good, practical man.

Mr. DANIEL. A good tailor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, a good all round man, who will do what he is called upon to do—faithfully and well.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say that this celebrated tailor was kept on inspecting considerably after the work was done, according to the statement of the gentleman who then represented Kings county in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If that was so, it would be very unusual and ought not to take place. I do not think it has taken place in recent years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You cannot have too much of a good thing; and if he was as good an inspector as the minister says he was, his services were probably as valuable afterwards as before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend from St. John is relying upon his imagination when he makes the statement he does.

Mr. HENDERSON. My recollection is the same as that of the hon. member for St. John, that the inspector was kept on after the work was done.

Mr. DANIEL. I was not relying on my imagination, but on the positive statement of the former member for Kings, which statement will be found in 'Hansard'.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what that has to do with the wharf at Cabano?

Mr. DANIEL. Not the slightest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has to do with the general principle we were discussing of carrying on these works by tender or day work. The minister was relying on inspection, and I observed that it depended on how good the inspection was. I would not consider it consistent with efficient administration that a tailor should be selected for the inspection of an armoury.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The question of the inspection of this work does not come up now. Our effort is always to get practical men, and I think we succeed in getting them. I have not heard complaints in recent years in regard to inspectors.

Cap à l'Aigle—repairs to wharf, $2,400.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide for repairs to the wharf, as recommended by the resident engineer, Mr. Decary. The total estimated cost is $2,400.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was the original wharf built?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1881 and 1882. It was widened in 1901.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it a free port, or are tolls charged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As it has not been transferred to the Marine Department, no revenue is derived from it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know this place well. It is in the county of Charlevoix, and is one of the summer resorts in the St. Lawrence. The government have a steamer plying between River L'Ouelle, St. Irenée, Cap à l'Aigle, Murray Bay and the terminus of one of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. It is at the request of the Richelieu Navigation Company that this vote is put in the estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what principle does the government act in transferring or not transferring wharfs from the Public Works Department to the Marine Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has never been any principle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it not time that there should be one?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is, but it is a difficult matter to work out. It is now engaging the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself. I may say that this is not a new difficulty; it has existed under all governments since confederation. Suppose I transfer this wharf to the Marine Department. It would at once begin to collect tolls. The farmer who takes half a dozen bags of potatoes to the wharf has to pay toll. He goes home and brings a barrel of flour, and on that he has to pay toll. All the tolls in the course of a year do not amount to much, but they are a burden on the farmer. In several cases I have hesitated on this account to make the transfer. We are endeavouring to work out some plan under which we would charge a yearly fee to the steamboat owners, so that the farmers would not have to pay any toll. We may work out a solution of the difficulty on some such basis as that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it is desirable that that should be done, because, admitting the existence of what the minister calls a hardship to farmers, it is still rather inequitable that farmers in some parts of the country should be subjected to that hardship, while farmers in other sections are relieved of it. I therefore think some general system should be adopted, and what the minister suggests seems to have some merit in it. It should not be allowed to continue in its present state of confusion.

Mr. HENDERSON. In my county fishermen who land their fish on the wharf have to pay wharfage dues, which was

not the case until the wharf had been repaired. I do not see why in some sections of the country there should be no wharfage dues charged, while in my county they are charged because the wharf has been transferred to the Marine Department. One rule should apply to all. I am not particular whether a tariff is charged on this wharf or the one I refer to made free, for the revenue obtained out of the one I refer to is so trifling that it would make little difference if no tolls were charged. The harbour cost the government something over $30,000 and only one boat went there last year.

Mr. WRIGHT. Did I understand the hon. minister correctly that these wharfs are free while under the Public Works Department, but when transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, dues are charged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is right. Does my hon. friend urge that the wharf at Gravenhurst should be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries at once?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is likely to be long before it is finished unless the work is proceeded with faster.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be completed in good time.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister's question is hardly a fair one. Last year we had a statute under discussion, and it was understood that a uniform system was going to be adopted which would work almost automatically. Some regular system should apply, and it should not be left to the discretion of the minister to decide that it will be a hardship to make the transfer in one case and not in another. I understood that last year in many cases the costs of the agent who looked after the collections were quite equal to the amount collected and sometimes far more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department pays only 25 per cent of the recipts.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there are cases where the wharfingers are not confined to a percentage. I am not in favour at all of any hardships being inflicted which would only result in collecting a very small amount of fees in proportion to the expenditure, but there should be some uniform system adopted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a wharf built by the old government some twenty years ago upon one of the lakes in the eastern townships and it had never been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the old government never collected any wharfage. After I had been minister about a year—the wharf had then been built about nineteen years—there was a suggestion made to me to transfer the wharf to the Marine Department. Of course I let it be known that the department would charge tolls. All the people were then up in arms. They said it was a monstrous thing. For nineteen years they had enjoyed under both governments free use of the wharf and now the government was going to impose toll. The result was, whether rightly or wrongly, I did not make the transfer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That only shows the necessity of some system.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So it does, but it is a difficult thing to work out. There are two wharfs, one in New Brunswick and one in Nova Scotia, that pay one-third of the total tolls collected from wharfs throughout the whole Dominion. One of these wharfs is at Digby and the other at Campbellton.

Mr. BRADBURY. Last year I drew attention to the condition at Selkirk. The Public Works Department controls the dock at that place. There has been considerable expenditure on that dock, and I understood there was to be some arrangement by which it would come under the control of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I am not anxious to see a change if dues are to be collected, but what does take place is this. There is a wharfinger supposed to be there, but who is a private banker, and he levies, I presume by authority of the department, a certain fee on each steamboat and fishing boat that comes to the dock. I understand he collects something like $300 a year of which the government does not get a cent. It all goes into his pocket and he does no work that I know of. As a rule, the dock is controlled by Captain William Robertson, who is the largest lumber shipper in that locality, and you generally find the dock crowded with his lumber. There is no advantage to the government in these tolls which are charged and they are a hardship on the steamboat men. I would just as soon see this fee done away with altogether, and have an absolutely free dock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am surprised at my hon. friend's statement, because if a wharfinger has been appointed, that would imply that the wharf had been handed over to the Marine Department. My department does not appoint any wharfingers.

Mr. BRADBURY. I may not be correct in saying he is a wharfinger, but he collects the money and keeps it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is there a harbour master in Selkirk?

Mr. BRADBURY. Not that I know of, unless this man acts as harbour master.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps he is an inspector.

Mr. LOGGIE. I think you will find that the wharfinger only keeps a percentage of the money.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have looked through the Auditor General's Report several times to find out how this man gets his money, and can find nothing to indicate where this money goes, but I know it is paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will give instructions to have the matter looked into.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This will complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Carleton—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is recommended by the resident engineer, Mr. Amyot. This wharf was built in 1882-3.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. I find that this is a recognized summer resort and therefore, according to the report, the wharf should be kept in order. But it is rather singular that these reports should have been delayed until the election month. The work, which was done by day labour, was begun October 5. Here is a description of the work:

The old beach protection, situated a few acres west of the wharf, has been replaced by a new round timber construction 350 feet long, 6 feet wide and 4 feet high, well ballasted with stone.

I should like to know wherein that differs from the beach protection work on the Fraser river, which we were told could not be given because of some constitutional difficulty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This beach protection done at Carleton, was simply a renewal of the old work which had been done years ago. It is not at all improper that the government should repair works it constructed and which had got out of repair.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR. Then are we to understand that it will be perfectly in order to make application for repair to old beach protections?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they were built by this government originally, I think that would not be out of the way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes—estimated cost, $1,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the revenue last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was no revenue—this work has not been transferred.

Chateauguay—wharf on south shore of Lake St. Louis, between Woodland and Bellevue—revote of $2,900 lapsed, $8,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work, it is represented, is very much needed in order to enable steamers to call.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the former vote of $2,900 part of a larger vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a vote of $3,000, from which there was an expenditure of only $73.25. The remainder lapsed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is this work to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By tender and contract in the usual way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there any private wharfs there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a dilapidated private wharf, but the public feel that it is of no use to them. We have been urged by resolution of the municipal council to do this work. It is expected that the shipments from this wharf will reach at least $100,000 annually, and will include hay, cattle, fruit and general farm produce. This is an important place.

Chicoutimi—harbour improvements, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete a work which is under contract, consisting of harbour improvements in the Saguenay river at Chicoutimi, also to make renewals and repairs of the old government pier there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work we have in hand. The amount of the contract was $55,455.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the improvement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The extension of the old wharf.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, why call it 'harbour improvements'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is some little additional work in renewing the old government pier. That will be done by day work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this really the construction of a wharf or the improvement of a harbour? I thought 'harbour improvements' included some such thing as dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It includes that and wharf construction as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems a pretty substantial sum for a wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to have a concrete superstructure. It will be a very substan-

tial wharf. Chicoutimi is an important town.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many thousand inhabitants has it?

Mr. GIRARD. Five thousand.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me this expression 'harbour improvements' hardly conveys to the committee the idea as the minister has explained it. I think that members of the committee generally would not get from the word 'harbour improvements' the idea of the construction of a wharf alone. I think that, in such a case, the department would be treating the committee with more candour if it asked for a vote for a wharf. When we speak of 'harbour improvements' we think of such things as are going on in the harbour of Montreal. But where there is a wharf and nothing more, it should be called a wharf, and then the committee would know better what is under discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are not adopting a new plan in this matter. The Quebec harbour improvements include dredging and wharf building, and the same at Montreal. Take the case of St. Andrew's rapids, on the Red river—we speak of the works there as 'improvements'. At Chicoutimi, this work has been carried on from time to time, and it was thought that under this heading it would be easier to give the committee information as to all the expenditures in this harbour.

Mr. LENNOX. I thought I had expressed myself with a reasonable degree of clearness. Perhaps the minister was not listening. He said about what I said. If there is a variety of improvements, I do not object to the word 'harbour improvements'; but where there is nothing but the making of a wharf, I think that the committee would not expect to find the work described by the general term. It would strike one that $55,000 was a large sum for a wharf, but one would be less apt to question such an amount spent in the general improvement of a harbour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this an old wharf or an entirely new structure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a recent structure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister spoke of an old wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original government pier—yes. Some repairs have to be made upon it. This work is an extension of the government pier.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is repairing the old portion and extending it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give us the size of the pier and the material of which it is made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work is the inclosure of a lot 500 feet long on the river front with a mean width of about 190 feet, opposite the Coté, Boivin Company's property on the lower side of the present government wharf. It is being constructed with 50 feet on its outer face on the side of the bridge, and 15 feet high above low water. A retaining wall open face, ballasted cribwork, 31 feet in depth, extending 500 feet down stream in a westerly direction nearly at right angles to the old pier. Then the area which is inclosed on the north and east side by the new retaining wall is to be filled in with material from the river bed by dredging 15 feet at lowest water in front of the retaining wall. The Richelieu and Ontario Company's steamers run there. There is a pulp mill at Chicoutimi which ships its products to Europe. We are gradually deepening the Saguenay so that ocean vessels will be able to go right up to the wharf. The property upon which this is being built is owned by the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the revenue from the old wharf last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend who represents Chicoutimi and Saguenay (Mr. Girard) tells me it was about $2,000 last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. member would tell us why it is necessary to make this large extension?

Mr. GIRARD. The Quebec and Lake St. John railway runs to Chicoutimi and discharges its freight on the wharf. A great deal of freight from Quebec to Montreal is transferred on this wharf, because the rates of transportation are not as high as they are by railway. Chicoutimi is the railway terminus.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there a transfer of the traffic made there from railway to the boat?

Mr. GIRARD. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the traffic is increasing?

Mr. GIRARD. Increasing every year. There are several lumber companies operating there, all using that wharf in the summer time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; it is expected it will take about $9,000 more.

Cap de Chatte—extension of training pier at mouth of river—revote of $2,000 lapsed, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The training pier is for the purpose of directing the current so as to keep the channel clear.

Mr. LENNOX. Why was this $2,000 held over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was one of those works which we decided to postpone last year on account of a shrinkage in the revenue.

Contrecœur—wharf—revote of $1,000 lapsed, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to reconstruct the old wharf purchased from the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company. The estimated cost is $7,000, and the cost of the old wharf is $2,000. We spent, in 1908-9, $2,000. We will require $4,000 to complete the work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did you buy the wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We bought it because we thought it would be in the public interest that it should be owned by the Crown, and we were able to get it at a very low price.

Mr. LENNOX. What is this made of? Is it made of good substantial material, and not sawdust?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sawdust is only a name. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not die anywhere within the next 50 years, and that when he does die the word 'sawdust' will not be found engraved on his heart.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it is more likely to be engraved on the minister's heart. Is the minister embarking to any considerable extent in the business of buying wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to a large extent. We buy them where we can get them very cheap, and where it is in the interest of the public to acquire them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What representations were made to the minister to urge him to buy this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The member for the county, and also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, both urged it strongly as being in the public interest. It is in the county of Chambly and Verchères.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was it acquired by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was acquired, pursuant to order in council dated April 1, 1909.

Mr. LENNOX. Do the Richelieu and Ontario Company continue to use it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am informed by the Solicitor General that they use it. I would assume that they have an arrangement now by way of lease with the Marine Department; if they have not, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took authority last session to insist upon a rental. I am in error as to this. It has not been transferred yet to the Marine Department, and will not be until it is finished. It will require $4,000 more to complete. The total cost will be $9,000. We paid $2,000 for the wharf.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the amount of revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to say. There is a large amount of traffic carried on in agriculture, fishing and manufactured products.

Mr. LENNOX. It was out of repair when the government bought it, I assume?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It required repairing. The resident engineer reported that the foundation was good, the part under water being sound and just as good as new.

Doucet's Landing—pile wharf—to complete, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay balances due on the work, and to complete repairs on the roadway leading from the highway to the wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected that $10,587.10 will cover the cost, of which there has been paid $8,587.10, leaving a balance of $2,000. This is quite a large wharf, 163½ feet long with 12 feet depth of water at low tide. It is near the railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it a new wharf?

Mr. BUREAU. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is it?

Mr BUREAU. It is at the terminus of the Grand Trunk railway running from Arthabaska. It is opposite Three Rivers. The Grand Trunk are the owners of a wharf there and they had to contribute to get on that particular wharf. This is to provide accommodation for the traffic which is increasing all the time on that side.

Mr. LENNOX. A pile wharf, is a cheap class of wharf, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It may be a little cheaper than cribwork, but a pile wharf may be a permanent construction. I think all the wharfs in the harbour of New York are pile wharfs.

Mr. LENNOX. Sometimes you build a pile wharf and sometimes a crib wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends on the opportunity for driving piles. If there is a good foundation for driving piles it may be better to drive the piles rather than construct cribwork. In some cases you must

build cribwork because you cannot drive piles. The engineer informs me that in places where it is not exposed to pressure from running ice pile work is just as good as cribwork.

Mr. LENNOX. What little experience I have had with pile work has gone to show that it is not very satisfactory. It slewed off to one side and became crooked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I noticed when I was in Vancouver that the wharfs built there mostly by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are pile wharfs and I think it is the same in New York.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the minister state what it would cost to complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete it.

Father Point—wharf repairs and improvements, $4,800.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for repairs and improvements to the wharf at Father Point which have been urged very strongly by the resident engineer, Mr. Tremblay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the revenue last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This has not been transferred to the Department of Marine. This is the wharf where the pilots leave to go aboard the ships.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this complete it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will complete all we have at present in contemplation. It may be before long there will be further work to be done.

Fort William—wharf on Ottawa river—revote of $4,000 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the construction of a public wharf, freight shed and waiting room for passengers at Fort William on the Ottawa river in the county of Pontiac. This is a stopping place for the steamer running on the Ottawa river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What revenue is expected from it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it to be transferred?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this is a wharf which we will transfer and let the Department of Marine and Fisheries endeavour to make a lease with the steamboat company.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it usual for the government to build a freight shed, or does the government frequently do that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not out of the way to build a freight shed and shelter for passengers. If my hon. friend goes down the St. Lawrence he will find that the wharf at Murray Bay and the wharf at Tadousac both have sheds.

Mr. LENNOX. Built and kept up by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it will leave a balance of $7,600. The total cost is estimated at $12,600.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population of Fort William?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is somewhere in the vicinity of 1,000. In the summer when the steamboat travel is on it is considerable. It is quite a summer resort, but it is also an important district for the shipment of agricultural and other products.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what places do the steamers ply?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not far above Pembroke. I do not know just where the termini of the steamers are. There is a steamer running up and down the river which calls at Fort William.

Gaspé—deepwater wharf, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to make provision for the building of a deep water wharf at Gaspé. Gaspé is rapidly assuming a position of very considerable importance. It has been for years an important place, but it will become many times as important, I anticipate, by reason of the construction of the Atlantic and Western railway. That railway is being constructed at very large expense. A company consisting of English capitalists are investing somewhere in the vicinity of $3,000,000 in the building of a railway. The railway will be completed during the coming year and it is proposed to construct a wharf, which of course is necessary for the accommodation of the steamers which are expected to come to Gaspé to make connection with this railway. I believe that Gaspé is open about ten months in the year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Where is Gaspé? Can you describe the location of this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend has not been to Gaspé he has a great deal still to live for.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have seen the Gaspé coast, but it is a mighty long coast.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Gaspé is right out at the extreme end of the peninsula.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister been there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then I have as much personal knowledge as the minister. I do not think this is a coast that has an end; it is a sort of semicircle.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a peninsula and at the head is the Bay of Gaspé.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Postmaster General ever been there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population?

Mr LEMIEUX. This is not in Gaspé. There is Gaspé village or Gaspé town and then there are Sandy Beach, Douglastown, and Point St. Peter. I think there is a population in the bay of about 5,000 or 6,000 people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But how many are there in Gaspé village alone?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The wharf is not located in Gaspé village.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there anybody there at all?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, a large population.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the population?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the bay there are about 5,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the extent of the bay?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not say exactly; it is a large bay. It is one of the harbours selected by the admiralty. When the British fleet comes across the Atlantic it generally anchors in the Bay of Gaspé. It will be the terminus of the Gaspé railway, and they are spending $3,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are steamers plying there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are you going to build shipyards there?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No; but I think it will be a great rival of St. John and Halifax.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say it will cost a considerable amount of money. We are obliged to build a pier 1,000 feet long, 95 feet wide at the top and running out to 45 or 50 feet depth of water. It will cost in the vicinity of $300,000.

Mr. LENNOX. What is it to be built of?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Ordinary cribwork faced. We did hope to narrow the width so as to decrease the cost, but we could not feel sure that the wharf would be safe.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the object of going to 45 feet of water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We get to deep water very quickly after going out a long distance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could it not have been dredged?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thought if the wharf were narrowed it would reduce the cost, but as the railway company will have probably three tracks on it, it could not be narrower than it is. The amount appears large, but the work will be very useful. It is the terminus of the railway, and they intend to have a line of steamers there running to Liverpool.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we building wharfs for the railway companies?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, no; we are building it for the public; there will be a line of steamers to Europe from there.

Mr. SPROULE. But the minister says that the wharf has to be made wider because the railway company will have three tracks on it, and it would seem as if the whole thing was for the benefit of the railway company.

Mr. LEMIEUX. For the public.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, but the railway will charge the public for every pound of freight they haul. It looks as if we were subsidizing the railway by building a wharf for them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The railway company first applied to parliament to build a short line through the interior of the peninsula, but the population is along the shore, and the railway company acceded to the wishes of the people that the line should run along the coast. They are building a very high grade line, one of the best in Canada, and on account of running along the shore they have to construct twenty-six bridges within 100 miles, which adds enormously to the cost. It is quite natural that we should provide facilities at this terminus as we do at Montreal, Quebec, Fort William, Port Arthur and elsewhere. In this instance the money is well expended in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not saying that the money is thrown away, nor do I contend that it is not proper to provide facilities for the commerce of the country, but the minister told us it was necessary to make this wharf wider, because the railway company would have three tracks on it,

and the question is: Why does not the railway contribute towards the extra cost?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The railway company has given to the government valuable land for the abutment of the pier.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What revenue does the minister expect from this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the revenue would be pretty considerable. If the expectations are realized, I should think the revenue would be quite as great as at Campbellton, where it amounts to a few thousand dollars.

Mr. BRADBURY. If the government is going to spend all this money, would it not be better for them to build a more substantial structure than they propose? What is the life of a wharf of that kind?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That part of it which is below the water will last for ages, and that above the water ought to be good for 25 or 30 years.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not know what the conditions are on the Atlantic coast, but I know that on the Pacific coast that has not been the experience with wharfs of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The teredo worm is much worse on the Pacific coast.

Mr. SPROULE. That depends on the kind of timber you use. If you use hemlock, it would last only for ten or fifteen years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The outer face of this wharf will be built of creosoted timber, and it will be double-faced; so that we think it will last a very long time.

Mr. SPROULE. But the timber on the cribwork is not creosoted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The teredo is not likely to get through the creosoted square-faced timber to the inside. The creosote thoroughly protects the inner timber.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the character of the freight that will be obtained by the railway and shipped from this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fish, lumber, farm produce, probably pulp and paper, all the usual products of a country of varied resources rapidly developing. I do not believe there is any section of eastern Canada developing more rapidly than northern New Brunswick, and that part of the province of Quebec facing on the Bay of Chaleurs.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is aware that this is not a small railway. At first the railway company applied for a charter to build from Cascapedia to Gaspé Basin; but since then they have acquired the old Baie des Cheleurs railway from Matapedia to Cascapedia; and now they have power to build from Matapedia to Rivière du Loup to connect with the Intercolonial, and also to build from Campbellton to the St. John river to connect with the Transcontinental railway. The route by Gaspé Basin is the shortest between Canada and Liverpool.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to know if the Minister of Public Works makes a practice of building wharfs for the railways at small places, which is practically what this means.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in small places. This is a question of policy, and in determining whether or not the government will build a wharf to facilitate the exchange of traffic between a line of steamers and a railway line, one must consider whether or not the traffic is such that the work partakes somewhat of a national aspect. At Fort William, for instance, the government is not only dredging out the Kaministiquia river, but is building a wharf of considerable length, not merely for the purpose of assisting the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, but to promote the transportation interests of the country by facilitating the easy and rapid transference of traffic from the railways to the steamers and from the steamers to the railways. We are proposing to do on a smaller scale the same thing at Gaspé, which we believe will be an important port in connection with the transportation interests of Canada. We believe there will be a very large traffic there as a result of the construction of a splendid line of railway, and therefore we are justified in proceeding with the construction of this work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would not that argument apply to many towns on our lakes and rivers?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are doing it in hundreds of places. We have done it at Port Hope, at Tiffin on the Georgian bay, at Collingwood, at Lakefield, at Parry Sound, and at hundreds of other places all over the country which are the terminal of railways, or where railways run to navigable water, in order to facilitate and cheapen transportation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister say he is actually building a wharf on which a railway runs its tracks and transhipps goods?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and we are glad to have the railway tracks on the wharf. I would ten times rather build a wharf on which a railway runs its tracks than where there is no railway connection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is still a good deal of force in what my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) has urged. It is perfectly

apparent that this wharf is really a part of the railway. If the government did not build it, the railway company would be obliged to build it; otherwise its railway line would be to a certain extent useless, because steamers could not connect with the railway and traffic could not be carried on. It is a matter of policy, of course, whether or not the government shall build a wharf; but if they do and make it an essential part of the railway, they ought to receive reasonable returns. If they spend $300,000 on the construction of this wharf, they should insist on some arrangement with the railway company by which the company shall pay the interest on the money expended and the cost of maintenance. If we are assured of that, there does not seem to be any special objection to this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I take it for granted that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will exact reasonable toll, having regard to the business carried on and the cost of the wharf, so as to get a revenue which, in a large measure at all events. will pay the interest on the cost and also provide for repairs. I may say that you cannot build a wharf any where, where a railway comes to navigable water, without in some way benefiting the railway. You cannot benefit the public without benefiting the railway. Take the city of St. John, take all those wharfs which the city has built on the western side of the harbour, and one of which is now being built by the government as an extension, the Canadian Pacific railway is the only line running there, and you might argue that this is for the benefit altogether of that company. But it is not. The Canadian Pacific railway brings the traffic, but the wharfs are equally an accommodation and encouragement of business, which is evidenced by the fact that since 1895 the winter export trade of that city has grown from small dimensions to $25,000,000. That is the result of giving accommodation to steamers. The Canadian Pacific railway gets its benefit, but the whole country gets the benefit as well.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister any idea of the number of steamers likely to call there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am told that there will be a regular line of steamers going there. Who would have imagined 14 years ago that the growth of business of St. John would have been so rapid? You provide the facilities and the business will develop.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is a good harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. One of the best on the coast.

Mr. SPROULE. Has any contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. There was a small vote the year before last, but we did nothing because when we found that the wharf was going to cost so much we thought it would not be fair to parliament to enter into a contract without coming back and informing parliament of the cost.

Mr. SPROULE. How is this wharf to be built? Is it to be of cribwork? Is it to be faced with creosoted material to prevent the teredo worm from getting in its work? From the remarks of the minister one would conclude that it is to be faced around so that it would be impossible for the teredo to get into the cribwork. How is that to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it is absolutely closed tight how can the worm work through the timber?

Mr. SPROULE. Will you place it as you would a piece of tongue and grooved staging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. You put it down to the earth where the sand is washing against it and the water working through the stone all the time, how then can the minister say it is possible to keep the teredo worm out of these cribs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say it, but the engineers do.

Mr. SPROULE. I shall be very much surprised if they succeed, and if they do not, that raises an important question. If the teredo worm destroys the cribwork, what will hold the wharf together unless it is very much bound by iron bolts or something else.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be double faced, and the joints will overlap each other some six inches, and be almost water-tight.

Godfroy river—cribwork extension to pile wharf, &c., $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is recommended by the resident engineer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this transferred?

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. This wharf was built some two or three years ago, and the road to it is frequently overflooded at certain seasons of the year. We have been asking for money to raise the road, so that the public may be accommodated. Godfroy is an important place. There is a ferry between it and Three Rivers which carries all sorts of goods from the parishes in my county, and this road has to be kept in first-class order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the item is not for a road but for a wharf.

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. Besides the road there is cribwork to be built alongside the wharf, because the wharf is too high at low water. It is to be an extension of the wharf. The money was asked for that cribwork and the raising of the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it for cribwork or for a road?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a cribwork extension to be filled in with stone, and there will be an approach as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apparently the '&c.' is pretty much the whole thing, because the hon. member for the county seems to think so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief work is the cribwork. There is a wharf there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And a line of steamers goes to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know whether it is a road or a wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is both. It is really an approach. This takes in both. In order to get to the wharf you must have an approach.

Mr. HENDERSON. How far does it extend into the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to send my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) the picture of a wharf which his friends built about twenty years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would rather you sent some money to construct some piers in my country as easily as you are induced to send it for wharfs down here.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The land is very low. When you pass Three Rivers, you can see on the south shore, nothing but low land. At the mouth of the river there is a wharf built by the government, and my hon. friend from Nicolet meant the approach to the wharf.

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. It is a road that starts from the main road and goes to the wharf. Call it an approach if you like.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only misapprehension is that we misunderstood the nature of the thing which is to be built. We thought it was an extension out into the water, but it is an extension back into the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With that explanation, it ought to carry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is not it, what is it?

Mr. G. A. TURCOTTE. There is the approach to the wharf, and then there is an extension by a crib on account of the water going too low this summer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister a plan of this wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have in the department, but none here.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would really like to see it, because I do not thoroughly understand it yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Could not I explain it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think you could, but I am not sure I could understand it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a pile wharf and at the end the water is not sufficiently deep to give accommodation to the vessels which frequent it. We propose to build an extension which will give an ample depth of water. This will be the main expenditure. Then, we shall build an approach to the wharf. And the whole will cost $1,000.

Grand Méchin wharf—to complete payments, &c., $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of this amount $3,398.86 is the amount of a claim to the contractor—a balance due, certified by the resident engineer, Mr. Tremblay. The balance of the vote is to be used in rip-rapping work for the protection of the wharf.

Mr. LENNOX. How much will the whole work cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The original contract was $26,900, to which this vote is to be added.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the anticipated revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry, I cannot tell my hon. friend. Matters connected with the revenues are made up in the Marine Department.

Mr. LENNOX. I think this system would stand a good deal of improvement. Over and over again, we are told, concerning things that we ought to know, that the matter is in charge of some other department and the information is not to be had. The minister may tell us that the system is the same as under a former government—

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will pardon me; this wharf is not yet transferred.

Mr. LENNOX. My remark may not apply so much to this particular case, but it applies to many cases. There ought to be some system by which the minister will be able to give us the information that we ought to have. If necessary to have another minister here to assist him——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or some official from the other department.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes. This difficulty arises, not only once or twice during the session, but often. Does not the minister think he could effect an improvement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will see that until the wharf is transferred and until some experience has been had of the business, it would be impossible for an official to estimate the revenue with any degree of accuracy. In fact I would not ask him to make an estimate in advance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not agree with that. I suppose that, when the proposal is made to build a wharf, one department or the other would consider whether the revenue would be likely to pay for the maintenance at least. I should hardly suppose that the Department of Public Works would undertake the building of a wharf quite without regard for that consideration. I do not say that there might not be cases where you would go on with the work even if you knew that the revenue would not maintain it. But I should think that the inquiry must be made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to serve as a breakwater as well as a wharf. This point is an important fishing centre.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That would be incidental to the wharf. That is, if you had not a wharf you would not need a breakwater.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, this is a place to which fishermen resort for safety. And it might be that the primary object was to give a harbour of refuge.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that true in this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. We had a memorial presented to us stating that the fishing industry at this point was an important one, and that every year the fishermen have to provide themselves with new boats to replace those broken on the rocks, and a place of resort in stormy weather is very much needed. The department decided—before I became minister—that it would be well to give the breakwater and create the harbour of refuge. They have decided also that it was advisable to make the breakwater available for a wharf.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it customary for the minister not to make inquiry as to the probable revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as I am concerned as minister, the object has been rather to look at the accommodation given to the people, and not so much at the revenue to be derived. In the case of these wharfs, you cannot expect to derive much revenue. Wherever we can feel that a wharf will operate as a breakwater and at the same time create a harbour of refuge, I am always more impressed with that consideration rather than the few dollars that may be derived as a revenue from the construction of the wharf. I do not know what were the arguments used in this case, because, as I have said, petitions were presented and the work undertaken before I became minister. But I found there were many petitions in favour of it dating as far back as January, 1903.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost, when completed, will be a little over $30,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are we to understand that the minister is to spend $30,000, and cannot give us even a reasonable idea of whether there will be any revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be no revenue unless we transfer it to the Marine Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely the government ought to know whether their policy is that this will be transferred to the Marine Department. If the principle is good in one locality, it ought to be equally good in all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the nature of the wharf accommodation before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was none before, no breakwater, no protection to fishing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The population in 1901 was 557.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention of the government to have these wharfs transferred to the Marine Department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we take up that question, we will have to consider whether the primary object of this work is a breakwater and harbour of refuge; if it is, I would not think that would be a case where it should be transferred to the Marine Department, and where these people would be obliged to pay tolls. But that is a matter I have not yet considered. I am waiting for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to determine upon his policy under the statute passed last session. I shall be guided greatly by the suggestion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because the legislation was promoted by him.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister is putting us off. When we ask what will be the income from this, he says he does not know until it is transferred to the Marine Department, thereby implying that it is going to be transferred. I do not wish to be understood as saying that they ought to be transferred, but I do mean to imply that the government ought to have some settled

policy with regard to them, that would be applicable to the whole country. But when he says he does not know what the income will be because it has not been transferred, that seems to me to be an excuse for the time being to get the item passed.

Grande Rivière (Gaspé)—repairs to wharf and approach, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The proposed extension will be 100 feet long, and the probable cost will be $15,500. Repairs to the approach, $500. We expended in 1908-9, $7,772.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long will it be before the work is completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to have it completed during the coming fiscal year. The extension is cribwork filled with stone, 37 feet in width at one end, and 40 feet at the other. We are extending it 100 feet.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It was built 25 years ago. I think there was at the outer end of the wharf something like 20 feet of water. But the Grand river empties nearby, and carries down sand, and for a few years back there has been an accumulation of sand which, on several occasions, prevented ships from reaching the wharf. There are three steamers using this wharf, one running between Montreal and Gaspé, one from Campbellton to Gaspé, and, I think, another one running between Montreal, Quebec and Gaspé ports. This is a very important place. On two or three occasions last summer a steamer was stopped on its way on account of the accumulation of sand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate of the engineer is that this sum will complete the work. We have already expended $7,772, and this $5,000 will make $12,000. That will leave $2,500 more that we will have to get later on.

Mr. SPROULE. That is done by contract, I presume?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far the work we have done in the way of repairs has been by day labour, but we have not decided as to whether we shall ask for a contract for this. I think that in all probability we shall.

Mr. SPROULE. But you say you have spent $7,000 on the new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did I say on the new work?

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if it was on the new work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My notes do not distinguish clearly between new work and repairs. The only note which I have is that this $5,000 is to make provision for repairs to the wharf and roadway of approach and extending the wharf at Grand Rivière. The total cost is estimated to be $15,000. Then we deduct from that the expenditure during 1908-9, which work was done by day work. There is an appropriation for the year which will expire on March 31 next of $5,000. I have not a memo of how much of that has been expended.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it done by day work or contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whatever has been expended has been by day work. Then we have the additional $5,000 which we are now asking, and we will require $2,500 more to finish the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that you propose to do that by day work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided, but I do not see why we should not do that by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see why the other should not have been done by contract, if you pay any attention to the resolution to this House, that all work involving an expenditure of $5,000 or over shall be done by contract unless the circumstances are exceptional.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to that, I shall confer with the chief engineer, but I think it could be very well done by contract.

Grande Vallée—restoration of breakwater pier—revote of $9,850 lapsed, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That $9,850 was voted for the year which ended on the 31st March, 1909, and it was not used. We are asking for an extension of the same amount. This is to make provision towards repairing the pier at Grande Vallée. There are quite a large number of mills at that place, and the wharf is badly in need of repairs.

Mr. LENNOX. Is $10,000 the total amount?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will require to spend the $10,000, but the estimate is that $4,500 more will be required to finish it.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid this will have to be done by day work, as it is repairing and it is very difficult to let a contract for it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the total cost of this pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure up to the 31st December, 1909, was $57,773.85.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is not the pier that is built in front of or on private property that we heard of some years ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not think so. My hon. friend may possibly have the same work in his mind, but the government owns the site. It is built on government property.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is there only one lumber company there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is the Dominion Lumber Company, and the residents of Grande Vallée have also requested that these repairs be made as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SPROULE. Has this been transferred to the Department of Marine, and if so, what income is there from it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a breakwater and not a wharf. Of course, it serves the purpose of a wharf, but its primary purpose is that of a breakwater. It also creates a harbour of refuge.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it pile or cribwork?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cribwork.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is cribwork and $10,000 has been spent on it surely it could have been done quite as well by contract as by day work. It is the most ordinary kind of work that could be done in the shape of a breakwater. I do not see any reason why it should not be done by contract and you would be much more likely to get a full return for the money than by doing the work by day labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In repairing a breakwater it is pretty difficult to specify with any certainty the work which will have to be done. If we were to specify less than was necessary, in order to receive tenders we would be liable to be called upon to pay quite large sums in extras, unless we specified it so liberally that the tenders might be larger than the actual cost would be. It is very difficult to specify with any reasonable degree of accuracy in a case like this where different kinds of repairs have to be made.

Mr. SPROULE. I would say that in a case of that kind it would be. I infer that this is a wharf as well as a breakwater.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The primary object is that of a breakwater, but it is used for both. It is called a breakwater pier.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—repairs and extension to wharf, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is required to make repairs to the wharf at Grosse Isle and to make further provision towards the extension of the eastern or hospital wharf. This larger work has been applied for by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who has assured me that it was regarded as absolutely essential for properly carrying on the quarantine work there.

Mr. SPROULE. There was some money voted last year. Is it the same work that is being carried on?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year $4,200 was voted simply for repairs, while this larger sum here is for the extension of the wharf.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is expected it will.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of an extension do you propose to make, and how do you propose to do the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume it will be of the same character as the present work. It will be close faced cribwork, ballasted and sheeted. The object is that the ocean steamers may land there and discharge passengers who are to be placed in quarantine.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Should not cement or some permanent material be used in such a work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would cost a great deal of money.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this be let by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Harrington Harbour wharf, north shore, Gulf of St. Lawrence, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to build a very necessary wharf to be utilized in connection with the most valuable work which Dr. Grenfell is doing on the Labrador coast.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not know whether Dr. Grenfell is a blacksmith or a lumberman or a mason, or what work he is doing. However, this is a small amount; is this to complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I thought my hon. friend knew Dr. Grenfell's work. He has devoted his life to the people along the Labrador coast.

Mr. LENNOX. He is the man who brought out the reindeers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Dr. Grenfell has done considerable himself in the way of giving accommodation at Harrington harbour, and this amount is required to complete the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Carried.

Ile Verte—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $2,500. We will have to ask for a thousand more later.

Kamouraska wharf—repairs, $1,200.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is expected this will complete.

Lake Aylmer—wharf at Stratford Centre, $3,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the total cost will probably be $6,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where is Lake Aylmer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Richmond and Wolfe. There is a good deal of travel there, particularly in the summer. There are five saw mills, five stores, population about 1,000.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a very nice place, we were down there to see it once.

Les Eboulements—repairs to wharf and shed, $1,450.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimated cost is $2,950.

Le Petit Debarquement, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the total estimated cost is $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the dimensions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 25 feet long, 30 feet wide; we want to get about 12 feet of water.

Malbaie (Gaspé) boat shelter, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will complete the work it is supposed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a mistake in this item. There are two Malbaies in Gaspé and this vote is for Barrachois de Malbaie.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move that the item be changed to read that way.

Matane—protection pier on east side of outlet of the Matane river, $20,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked for by petition of the residents, and is regarded as a very important work. The total cost is estimated at $41,500.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the nature of the traffic there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a large lumbering business. Price Brothers have a large mill there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the length of the pier?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be 500 feet long.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does it protect the land from being washed away by the river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It prevents the sand drifting in and filling up the harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be cribwork and stone ballasting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does ordinary work cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. From 8 to 10 cents per cubic foot, taking the woodwork and the stone together.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this work going to be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Montebello—wharf on the River Ottawa, $9,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is asked for by petition of the residents. It will be a double decked cribwork structure extending out 240 feet and having a height of 14 feet. This is a new work. The estimated cost is $9,000. This will be done by contract.

Murray Bay wharf—enlargement and repairs, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a very important work. Murray bay is one of the principal points at which steamers navigating the St. Lawrence call. The wharf has got out of repair, and we require this amount to make the necessary repairs. We had a vote of $7,800 for the same purpose which was allowed to lapse.

Mr. LENNOX. That seems a little peculiar. I would think that if a vote is taken for necessary repairs, that ought not to be allowed to lapse. I think the repairs ought to be carried on, as the wharf gets a great deal worse if it is allowed to stand, and the repairs cost more. Has the minister any explanation as to that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will notice that this is for enlargement and repairs. We felt that the enlargement could stand over until this session, but the repairs became so urgent during the season just passed that we were obliged to obtain a Governor General's warrant, and the repairs have been completed.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was expended on Governor General's warrant?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some $6,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is that a usual procedure or very unusual?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a very unusual procedure, and it is only done when the work becomes absolutely necessary and we cannot wait for the meeting of parliament wtihout detriment to the public interest.

Mr. LENNOX. Did these repairs become urgent owing to storms, or were they a matter of decay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Owing to storms last winter and spring.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there anything at this wharf besides the steamers that call there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a great deal of traffic. It is a very important point. In addition to the Richelieu steamers there is a steamer running from Rivière Ouelle in connection with the Intercolonial railway and which brings a great deal of traffic.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any revenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I could get the amount from the Marine Department, but no doubt it will be in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BLAIN. It would be a good thing for the hon. gentleman to keep before him, the amount of revenue in each case when asking for these large expenditures.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I had that, my hon. friend might not be so inquisitive on this point. He would then want something else.

Mr. BLAIN. No, the hon. minister has always told us that he keeps in view the revenues to be derived from these wharfs. Perhaps if he would keep before him the amounts received in past years, he would be a little more economical.

Natashquan—breakwater pier on north shore of St. Lawrence—revote of $1,960 lapsed, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is towards constructing a breakwater, 175 feet by 25, and 125 feet by 30, 18 feet of water at low spring tide. This is asked for by petition of the residents.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this to prevent land being washed away?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; it is to be used as a wharf as well as a breakwater. Natashquan is some 75 miles below Esquimalt Point, and I am told the best fishing ground on the north shore.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is a very large fishing establishment there. It is the terminus of the mail boats on the north shore, and can be made a good harbour.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this to be construtced to serve this large fish corporation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be a harbour of refuge for the fishermen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many of a population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 100 fishermen during the fishing season. It is in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is estimated to cost $20,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the representative of the county here? I would like an explanation from him.

Mr. GIRARD. Natashquan is one of the principal fishing places on the north shore, from Belle Isle up to Esquimalt Point. It has a large population during the summer, and there is a population of about six or seven hundred all the year round. Natashquan Point is the head of the mail boats from Quebec down the north shore. It has no protection at present, and when the weather is a little stormy, the boats cannot land at all, and the result is that the mails, which are sent by the boats and are carried by small boats down to Belle Isle, are delayed two or three trips, so that this wharf is required to give a chance to the whole population to get their mails regularly. There is also a local traffic, which is very important in summer. That traffic consists of the export of fish and the import of the necessary requirements for the fishing population, which amounts to many hundreds in the summer time.

Mr. BLAIN. What accommodation have the people there now?

Mr. GIRARD. There is no wharf there at all.

Mr. BLAIN. How did they get along so many years without it?

Mr. GIRARD. The boats which come there have to anchor at a great distance from the shore, and when it is a little stormy these boats cannot remain there, because there is no protection, and outside of that the small schooners, used by the fishermen are often obliged in stormy weather to cross over to Anticosti island for protection against the wind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nearest railway point?

Mr. GIRARD. It is Quebec. From Quebec down to Belle Isle there is no railway at all, and the only way of communication is by sea.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it that the minister has neglected this part so long?

Mr. GIRARD. It has been neglected since the beginning of the world, and this is the first time any government has looked after it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this be by tender and contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the minister advertise for these public tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As widely as is reasonably necessary in order to insure keen competition.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any change in the policy?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Has nothing been spent here before for wharfs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Never except we bought some timber, some $2,000 out of the general vote, for harbours and rivers.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have no harbour there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are going to make a harbour.

Mr. SPROULE. But I see there was another vote, because there is an amount of $1,900 lapsed. That might imply that there was money spent. I asked how it was spent and the minister says it was spent on timber.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not out of that vote, but out of the general vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the hon. minister take money out of the general vote to buy some timber when there was no work undertaken. When an amount is voted for harbours and rivers generally, I have always understood it was for ordinary repairs and could not be used in beginning new work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1898 there was an appropriation of $2,000, out of which $35.68 was spent, leaving $1,960 which lapsed.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the expenditure started for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The expenditure was only $35.66 and probably for engineers examination. During the present fiscal year we bought timber for this work to the amount of $2,000 and we pay for that out of the general vote for harbours and rivers.

Mr. LENNOX. Will that remain that way, or will the $2,000 be restored?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When we make a contract, the contractor will be obliged to take over the timber at actual cost.

Mr. LENNOX. But will the $2,000 go back to the general vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will go into the cost of this work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This $2,000 will come out of the $20,000?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the total cost of $20,000. Of this we are asking now $5,000; there is also this timber, $2,000, leaving $13,000 to complete.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the nature of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cribwork with stone ballast. It is to be 300 feet long, with a width of 25 feet for 175 feet, and of 30 feet for 125 feet.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister was to produce a letter from the member representing the county in relation to the Roberval item. Has he it here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That related to public buildings. We have not been on the items of public buildings since that time. But when the public buildings for the province of Quebec are before the committee again, I will have it here.

New Carlisle wharf—repairs and renewals, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for repairs, and is recommended by the resident engineer. The flooring and stringers are in a very bad state and must be renewed. This is in Bonaventure county.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Norway bay—wharf on River Ottawa—revote of $2,000 lapsed, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Pontiac county.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; we shall require $4,000 more.

Paspebiac, East (portage) — breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the length of this breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. 900 feet long.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And what will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be $15,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And what is the object of building a pier 900 feet long?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide a harbour of refuge, as many boats have been damaged and others totally wrecked. There are over 200 fishermen there.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is there a village there? If so, what is its population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 1,000. I am told it is the most important fishing station on Chaleur bay.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What kind of accommodation was there there before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Practically none, so far as protection works were concerned. These people carry on business under enormous disadvantages when they have no harbour of refuge.

Mr. WRIGHT. What vessels ply on that harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Fishing vessels. A large number have their headquarters there.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Cribwork with stone ballasting—the usual style.

Mr. SPROULE. A length of 900 feet seems very great for a breakwater for a village of 1,000 inhabitants.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You must provide the length necessary to afford the shelter—no use doing the work if you do not accomplish that. We would not make it so long if we could help it.

Mr. SPROULE. The water must be very shallow there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to give 15 feet at high water, spring tide.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this work be done by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Petit Saguenay river—wharf on west side, near mouth of river, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that a new work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. It is estimated to cost $3,000, so we shall need $2,000 more to complete it.

Mr. BLAIN. Are these close estimates the minister is giving?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The estimate of the engineer, and I rely upon it as accurate.

Mr. BLAIN. What county is this in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. BLAIN. Is any revenue expected from this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should not expect any to speak of.

Piché Point wharf, on Lake Temiscaming—ice breaker and repairs, $2,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to provide two or three ice breakers to protect the wharf and to make necessary repairs to the wharf. This is opposite Haileybury.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is expected to complete.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there deep water there?

Mr PUGSLEY. Yes, steamers ply upon the lake.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the lake was not deep.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is about 9 feet navigation in Lake Temiscaming

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the naval debate.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, February 21, 1910.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That in pursuance of the recommendation of his hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, laid on the table of the House, with other papers on the subject, on Thursday the 17th instant, by virtue of the Civil Service Act and amendments thereto, Mr. Ernest L. Desaulniers be appointed as translator of the Debates branch of the House of Commons, in place of the late Rodolphe Laferrière, deceased.

Mr. BORDEN. I presume the necessary provisions of the Civil Service Act have been complied with.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. If my hon. friend will look into the Votes and Proceedings of the 17th of February, he will find all the certificates there in connection with Mr. Speaker's report.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to amend the Railway Act. He said: Briefly the provisions of this Bill are as follows: Section 1 provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners can deal with work already done by railway companies irrespective of the Act under which they should have proceeded. Some railway companies have proceeded to locate lines, for instance, without going through the necessary routine of getting the approval of the Board of Railway Commissioners. When called upon to deal with these the board held that they had no juris-

diction unless practically the rails were removed and they started over again. In order to give the board the power to deal with such cases in the past, but not in the future, this amendment is introduced.

The second section is to provide that railway companies may appoint vice presidents with certain prescribed duties although those persons are not members of the Board of Directors.

The third section is to expedite the passing of wires for telegraph, telephone, or electric light purposes over railways without waiting for an order of the board.

Section 4 deals with the question of the necessity of a brakeman riding on the rear end of a locomotive when it is passing over certain portions of the line. The employees of the railway companies complain that while they have no objection to being on the rear end of the locomotive while it is engaged in shunting, for the necessary protection of the public, in some cases where they have to run many miles, there is no protection to the public and it is very severe on the men, particularly in cold weather.

Section 5 provides that the railways in Canada may give transportation, if they wish, to an ex-employee of a railway company, or to members of the Inter-state Commerce Commission.

Section 6 amends the clause in the existing Act, which provides that working agreements between telephone companies must be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners by extending the application of the clause to telegraph companies.

Section 7 is to correct what seems to be an error in the statute of 1909. In that statute in the section referring to the protection of level crossings by railways to be constructed in the future, the words 'constructed after the passing of this Act' are used. This interpreted would mean after the passing of the Act of 1903, and it is to make it clear that this is after the passing of the amendment of 1909.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

DOMINION MILLERS' ASSOCIATION.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 111) respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—Mr. Harris.

On section 2,—objects of the association.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The Bill was referred by the Private Bills Committee to a sub-committee of which I was a member. That clause was discussed to a considerable extent and it is practically the same clause as was in the Act incorporating the company in 1892. The members of this company are not confined to shareholders but are confined to millers generally; the present Bill extends it to farmers so that farmers may become members of the company as well as millers. The only difficulty the members of the committee had with this section was in connection with the subsection providing that they should have no power to fix the price to be paid. That was put in at first at the instance of the Grangers or the Patrons of Industry. There was another question as to whether it should go further and forbid them to fix the selling price, but it was thought that that was sufficiently guarded by the general law against combines.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the association that settles disputes between millers and those from whom they purchase grain? For instance if a miller brings grain from Port Arthur and there is a shortage of the shipment, it has been complained that I think this association sometimes acts in an arbitrary manner.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. They can only arbitrate when both parties agree to have them arbitrate.

Mr. SPROULE. I am supposing that I am not a member of the association, but am ordering through them, and they have heretofore exercised rather arbitrary powers in the judgment of some, in saying just how much they should give you.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. That point was considered by the sub-committee. It is not intended that this Bill should give the company power to arbitrate so as to bind persons who are not members of the association. This Bill cannot bind any one unless they agree to submit their differences to the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The arbitration is not compulsory?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I think it is compulsory on those who become members and agree to that regulation, but it is not compulsory on outsiders. In that respect there is no change in the law.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill is peculiar in that the previous Act was an Act to provide for an association of millers, but this Bill, purporting to be an amendment, establishes that association as an ordinary business enterprise. Therefore, by the Act now in force, and by this present Bill, the parties concerned have the benefit of legislation which establishes them as an association and also as a business enterprise. Whether there is any serious harm actually in the Bill or not, as it reads, it would indicate to me that it is an attempt to secure legislative authority for a merger

or combine, which it does not appear to me to be judicious that parliament should assent to without the very fullest consideration of what seems to be the object of this legislation. If, after it has been gone into carefully, it is found that no such feature exists in this Bill, I would say let it pass, but so long as there appears on the face of it that intention it would scarcely be judicious I think for parliament to give its sanction.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I put a question about that feature of the Bill in committee and we got no very satisfactory answer. I am in sympathy with the remarks of the Minister of the Interior. There never has been a proper explanation made as to the real intention of this Bill, and it does look to me that it is quite possible that the smaller mills in Manitoba and the west might be injured. Before this Bill passes I would like an explanation as to what extent it might lead to a merger or combine in the milling industry. A great deal of capital has been expended in building smaller mills in the west of from 50 to 300 barrels capacity. We have a splendid mill in my town of about 300 barrels capacity, and through the influence of the larger mills, like the Lake of the Woods and Ogilvies, that mill, like many others throughout Manitoba, has been unable to carry on its business because of the control of prices by these larger corporations. If this Bill tends towards that object I would oppose it, and at all events it should not pass until the member who introduced it is here to explain.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member (Mr. A. H. Clarke) to say that this Bill is the same as the last Bill, but that is not so. Clause 3 of the original Bill provides that they shall not deal in grain, and this Bill is the very reverse, for it provides they may carry on the business of purchasing, selling, storing, shipping, dealing in grain, and selling flour, and acquire by hire or otherwise, elevators and so on. That clause gives them the power to become a monopoly or a controlling element in the handling of grain to the detriment of others. I have grave doubts that we should pass such a Bill.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I did not intend to say that the powers given by this Bill were not greater than the powers in the former Bill. We were only discussing clause (d) as to the power to arbitrate, and what I said was that that provision was in the former Bill. This Bill does give wider powers than the previous Bill, and I think the Minister of the Interior has stated what these powers are. The former Bill did not give them the power to operate as traders and to buy and sell grain. It rather constituted a combination of the smaller millers, and this was a central organization for promoting their interests. It was stated before the sub-committee that this company had been formed for the protection of the smaller millers as against the larger millers, the Lake of the Woods and others. Section 3 of the former Bill gave them power to extend, promote and improve the manufacture of flour and meal, to engage in the business of flour milling generally in Canada, in shipping and selling to foreign markets, as well as the markets of this country, of grain, flour or meal, and to assist the members of the association with regard to the matters aforesaid. There was an express denial there of the right to do a trading business. It is said that it should not constitute a trading company, or empower them to engage as a trading association in the business of buying and selling grain. The intention of this present Bill is to remove that restriction and to give them power to do not only what they have done before, but to buy and sell grain. There is an incidental power given in one of the later clauses which is common to every company: That they may take stock in other companies and other companies may take stock in this company. It was on account of this that the Minister of Agriculture made some objection when it first came before the Private Bills Committee, and it was for that reason referred to a sub-committee. The sub-committee heard Mr. Watts, the representative of the association, and it appeared that the powers sought under this Bill are similar to those which other companies of the same kind possess, and so far as the sub-committee could see the powers which were being sought were practically the same as those which had been accorded to similar companies. If it is an objection that the company should be incorporated for buying and selling grain, then that power is included in this Bill. I am not at all concerned in the Bill; I am only speaking because I was a member of the sub-committee in order to tell the House what took place before that committee. The sub-committee could not see that any harm would be done by incorporating this company to buy and sell. It is a legitimate enterprise; it is something an individual could do, and I do not see any good reason that this company should not be incorporated to do these lawful things which individuals associated together might do without an Act of parliament.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Seeing there are so many different views with regard to this measure, and that the member who is in charge of the Bill is not present, it would be wise to leave it over until the member for Brantford be here to explain.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. The Bill is merely in his name; he does not know any more about it than any of us.

Mr. OLIVER. While I have the highest respect for my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke). I think he has hardly stated accurately the position taken by those who are criticising this Bill. There is no objection to any number of gentlemen coming to this parliament and securing incorporation for the purpose of buying, selling and dealing in grain, probably in the very terms which are contained in this Bill; but there is no reason why gentlemen who already have certain powers for another purpose should come here and obtain the legislation which they would be entitled to have if they were not associated together for that other purpose. As it appears to me, these gentlemen are getting the advantage of two separate and different situations by legislation in the one Bill, and the amendments to it. I submit that that is dangerous, looked at from the standpoint of the public interest. There is no reason why, if these gentlemen want to buy and sell grain, they should not come here and get incorporation as a company to buy and sell grain; but, on the other hand, there is no reason why, in order that they may do that, they should come as a Millers' Association, and ask that the Millers' Association shall have power to buy and sell grain.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble seems to be what I referred to in the first place. Any one outside of that association who desires to buy a carload of grain cannot get it unless he orders it through the association, and comes to their terms, no matter what they are. I am speaking from my own experience. You may buy grain in the west at a reasonable price for shipment to Ontario, but you cannot get it shipped except through the association otherwise, unless you pay an exorbitant freight rate. The railway company would not agree to deliver your grain in two, three, or four months. There is no use in attempting to handle grain in that way. I am not saying that this association is responsible for that, or whether it influences the railway companies or not; but I do know that grain that was ordered in the west did not reach Ontario for two and a half or three months. Such delay destroys the chance of any one getting any profit out of the business, and many who desire to have the grain do not order it because they cannot depend on getting it. If this association is responsible for that, then I think we are giving them too much power.

Mr. NESBITT. As I understand those speaking for the members of the association, they have no desire to hinder an independent miller from getting grain at any price he can get it at. Their desire is through organization to assist the smaller millers throughout the country, who cannot buy in the quantities that the large millers can, to buy unitedly. With regard to what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said about holding up independent parties, it seems to me there should be no difficulty of that kind, because any person who is held up can apply to the Railway Board, set forth the facts, and get redress. It is quite impossible, in my judgment, for any association to hold up those who are independent of it, and make them pay a higher freight rate or delay shipment. If the members of this association want to buy grain for the purpose of distribution among themselves, I do not see why we should not allow them to do so. As to their calling themselves an association instead of a company, that is an immaterial distinction, and so long as their objects are legitimate, I do not see why we should not pass the Bill. I have no interest in the Bill further than to see that justice is done to the smaller millers throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. If a man wants a carload of grain, he is not going to waste his time going before the Railway Board, if he cannot get it.

Mr. NESBITT. He need not waste time. He need only write a letter.

Mr. SPROULE. If you are ordering a carload of grain from the west, and you are told that the only way you can get it through is through one of these associations, you begin to think that the association has some influence with the railway company that it should not have. I am not sure how far the association is responsible, but I am sure that you could not get the grain or know when it would be shipped, and besides, you would have to pay a higher freight rate on it. These are two objectionable features to the man who wants to buy, and if this association exercises such influence with the railways, I think it is a bad one.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The object of the association may be a very good one, and very likely is, namely, that a lot of millers may combine together for the purpose of competing with the large milling companies like Ogilvie's, or the Lake of the Woods Company in purchasing grain; but, on the other hand, it may be an injury. You do not know the terms on which these parties combine together. Some individual in the combine may not have as much interest as others. The House ought to know particularly what fees the association is allowed to charge, and it might be right to limit it in that respect, so that it would be obliged to give equal rights to all who hold stock in the association. The object is a perfectly good one. The association en-

ables parties who want only one or two carloads of grain to get them by entering into a combination of this kind, and sending a buyer into the market to buy two or three hundred carloads. Two or three hundred may be purchased cheaper than a couple might be able to do. It may be all right for an individual mill owner to belong to a concern of this kind, but the powers granted should be strictly guarded so that no advantage may be taken of individual mill owners who are not in it.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to say anything special on the merits of the Bill, but I think there is sufficient opposition to it to justify our allowing to give further explanation. While it may not be written law, it is a well observed custom that when the introducer of a Bill is absent we should not proceed with it if there be any opposition.

Mr. A. M. MARTIN. There appears to be quite a misunderstanding regarding freight rates. The freight rate must be approved by the Railway Commission and printed and published before coming into effect. No society of any kind has any power or right over the freight rates of any company. Any man who wishes, may go into a railway freight office in any part of the Dominion and get a copy of the freight rates. There is no difference in freight rates, but there is a milling rate which gives the miller the right to take the grain into his mill cheaper than the rate to an ordinary shipper who buys to sell. The reason of this is that the miller ships the product over the same road. That is all the preference he gets. This association has been in existence since 1902. The members of it are all responsible men who have been carrying on a legitimate business under it. The association was formed, as the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) has said, to compete against the larger mills. They have the right to buy grain under their charter and all they now ask is the right to sell grain. That is about all the difference. I see no harm in this. I was on the sub-committee with the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) and we went over the Bill very carefully and made one or two changes. The Bill itself does not differ from some other Bills. I had before me a Bill to incorporate the Maritime Milling Company, and its terms are precisely similar. As regards arbitration, this association is not asking for more powers than are given the board of trade. The only case of arbitration it has ever had is one which is before it now, so that if there have been, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said, other cases, they had no connection with this company whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. This company is asking for very much larger powers. Section 3 in the old Act is as follows:

The objects of the association are to promote, extend, and improve the manufacture of flour and meal, the business of flour milling generally in Canada, and the shipping and sale to foreign markets, as well as to the markets of this country, of grain, flour and meal, and to assist the members of the association with regard to the matters aforesaid, as provided by by-law, and to arbitrate, adjust, settle and determine controversies and misunderstandings between persons engaged in the said trades, or such as are submitted for arbitration as hereinafter provided; but nothing herein contained shall be construed as constituting the association a trading company, or empowering them to engage as a trading association in the business of buying and selling grain, flour or other merchandise; nor shall the association, by rule, regulation, by-law or otherwise, fix or determine, or endeavour to fix or determine, in any way whatever, the price that the members or any of them shall pay or offer for grains in Canada.

That is to be repealed and the following substituted:

The association may carry on the business of purchasing, selling, storing, shipping and dealing in grain——

Just what the other provides they shall not do.

—and manufacturing, buying and selling flour and other products of grain and may construct, acquire, operate, hire, lease, sell or otherwise dispose of elevators for elevating wheat, grain or other products, and acquire, lease and utilize, hydraulic, electric or other power for the purpose of the said business, and generally may carry on an elevator and storage business;

(b) construct, acquire, charter, operate, sell, lease and otherwise dispose of all kinds of vessels and boats, and wharfs, docks, workshops, stations and other buildings.

These are very much more extensive powers than the others and would seem to have very little relation to this association, but would rather appertain to a transportation company.

(c) acquire and hold shares in any ships, and manage, navigate and operate such ships and may acquire shares in any company incorporated for the purpose of owning, managing and operating ships and may lease, hire and charter any such ship and do all acts and things for the promotion, extension and improvement of the manufacture of flour and meal, and the business of flour milling generally, and the shipping and sale of flour and grain and other products in foreign markets as well as in the markets of Canada, and assist the members of the association with regard thereto.

Then we have subsection (e).

(e) carry on any other business which may seem to the association capable of being con-

veniently carried on in connection with the business of the association, or calculated directly or indirectly to enhance the value or render profitable any of its property or rights;

(f) apply for, and purchase or otherwise acquire any patents, licenses, concessions conferring any exclusive or non-exclusive or limited rights to use, or any secret or other information as to any invention which may seem capable of being used for any of the purposes of the association, or the acquisition of which may seem calculated directly or indirectly to benefit the association, and may use, exercise, develop or grant licenses in respect of, or otherwise turn to account the property, rights, or information so acquired;

(g) enter into any arrangement with any authorities, municipal, local or otherwise, that may seem conducive to the association's objects, and obtain from any such authority any rights, privileges and concessions which the association thinks desirable, and may carry out, exercise and comply with any such arrangements, rights, privileges and concessions;

(h) acquire and hold shares in any company or association having objects together or in part similar to those of the association or carrying on any business capable of being conducted so as directly or indirectly to benefit the association;

(i) draw, make, accept, endorse, discount, execute and issue promissory notes, bills of exchange, bills of lading, warrants and other negotiable and transferable instruments.

It seems to me that while the old Act limited this association generally to millers, doing a milling business, who required to get grain, this makes out of it a company to buy, sell and ship and own vessels —aiming at the same kind of work which the original incorporators in this company claimed was so detrimental to them, namely, the obtaining by the big milling companies of control of the grain supply and putting the small workers at a disadvantage. This is a Bill which requires to be looked into very carefully before we decide to pass it. It may give rise to many evils which we may not see at a moment's glance to-day.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I have no interest in the Bill; but, as it was before the committee of which I was a member, I may be allowed to say a word. I would be glad, like my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. A. M. Martin), if any one would suggest what possible harm could come from the incorporation of a company or the granting of the additional power proposed. The committee endeavoured to find if any such interest would be jeopardized. There were men of affairs there, for instance, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Fowke) who is in the shipping business, the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) and others. It had been suggested that there might be some room here for combination or something of that sort; but, so far as the committee were able to discover, after hearing the member of the company who was there, and comparing this Bill with the acts of similar companies, we could not discover that any interest would be jeopardized, but, on the contrary, that competition would be increased, which we thought would be for the benefit of the farmers having grain to sell. It means the addition of one more competitor in the market for the purchase of grain. I have not the slightest objection, if it is thought that anything would be gained by further consideration. I know the promoter of the Bill the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) does not know anything about the Bill. It was put in his name, but beyond that he was not able, in the committee, to give us information or render us assistance. There is one point I have thought might possibly require guarding, and that is in subsection (d) where it is provided that the company are not to fix the price for buying. It might possibly be right to go further and say that the company shall not fix their selling price. The committee thought that the law of combines would cover that. But this is one company, and it might be said that there would be no infringement of the combine law if they were to regulate the price at which their own members would sell. I would be inclined to add a proviso that the company should not determine the price at which they should buy or the price at which they should sell. That, it seems to me, is the only way in which they can possibly combine under this Bill to do harm.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The objection to this is the same as to every other combine. Here you give powers for the incorporation of mill owners.And for what purpose? For buying which they are to grind and selling the products of that grain after manufacture. If it is a harm for fifty or sixty millers to combine, surely there is harm in this. It occurred to me that we might remedy the difficulty by providing that any mill owner should be at liberty to join this association and that no individual should be placed at a disadvantage in joining it or belonging to it, but that all should have equal rights in it. But, unless——

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Would not the regulations provide for all these things?

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The regulations do not provide for them. You are giving them special power to do certain things under the law. I doubt very much whether, under the regulations against combines——

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I did not refer to those regulations, but to the by-laws and regulations of the company. Any one

joining the association knows exactly on what terms he is joining, and these parties, I understand, are the ones about whom the hon. member (John Haggart) is concerned. And, if they know the terms of the by-laws and regulations, I do not see how they could be injured.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. The by-laws and regulations might be such that parties would not wish to join. But every one should have an equal right to join.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I think they have.

Mr. JOHN HAGGART. No; this is a combination of certain persons for certain purposes and may be exclusive.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Section 6 provides for those 'who may become members'. And not only mill men, but farmers may join. At first it was confined to mill men, but now the Bill is extended to farmers as well. That will be found in section 5 of the Bill as it now appears.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It occurred to me, on reading the Bill over, that if the measure provided for a larger capital, it would be one of the most favourable arrangements for a millers' trust against the farmers that one could possibly imagine. It provides that all the millers in Canada may become members of the Millers' Association, and, in that way, they could do what, under the present law, they could not do, that is, fix the price at which they would buy the grain from the farmers.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. Paragraph (d) expressly forbids that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. That relates only to arbitration proceedings. This would become a company of which all the mill-owners in Canada could be members, and they could regulate the price which they would pay to the farmers for their grain. It seems to me to be a wrong principle to incorporate a company to enable all the purchasers of grain—for the farmers must look to the mill-owners as their customers —to make a legal combination which they could not do without some such special Act as this. This would be a recognition of the desirability and propriety of forming a trust, and I do not think that parliament would accede to that without very careful consideration. I listened to section 3 of the original Act, as read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and it seemed to me that that section met all reasonable requirements. But I think that before we make such a very great alteration in the Act of incorporation, we ought to have very clear reasons for making that change. By this Bill it is proposed to strike out at once all the safeguards which parliament seems to have thought necessary to place in the original Act of incorporation. I think we ought to have very strong reasons presented to us before we do so.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. A. H. Clarke) if any representative farmers appeared before the special committee, or were they particularly invited?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. No person appeared except the representative of the association.

Mr. BLAIN. I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) who is leading the House, that there is certainly sufficient opposition to this Bill to justify us in asking that it be left for further consideration. The special committee, of necessity, was a small one. No doubt, they have gone into the matter very carefully—I am not offering any criticism of their action whatever—but the great mass of the members on both sides have had no opportunity of looking into this matter, and I am sure that it is a matter that requires very careful consideration. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) have pointed out grave objections and grave reasons why this should not become law, and, for myself, I think that I and other members should have an opportunity of consulting the farmers to learn whether they do or do not regard this as a combine.

Mr. JOHN. HAGGART. I do not wish to be thought to be opposed to the principle of the Bill. I can understand the absolute necessity, in some cases, of a Bill of this kind. The small mill owners, if they are to exist at all, can exist only by some form of arrangement of this kind for the purchasing and selling of grain. The hon. member who is chairman of the committee says that this Bill is not exclusive, that any one has the right to join and participate in its advantages. But I see an absolute necessity of some arrangement, or of the formation of some company on the line of this Bill, if they are going to carry on business at all in competition with larger concerns.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not wish to be understood as urging anything against the millers of Ontario, either small or large, organizing to defend their interest in a proper way, and I am not saying that this Bill is an attempt on their part to organize improperly. But there is a feature of this Bill that claims attention. There is no doubt that the purpose of the Bill is not, as my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Clarke) says, to increase competition, but to eliminate competition so far as possible in the buying of grain. Now that is something that claims the attention of those who are interested in the selling of grain, and we ask therefore, that it be made per-

fectly clear that this elimination of competition in the buying of grain is not going to be of such a character as to injure those who are interested in selling grain, and in the maintenance of competition in selling that grain. There is no objection whatever to any set of persons investing their capital in the business of buying grain, there is no attempt to prevent any such thing. But the objection is to using the powers of an association and the powers of an incorporated company in conjunction; that, it appears to me on the face of it, is not a fair proposition. Now let me call attention to section 6 of the Bill:

Section 9 of the said Act is amended by adding at the end thereof, 'but no such by-law shall provide for the expulsion of any person who has become a shareholder in the association, but, as to such persons, shall make provision only for their being deprived of the special privileges and advantages of the association other than such pecuniary advantages as are incident to their stock holdings.'

Mr. NESBITT. Would the minister read the first part of it so as to give the sense?

Mr. OLIVER. Generally speaking it provides for a board of arbitration, and for the expulsion of members who do not comply with the requirements of the Bill, and then this section comes in and says:

But no such by-law shall provide for the expulsion of any person who has become a shareholder in the association, but, as to such persons, shall make provision only for their being deprived of the special privileges and advantages of the association other than such pecuniary advantages as are incident to their stock holdings.

Did anybody ever see a clause like that in the charter of an ordinary incorporated company, whereby a distinction was made, to give privileges and rights to one shareholder over another shareholder? That shows the extraordinary character of this measure. While it may be all right, this House, having set its face against combines and mergers, should be very careful before putting legislation on the statute-book which, on its face, is of such an extraordinary character, and on its face does actually combine the advantages of an association and those of a business enterprise, as in this section it undertakes to combine them. I do not think that is safe legislation to put through without understanding its limitations.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I think, in view of the interest in the Bill, there is no objection to its standing over so that all objections may be considered. I am not at all interested in forcing it through.

Mr. SPROULE. To my mind any Bill which incorporates an association that can get better advantages or terms than an individual, using the railways, and trying to buy cheaper, has something wrong in it. Now the old association was thought to be a pretty good one, and it did not put the fee at a higher figure than $5, but might have put it at $25, so high that no man who wanted to buy one or two carloads of grain could have joined it for that purpose. Now here was the trouble. I was in correspondence with parties in the west year before last when I desired to buy frozen grain. I could buy frozen grain for 25 to 29 or 30 cents a bushel, but I was given a freight rate from Brandon, I think at 25 cents a bushel, and from Moosejaw at 29 to 30 cents. I was told that if it was purchased through an association I would save 5 or 6 cents a bushel, the railway would carry it at 5 or 6 cents a bushel cheaper than they would for a private individual. Now I held that to be a distinct injustice to the farmer and to myself. I could give him a higher price for the grain if I could get a fair rate of transportation, what the law provides I ought to be able to get, the same rate of freight from the railway as a company gets, because the law says that the railway company shall not discriminate in favour of one against another. But you want the grain and you cannot help yourself. There are two things you are confronted with: One is that you are charged a higher price, and the other is that you have no guarantee when you will get the grain. I know a case where the grain did not reach Ontario for two or three months.

That is not the kind of business any farmer wants to do. There is just where the trouble comes in. You cannot buy from the man in the west who desires to sell, because he is a farmer, he is not a member of this association, and you are not a member of the association. I inquired why it was that the association can do better than the individual? It was because they have got their men all along the line, they know the railway companies better, they have greater influence with the employees. They will perhaps take on cars for an individual at Brandon or Moosejaw and drop them off at North Bay, or Kenora, or Port Arthur, and they may lie there for weeks or months. This association have men at all these prominent places along the line stirring up the railway companies to pick up these cars, and can push them forward. These parties have that advantage which a private individual could not have. Now I know a large number of people in our country who desired to buy grain, and could sell it at a little higher figure than it was sold at in the west, but they could not take the advantage, because they could not get it shipped through. The restrictions prevented them from handling it at that price. I am not saying positively that the company was responsible for it, but it was at least the

general understanding that the company was responsible. I say that if any company exercises such control or such power, then it is injurious both to the farmer and to the man who wants to buy.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. When this Bill was before the Private Bills Committee, it was opposed on the ground that it looked too much like a combination, like allowing millers, farmers and others to combine for the purpose of getting grain at a cheaper price, to the detriment of the farmer. One of the great objections taken was to clause 7 because it restricted the membership of the association. If this association has such benevolent purposes as the promoters pretend, there is no object in restricting the membership to certain specified individuals. Why not have the shares placed on the market and allow any one who desires to purchase them? I raised that objection before the committee, but like many other private Bills coming before that committee it was rushed through with little consideration.

Progress reported.

LONDON AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Harris.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was somewhat intricate in its different provisions, as it was dealing with companies that had already made agreements with the municipalities in that part of the province. In order that the Railway Committee might thoroughly understand what all these agreements meant which we were asked to confirm, this Bill was referred to a special committee who went into it thoroughly and this amended Bill is the result of their work. I think from the report brought in by the special committee of the Railway Committee, that the rights of the municipalities are perfectly guarded with reference to the agreements they had formerly made with these other companies which this company proposes to take over.

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is this the Bill concerning which certain delegates waited on the Railway Committee asking for the insertion of a clause protecting the Sabbath Observance law in relation to this railway? I understand that Dominion jurisdiction is being given over what were previously provincial railways. Is it the intention of the government to put in a clause protecting the Sabbath Observance law as requested by the delegation?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon friend was in the committee when the Bill was thoroughly discussed, and I do not think he moved any amendment to that effect. It was perfectly free to any member to move anything he chose. The matter was discussed and the committee decided that if the Railway Commission were to be brought under Dominion jurisdiction it must come under the provisions of the Railway Act of the Dominion in its entirety and be subject to the Railway Board.

Mr. J. HAGGART. Under section 8, you give them power to acquire the Southwestern Traction Company. Has that company power to sell?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, the sale was carried out under the order of the court. The Southwestern Traction Company was wound up by the court, and its assets were sold by order of the court.

On section 15,

Mr. S. SHARPE. Is that the usual form in which this clause is inserted in these Bills? It says that it must be approved by a by-law of the council. Should it not be ratified by the people, because frequently the railway companies can carry a by-law by influence in the council, that would not be approved by the people. Should they not be obliged to obtain assent of the people as expressed by their votes?

Mr. GUTHRIE. We do not usually insert such a provision.

Mr. S. SHARPE. It was done in the Michigan and Ontario Power Company Bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It may be inserted in some particular instances, but it is not usual.

Mr. BEATTIE. This is a special clause drawn by the city solicitor for London who thought it was all that was necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. The object of that clause was to provide in case a municipality had a plant of its own, that this company should not become a competitor with it. If a municipality had a plant of its own the people would be sufficiently interested not to pass a by-law unless they thought proper to do so.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Forget.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 144) for the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.—Mr. Boyce.

QUESTIONS.

CANADIAN NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What cruisers or other vessels, if any, have been purchased by the government for the proposed Canadian naval service?
2. What is the description of the vessels and what prices were paid for them, respectively?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Negotiations have been going on for the purchase of one steamer for the protection of the fisheries in British Columbia, and for the purchase of another ship in connection with the navy, subject to the money being voted by parliament.
2. Negotiations are not complete, and no moneys have been paid.

IMPORTED SEWER PIPE.

Mr. WALLACE:

How much duty was collected on vitrified sewer pipe last year under the dumping clause at Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg, Halifax and Vancouver, respectively?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The total duty collected on vitrified sewer pipe during the calendar year 1909, at the undermentioned ports, was as follows, under dumping clause:

	Duty collected under dumping clause.
Toronto	
Montreal	
Winnipeg	$ 46 76
Halifax	
Vancouver	834 13
Total	$ 880 89

Mr. WALLACE:

1. What amount of vitrified clay sewer pipe and fittings, in gross dollars, entered each province in Canada during 1909 from the United States and from Scotland, respectively?
2. What is the rate of duty on sewer pipe and fittings, both in double and single strength, also in first and seconds, from these two countries?
3. Is there a dumping clause on pipe and is it enforced?
4. What is the discount basis on pipe entering Ontario from the United States, and what is the discount basis on pipe entering Winnipeg and west, from factories located where the Western American list is used, and also where the Eastern list is used?
5. What amount of pipe entered Port Arthur during 1909, in gross dollars, was it invoiced in as firsts or seconds, and on what discounts was duty levied?
6. What is the duty based on when pipe is shipped from Indiana and Ohio for shipment to Winnipeg and west?
7. What is the duty based on when shipped from Macomb, Illinois, to Winnipeg and west?
8. How often are the American selling prices for home consumption checked up, and when were they last checked?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The imports of earthern sewer pipe and fittings entered for duty in each province, during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, from the United States, and the United Kingdom, respectively, were as follows:

	United Kingdom. Value.	United States. Value.
Ontario	$2,875	$ 19,642
Quebec	16,581	4,267
Nova Scotia	407	428
New Brunswick	1,258	120
Manitoba	.....	19,437
British Columbia	13,115	25,182
Prince Edward Island	.....	
Alberta	.....	57,241
Saskatchewan	.....	9,492
Yukon	18	
Total	$34,254	$135,809

2. The rate of duty on earthenware sewer pipes, single or double strength, and fittings is as follows:

Under tariff item 284, 35 per cent general tariff.

Under tariff item 284, 25 per cent British preferential tariff.

3. Earthen sewer pipe being articles of a class or kind made in Canada, are subject to the provisions of the dumping clause. The dumping clause is enforced in cases where the collectors decide it to be applicable.

4. The price lists of sewer pipe usually imported from the United States are known as 'the Eastern Price List' and 'the Western Price List'. The basis of discount off these price lists to importers is treated as confidential by the Department of Customs.

5. The value of sewer pipe (invoiced as firsts and seconds) entered at Port Arthur during the fiscal year 1909 was $2,496.

6. Sewer pipe shipped direct to Canada from Indiana is held to be dutiable on the basis of the eastern or western price list, according to the location of the shipping point in that state. Sewer pipe shipped direct from Ohio is held to be dutiable on the basis of the eastern price list.

7. Sewer pipe shipped to Canada from Macomb, Illinois, is held to be dutiable on the basis of the western price list.

8. The American selling prices are investigated at irregular intervals, and when considered necessary. The last report of investigation into these prices by a spe-

cial customs officer is dated 21st January, 1910.

GODERICH EXCISE COLLECTIONS.

Mr. BEATTIE:

1. What were the excise collections at Goderich, Ontario, for each of the past five years?
2. Who is the officer in charge, and where does he reside?
3. Is he employed in any other occupation than that of collector of inland revenue?
4. What was his salary at the date of his appointment, and what has his salary been each year since appointment?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1904-5	$1,505 29
1905-6	943 71
1906-7	581 37
1907-8	755 09
1908-9	1,208 60

2. M. J. Dalton resides near Kingsbridge.
3. Not that the department is aware of.
4. Salary at appointment, $800; 1905-6 at rate of $800; 1906-7 at rate of $800; 1907-8 at rate of $800 for 11 months; $1,000 for 1 month; 1908-9 at rate of $1,000 for 1 month

LETHBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

Mr. MAGRATH:

What was the total revenue from the post office in the city of Lethbridge Alberta, for the ten months in the current fiscal year ending 31st January, 1910?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX. $22,994.78.

FISHING LICENSES IN BRITISH COLUMBA.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR:

1. Have any claims been made upon the government of Canada for compensation to holders of licenses to fish, because of alleged interference with the enjoyment of the right covered by such licenses arising out of the dispute said to exist between the federal government and the government of the province of British Columbia?
2. If so, by whom have such claims been made and for what amount in each case?
3. Did Sir Wilfrid Laurier direct that written intimation should be sent to J. A. Kendall, of New Westminster, that all due consideration would be given to his claim?
4. Has such consideration been given? If so, with what result?
5. What was the date upon which intimation of due consideration was addressed to claimant named; and when, if at all, was the result of the promised consideration communicated to said claimant?
6. Does the federal government recognize responsibility for protection of holders of fishery licenses in the exercise of the rights conferred by these licenses?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes.
2. J. A. Kendall, $850; W. Kendall, $737.50.
3. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's private secretary, by direction, acknowledged the receipt of Mr. Kendall's letter in the usual formal way and stated that due consideration would be given it.
4. The Department of Marine and Fisheries had already dealt with the matter, and had informed Mr. Kendall that there did not appear to be any ground upon which it could favourably consider such a claim. No further facts being adduced by Mr. Kendall in support of his claim, the department had no reason for changing their opinion in the matter.
5. The formal acknowledgment above referred to was dated 30th April, 1909, but the Department of Marine and Fisheries had already, 14th January, 1909, declined favourable consideration of the claim.
6. The question is too general to be answered definitely. Any claim made against the federal government would be dealt with upon its merits.

FORT HENRY RESERVE.

Mr. M. CURRIE:

In what condition was the land on the Fort Henry Reserve, formerly leased to R. J. Dunlop, when the Department of Militia resumed possession?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING. The land was in poor condition in that all fallen limbs of trees, etc., and underbrush had been allowed to lie, and the danger from fire was, consequently, very great. Also a fence which has been placed by Mr. Dunlop around the property was in a very dilapidated state and of little value. Several buildings, however, erected by Mr. Dunlop, viz:—a frame house; a frame barn and addition, and a small shack, were in fair condition.

CAMP BARRIEFIELD RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. M. CURRIE:

1. Did any one object to having the Rifle Ranges at Camp Barriefield, on the south side of the road, and were they consequently moved across the road, and new ranges erected at a cost of $12,000?
2. If such objection was made, from whom did it emanate?
3. Why did the government build an embankment of earth back of the butts on the new range within 100 yards of the foot of a hill which rises 10 to 12 feet higher than the embankment?

Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. No one objected. The reasons why the range was changed from the south to the north side of the Gananoque road were amply sufficient. In the first place the old range was laid out by the imperial authorities some sixty or seventy years ago, at a time when the extreme range of the arms then in use was much less than at

present. In the second place the old range was placed exactly between the travelled road on the one side and the St. Lawrence on the other and was but a short distance from either. The consequence was that, if a bullet was fired too high, it might very easily fall into the road a long way off or else into the St. Lawrence which was being constantly traversed by boats and vessels of all descriptions. With long range rifles accidents would have been sure to occur. A new rifle range of 18 targets has been erected at a cost of about $12,000.

3. An embankment of earth in rear of the targets was built to prevent ricochets upon the hill itself, and act as an effective stop butt for the majority of bullets. The natural slope of the hill is much too flat to prevent ricochets. It is also rock faced and does not run at right angles to the line of fire, thus increasing the danger from ricochets. The crest of the natural hill is five feet higher than the top of the artificial stop butt. This five feet, however, is at a greater angle to the line of fire than the remainder of the hill, and, therefore, less liable to ricochets.

ANALYSES OF JAMS AND JELLIES.

Mr. BRODER:

1. Has the Inland Revenue Department analysed any jams and jellies during the years 1908, 1909 and 1910? If so, has any person or firms been found adulterating such, or violating the law with regard to same, and have any prosecutions been made by the department? If so, what are the names of the persons so prosecuted?

2. If no prosecutions have been made, why not?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. The Department of Inland Revenue has analysed jams during the years mentioned. Yes, one sample was pronounced adulterated. No prosecution resulted.

2. No prosecution was instituted for the reason that the adulteration consisted only of an excess quantity of glucose, and it was admitted that, owing to the variable nature of glucose, this quantity could only be approximated.

RESCUE STATIONS IN COAL MINING DISTRICTS.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is the government aware, in view of the rapid extension of the coal fields of the Dominion, of the urgent need of rescue stations in the coal mining regions of Canada? If so, what steps has the government taken to establish such rescue stations, or to see that such stations are established by the collieries?

2. Is the government aware that the technologic branch of the United States Geological Survey is said to have in hand the establishment of rescue stations in all the large coal mining districts of the United States, and that the governments of Great Britain and other countries are said to be working along similar lines?

3. Are there any collieries in Canada equipped with rescue apparatus?

4. Does the government propose to establish a rescue station, or stations, for the purpose of demonstration or instruction in the matter of saving life and property in the event of conflagration or other disasters in coal mines?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1. Yes. The government has this matter under advisement.

2. No. On the contrary, the government understands that such is not the intention. Several demonstration stations have been established or planned for, but the object is to try to educate the operators and miners to the advantages of the rescue and fire-fighting apparatus, so that the companies may be interested in establishing joint rescue stations maintained by the companies in each important mining centre. The United States has such a demonstration station at Urbana, Illinois, but it is for a very large area, with a great number of mining centres, Illinois, Indianna, Iowa, Western Kentucky, Michigan and Missouri.

The government understands that the practice in the European countries is to have such joint stations as the United States Geological Survey wishes to see established in the states.

3. Yes.

4. Answered by No. 1.

LOBSTER FISHERIES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Are any fishery officers, in the employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the owners or operators of, or interested in, any lobster canning plant, operating under license from the department?

2. If so, what are their names and addresses, and what are the dates of their appointment?

3. Have such, if any, complied with the regulations respecting the size limit of the lobster used?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN:

1, 2 and 3. Not so far as the department is aware.

ST. SIMEON-TADOUSAC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Have tenders been asked for the carrying of the mails between St. Simeon, county of Charlevoix and Tadousac county of Saguenay?

2. If so, who was the lowest tenderer and what was the amount of the tender?

3. Has the contract been given to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Yes.

2. Joseph Couturier; (b) $974 per annum.

3. No. Mr. Couturier having failed to furnish satisfactory sureties, the contract could not be awarded to him.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. H. H. MILLER. Before the orders of the day are called I rise—for the first time in my six years as a member of this House—to a question of privilege. I do not know that I would have done this were it not that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), in a very courteous letter this morning, drew my attention to an article in the 'Citizen' and said that it ought to be brought to the attention of the House. The article is entitled 'a breach of parliamentary etiquette,' and refers to the issuance by me of a pamphlet regarding the Bill before the House to suppress gambling at race meets. I do not complain very much of the article or the language used. In my opinion the 'Citizen' is usually one of the fairest of Conservative newspapers, in the giving of news and the making of comments. One of my hon. friends near me suggests that it is improving. Perhaps in that respect it is. Nor do I desire to complain of the last paragraph in the article which says that Mr. Miller is a perfectly honest man. That statement I shall not endeavour to deny but would rather say, in connection with this matter at least, that I have endeavoured to be perfectly honest. But while I have no particular complaint to make of the article, I do say that the statements in it are not exactly correct. While, in the first place, I do not attach any importance to this, because it is beside the question, the article says:

While acting as chairman of the Special Committee on his Bill against racing, Mr. Miller, M.P., has issued a pamphlet in which he lauds the Bill and condemns racing without stint as a public evil.

Further down it says:

Mr. Miller's action in deciding the case against racing, when the committee had only just begun to hear testimony——

I say that is aside from the issue. The Bill does not in any way condemn racing nor have I endeavoured to condemn it. I hesitate to detain the House by reading the article, but perhaps I had better do so:

——while acting as chairman of the Special Committee on his Bill against racing, Mr. Miller, M.P., has issued a pamphlet in which he lauds the Bill and condemns racing as a public evil to be done away with.

That is not correct.

While acting as chairman of the Special Committee on his Bill against racing, Mr. Miller, M.P., has issued a pamphlet in which he lauds the Bill and condemns racing without stint as a public evil to be done away with. The main portion of the pamphlet is dated January 26, the preface February 1, indicating that it was prepared shortly after the committee had commenced the inquiry, while many other witnesses had to be examined pro and con, and, of course, long before he and his colleagues were in a position to discuss the evidence and form an unbiased conclusion. Anything more contrary to parliamentary etiquette or at variance with ordinary fair dealing it would be difficult, with all respect to Mr. Miller, to imagine.

In Canada, English parliamentary custom and procedure are followed. The members of a special committee are supposed to discharge a function corresponding to that of a judge on the bench. The testimony cannot be printed nor a report brought down without the sanction of parliament and the concurrence of the committee. In May's Law and Privileges of Parliament, edition of 1863, page 395, it is related that the chairman of a committee who had published and circulated a draft report which he had submitted to the committee, but which had not been entertained by them, was considered to have acted irregularly and contrary to the usage of the House.

In another case where a report had been prepared by the chairman, apparently without the knowledge of the other members of the committee, it was ordered to be cancelled. But these other lapses by the chairman of special committees in the imperial parliament are as nothing compared with Mr. Miller's action in deciding the case against racing when the committee had only just begun to hear testimony, and publishing his decision and the grounds on which he bases it without consulting his committee or saying 'By your leave,' to the Speaker of the House.

If this sort of thing is to be condoned, committees of parliament will no longer be safe guardians of the public interest. We shall have the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee deciding in advance of a complete hearing, or perhaps of any, that the charges brought by the opposition of extravagance or evil doing on the part of ministers or officials are baseless; while the chairman of the Railway Committee decrees of his own motion that an applicant company is not entitled to a charter or another ought to have its charter annulled.

Mr. Miller is a perfectly honest man, and we are sure that when he comes to reflect upon what he has done, he will be extremely sorry that he did it. Meanwhile the affair should be promptly dealt with by parliament.

As to the statement that the pamphlet is dated 26th January, shortly after the beginning of the inquiry, I would like to point out that the preface of the booklet I have published is dated 1st of February, that the end of the pamphlet bears the date 26th of January. The matter was sent to the printer on the 26th January and dated the 26th January, the proofs came back about the 1st of February, and were considerably changed and added to and redated the 1st of February. If hon. members will look at the pamphlet itself, they will see that it contains an editorial from the 'Globe' which appeared on the 2nd of February, so that it must have been

subsequent to the 2nd of February that the copy was finished and sent to the printer.

Mr. BOYCE. When was it distributed?

Mr. MILLER. I shall refer to that in a moment. I beg to call attention to the fact that all the evidence, which has been brought in so far, was taken before the date when the pamphlet was sent to the printer. True, a considerable amount of evidence is to follow, but the greater part is in print and now before the House—the greater part though not by any means all. The article states:

> The members of the Special Committee are supposed to discharge a function corresponding to that of a judge on the bench.

That is perfectly true up to a certain point. The members of a special committee, including the chairman, act in a dual capacity. I was, however, not only the chairman of the special committee, but the one who had introduced the Bill. In fact, I believe it was because I had introduced the Bill that I was appointed on the committee, just as one or two others were put on because they had expressed themselves in opposition to the Bill; and I can quite understand that, in acting as chairman of the committee, it was my duty to show all the fairness and impartiality of one acting in a judicial position. That I have endeavoured to do. My position was not in that respect particularly easy. It was known—and I took no pains to conceal the fact—that I was in favour of the Bill, but, nevertheless, I did endeavour to act with perfect fairness in conducting the committee in so far as a committee can be conducted by its chairman. That I am confident I succeeded in doing. The task was not an easy one, because there were some eight or nine lawyers employed by interests opposed to the Bill, and one by interests in its favour. That being the case, and it being well known that I was in favour of the measure, it was not easy for me to act so that all parties would be convinced I was dealing by them fairly. I am, therefore, the more gratified to know that at the close of the evidence, Mr. Leighton McCarthy, one of the leading counsel opposed to the Bill, thanked the committee for our perfectly fair treatment of all those who had come before us. He said that every one had been given a fair hearing and had been impartially dealt with, and several of the lawyers who appeared before the committee against the Bill personally thanked me for the fair manner in which I had conducted the meetings of the committee. But when those hearings before the committee had terminated I think that I occupied rather a different position. What objection could there have been to my

speaking to any member of this House at any time during the conduct of the case and exposing plainly and fully my views on the subject and supporting them by whatever arguments I might see fit. Surely, that I was chairman of the committee did not preclude me from the right that was enjoyed and exercised by other members of the House who chose to discuss the Bill. It has been asked: When was the pamphlet put in circulation? That, Sir, is a matter to which I intend to call your attention and that of the House. While the pamphlet was sent to the printer before all the evidence had been taken, I kept it in my possession—did not part with more than half a dozen copies to friends, until the committee had heard every bit of evidence that was to be heard.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. member was not the inquiry adjourned to receive arguments on the question?

Mr. MILLER. I will refer to that; it is perfectly fair. The pamphlet was retained until all the evidence had been heard. The point is well taken that the committee was adjourned to receive the arguments of counsel. But as to that, I freely say that I do not expect to be influenced by arguments of counsel who had no more opportunity of hearing and weighing the evidence than I had. And all the evidence produced was exactly of the same character as that in reference to a similar Bill in the New York legislature that I had read and studied and was thoroughly informed upon. Now, I wish to refer for a moment to the instances mentioned in this article of the 'Citizen':

> In May's Law and Privileges of Parliament, edition of 1863, page 395, it is related that the chairman of a committee who had published and circulated a draft report which he had submitted to the committee, but which had not been entertained by them, was considered to have acted irregularly and contrary to the usage of the House.

I contend that it is an entirely different case from the present. That gentleman was acting and purporting to act as chairman of the committee. In issuing this pamphlet I was not acting as chairman of the committee, but was exercising my right as introducer of the Bill and a member of this House. The pamphlet does not purport to come from the chairman of the committee or even from a member of the committee, but from myself, member of this House and a citizen of this country. The next case cited in the article is a similar one. In that case, a report had been prepared by the chairaman of a com mittee, apparently without the knowledge of other members of the committee, and it was ordered to be cancelled. There again,

the gentleman was acting and purporting to act as chairman of the committee, an entirely different case from the present. I have not thought—nor would I think—of expressing the views of the committee, or of making a report that purported to be the report of the committee, or of the chairman or of a member of the committee, but, I repeat, I was only exercising my rights in putting into print arguments that no one could object to my making in support of the measure of which I was in charge. What I have done I have done with perfect frankness. I have not endeavoured to lobby for the Bill, or to buttonhole members, or to use one argument to appeal to one and another argument to appeal to another; but I have placed in print the argument in support of the views I hold and have circulated the same, presenting a copy to every member of the House in the most frank and honourable way. To those explanations I would add that I believe that those in charge of the 'Citizen', in their criticism, have been perfectly honest, and I believe that when they further reflect upon the article they have written, they will be exceedingly sorry for having written it.

Mr. MONK. I suppose this should be considered a question of privilege, and it is for that reason that I venture to address the House upon the subject, for I think it involves a very important question of custom and parliamentary regulation. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) that he is a little mistaken in saying that by my letter to him this morning I called his attention to the article in the 'Citizen'. I think it was only after having despatched my letter to my hon. friend that the article was brought to my notice. What I wrote this morning was that, upon receipt of the pamphlet he had circulated, it had occurred to me that he had committed a very serious infraction of the privileges of the House, and that it would be our duty to call the attention of the House to it. I did not base my communication to my hon. friend on the article of the 'Citizen', but I deemed it necessary, in relation to this question which arose out of very little, to ask the House to lay down a rule with regard to such a proceeding as my hon. friend—quite sincerely and honestly—saw fit to adopt. Although one may not refer to the proceedings in the committee for the purpose of the decision of this question, I presume that it may be said that the Select Committee to which this Bill was referred had heard the evidence and had given the counsel concerned in the case one week to furnish written arguments in support of their contention. And it was, I think, Friday evening when the pamphlet of my hon. friend was circulated. I was immediately struck by the thought which, I believe, must have struck everybody, that that method of proceeding was quite unusual and irregular. I may say that our proceedings in committee have been most harmonious, and my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) has discharged his duties as chairman very satisfactorily—I do not think any difficulty arose amongst the members of the committee. But the question we have to consider is: Does the circulation—by a member of parliament, by a member of the committee, or by the chairman of the committee indifferently—of a statement in favour of a Bill or any subject matter that has been referred to a select committee, constitute an irregularity which amounts to an infraction of the privileges of the House. I think it does. And I think that if we allow the door to be opened to that kind of procedure, if the House does not declare that such a proceeding is not to be allowed, it will give rise to very serious abuse.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. member (Mr. Monk) think there is any difference between presenting to him, a member of parliament, an argument in writing or in print and making the same argument to a member in conversation?

Mr. MONK. I think there is a very great difference, and I will tell my hon. friend why. There is no doubt that all the members of the House are familiar with the principle. Matters that are referred by the House for special investigation to a committee are supposed to be fully investigated, and the minds of members of the House left uninfluenced in any way until that committee has investigated the matter and made its report. And, indeed, we carry the principle so far that it is strictly forbidden even to refer in the House in any way to the proceedings or the subject matter before the committee, and it is, strictly speaking, a breach of the privileges of the House to even communicate what takes place before the committee. That rule is relaxed, I know, with regard to the public press, as is a similar rule of the House itself. But it is more especially adhered to in regard to matters referred to a committee than in regard to affairs discussed in the House itself. The House will perceive at once that if it were possible to allow a member of the committee who is cognizant of everything taking place before the committee to address appeals to members while the committee still has under consideration and advisement the matters which have been referred to it, and before it has reported, that proceeding would give rise to the greatest possible abuses. I did not know that my hon. friend intended bringing up the matter at the present stage, and I must reproach him for not having advised me,

because I told him this morning it would be necessary to bring the matter to the notice of the House. I think he should have told me that he intended bringing it up.

Mr. MILLER. I was simply doing what he said to me in his letter ought to be done.

Mr. MONK. I did not intend bringing it to the notice of the House without first informing my hon. friend and my colleagues on the committee. I was surprised at my hon. friend doing so without informing his colleagues that he has such a proceeding in mind. I quite recognize the truth of what my hon. friend says as to the way in which he has seen fit, ex parte, so to speak, to present his case to the members of the House and the public. I must say that if we tolerated such a course we would be admitting a principle and changing a custom of parliament, admitting a principle that appeals may be made by members of this House to influence opinion on a subject matter which is being considered by a select committee. It is conceivable that that would give rise to grave abuses. I intended to put the question in the shape of a motion which would allow the House to lay down the principle which I think has been laid down time and again in England, that such a mode of procedure is absolutely irregular.

Mr. BLAIN. As a member of the committee, I had no notice of this matter coming before the House to-day. Therefore, I will make no comment on the question under discussion further than to say that in my opinion the House should seriously consider whether, after an hon. member presents a Bill and that Bill is referred to a special committee, it is proper for him to be himself the chairman of that special committee appointed to investigate the Bill. I think this difficulty would not have arisen had that circumstance not existed. I am not offering any criticism, only saying that in my experience, I think it would be in the interest of everybody concerned that the gentleman who introduces a Bill, and gathers evidence and brings it into the House, should not be selected as chairman of the sub-committee appointed to consider his own Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I received a copy of that pamphlet. This is my view of the case: parliament has charged that special committee with a certain duty, namely, to consider a certain Bill, to call witnesses, to order the payment of those witnesses, to take down evidence, and report it for the purpose of enlightening parliament. During the time that sub-committee is engaged in this work, I think it would be improper for any member of the House to refer to the subject in this House or to discuss it in any way. The order of reference was for a committee to take evidence as they saw fit and report their evidence to parliament. While I think it might not be considered perhaps improper or irregular for a member of that committee to address any appeal to any person outside this House, I do think it was very improper to address any argument, by way of pamphlet or otherwise, to any member of this House. Parliament, as my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says, is supposed to have an open and unbiassed mind, and to reach no decision until it has received and considered the report of its sub-committee. Therefore, I thought, whether the hon. member meant anything wrong or not, that he had not a very keen appreciation of the proprieties of parliamentary life and the ordinary usages of parliament, when he addressed a pamphlet like that to every member of the House at the very time the subject matter was under consideration by a committee.

Mr. MONK. I had not under my hand a moment ago the parliamentary rule with reference to this matter. I find it in Bourinot at page 155:

> The House has also frequently decided that the following matters fall within the category of breaches of privileges:—
> 4. All attempts to influence the decision of a committee on a Bill or other matter before it for consideration.

There is a note referring to a case in England:

> In 1879 Mr. C. E. Grissell and Mr. J. Sandilands Ward were ordered to attend at the bar for attempting to influence the decision of the Committee on the Power High Level Bridge (Metropolis) Bill in the interest of certain parties from whom they expected to receive some pecuniary advantages for their services.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. gentleman think this is a parallel case?

Mr. MONK. It is a different case, but it illustrates the principle of attempting to influence the decision of a committee.

Mr. FIELDING. The case the hon. gentleman quotes referred to outside influence.

Mr. MONK. I will finish my quotation:

> Mr. Ward was ordered into custody and subsequently released; Mr. Grissell evaded the order, but was afterwards arrested and imprisoned in Newgate.

Now the distribution of such a pamphlet not only to members of the House, but to members of the committee, is an attempt to influence them and is, therefore, a breach of privilege.

PURCHASE OF DREDGES BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. GERMAN. I wish to call the attention of the government to a matter af-

fecting the Public Works Department, and I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not present. Nearly a year ago an order was made by this House for a return, moved for by myself, asking for the number of dredges owned by the government, from whom purchased, the prices paid, and the work that was being done by these dredges. I have spoken to officers in the department on different occasions with reference to this return, and have always received the reply that it was in course of preparation. I know, of course, that the work of preparing a return of that kind is necessarily tedious and perhaps technical, and I felt that ample time was required. I must ask the government now to prepare it speedily, and the reason is that I am informed that the Minister of Public Works has announced it as the policy of the department, if not of the government, to purchase more dredges. I think the return I have asked for should be in the hands of members of the House before a discussion takes place on that particular line of policy, because I think such a return will have a beneficial effect on the minds of the House, and even on the minds of the members of the government, if they contemplate adopting such a policy.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the hon. gentleman's request.

SAULT STE. MARIE DRY DOCK COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the government once more with reference to a statement made in the House yesterday with regard to the Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Company. I asked the question as to whether the government had granted to that company the usual subsidy provided for by statute, and the Minister of Public Works said that no decision had then been arrived at. But I saw by a newspaper last evening that the government had decided at a council meeting held either that day or some previous day, to grant a subsidy to that company. I would now ask the hon. the Finance Minister what truth there is in that statement, in view of that statement made by the Minister of Public Works on the afternoon of that day?

Mr. FIELDING. I would prefer to have the question answered by the Minister of Public Works, who, I am sorry, is not present. But it will be my duty to call his attention to what the hon. gentleman has said, and on another occasion to give the information.

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting the naval service of Canada, the proposed amendment of Mr. Borden thereto, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Monk.

Mr. A. B. WARBURTON (Queens, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, when this matter came before this House during the last session, I took occasion to make a few remarks upon it and to give the opinion which I then held and which, to a great extent, I still hold, upon this great question of imperial defence. I then pointed out that we were doing very much to strengthen and consolidate the empire, and also to provide for its defence, by filling up our western provinces with immigrants from the old country, by building up a powerful and virile people, at the same time relieving the congestion in the old country and finding homes for the people from there. This was a benefit to the old land as well as to ourselves. I then said that by thus building up a strong race in Canada we were establishing what would be a bulwark to the empire, and that in doing that we would render the greatest service we could towards permanently securing the defence of the empire.

I may say further that having recently read some remarks of Lord Roberts, it also seemed to me, although I am not an expert in this matter, that possibly an even better way than the establishment of a navy to strengthen the empire would be to strengthen the military arm of our service. However, the view I then held was evidently not the view of hon. members, and when the discussion came on last March, and we came to unanimous decision on March 29, I supported and voted for that resolution, and having done so I propose to abide loyally by it. I would not have referred to this had it not been that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) made reference to my remarks and rather disconcerted me to this extent, that I was under the impression we were building up a fine race of people in the west, that our prairies were being settled by a virile race that would be a credit to the country, and that we must look to them in the future for our strength. I believed that a great proportion of the people going in there were from the old land and of the Anglo-Saxon race, a people the most desirable to be had anywhere to go into a country and build it up. But if my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) is right, I have been utterly wrong in that supposition, and instead of our western lands being occupied and filled by splendid people of Anglo-Saxon origin, they are being filled with Poles, Doukhobors and others whom the hon. member evidently looks on as undesirable. I regret that those western lands are being filled up in that way. I do not doubt, however, that when the next census is taken my hon.

friend will be anxious to have these people counted in when it comes to deciding what proportion of representation the west shall have. I did not expect to hear this from a western member. It might have sounded better from some of the representatives of eastern Canada, who are not so well aware of what is going on in the west. Notwithstanding my respect for the hon. gentleman's opinion, I still believe that the western land is being largely filled by people of the Anglo-Saxon race, by people from the motherland, who will carry out the ideal we have for the west, and will in time become a great source of strength to the empire, perhaps one of the greatest defences it could have.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. A. Broder), in his very excellent though brief speech, called attention to the curious fact that out of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat going out of Baltimore and grown in the United States, only 10,000 were shipped under the American flag, and that out of 1,200 ships leaving New York every year laden with American commerce for all parts of the world, only seven carried the American flag. He continued:

> No wonder that one of the American senators said: Just think of it, ten cruisers, eight Dreadnoughts, and nineteen battleships, guarding eight merchant ships in the Pacific.

I agree that it is curious to see that, and it is a wonder that something has not been said, not about the commerce, but about the lack of commerce of the United States. It might have occurred to my hon. friend to give some reasons why the commerce of the United States, a people naturally given to commerce and whose flag at one time almost, if not quite, rivalled the flag of the old country upon the seas, is non-existent so far as sea-going commerce is concerned. He might have told us that the great navy that the United States is building up is perhaps a good sign of better times, and that the commerce of the United States, having been driven off the seas under a mad and unwise fiscal policy, there are now indications in the United States that that policy will, in the not far distant future, be to some extent reversed, and possibly then the commerce of the United States will be seen on the seas and there will be some use for the United States navy in guarding it.

During the early part of this discussion the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) spoke and his address, as all his addresses are, was exceedingly eloquent. At the same time it contained some things that seemed strange. I would say that the state of mind in which my hon. friend must have been in from the time that the resolution was introduced by the Prime Minister until he made the speech, would be a subject of most interesting investigation on the part of a student of psychology. The hon. gentleman referred—and I suppose he referred to it in order to render more pronounced his expression of loyalty—to a report that had been made of a little incident that took place in this Chamber when, upon the conclusion of the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and when you, Mr. Speaker, had put on your hat and declared it six o'clock, there was what to my mind appeared to be a pre-arranged spontaneous outburst of loyal songs. This incident has been reported as occurring at the close of the speech of the right hon. the leader of the House, and my hon. friend asked the Prime Minister what he was going to do about it. The reply of the Prime Minister was: What have I to do with that? My hon. friend after referring to this incident, went on to say:

> But, we do claim from the right hon. gentleman and his party, as this matter was given such extraordinary prominence in the papers throughout the country, he should have used his undoubted influence to have got, in an equally prominent position, a correction of the report and a true statement of what took place in this House. When I put that question to the Prime Minister this afternoon what was his answer. His answer was! What have I got to do with it? Well, let me show that the right hon. gentleman had far more to do with that question than he had with another question on which he expended a great deal of power and energy last session. Everybody remembers the occasion last session when British Columbia affairs came up, that there was introduced a garbled telegram, and the Prime Minister waxed indignant upon the immorality of publishing a telegram of that character, though it had not half as much to do with the right hon. gentleman as this particular episode has to do with him at the present time.

I would not have gone into this subject, and I do not see much use in my hon. friend bringing it in, because it recalls perhaps a somewhat unsavoury episode. What surprises me is that the hon. gentleman should speak of it as a garbled telegram; it was not a garbled telegram, it was a forgery, it was a crime. To call it 'garbled' is taking a very extraordinary view of a very base crime. I would like to ask my hon. friend, who seems to think that the Prime Minister of Canada has nothing to do but to go round and correct newspaper reports, whether, when he knew of that crime, and knew that a minister of the Crown had been robbed of his seat by means of that crime, he ever took any means to have the criminal punished. Why did he not say: The Conservative party will not be in receipt of a seat in that way, and insist on having the Minister of Inland Revenue given the seat of

which he was deprived by means of that criminal act. I do not propose to dwell further on that subject, but it did seem to me that, as a psycological study, the remarks of the hon. member were of great interest.

Now, my hon. friend from Queens-Sunbury (Mr. H. H. McLean) spoke very eloquently the other evening as to the defence of the ports of this Dominion which can be so well provided for by the navy contemplated by the government, and I shall not repeat what that hon. gentleman has said. He pointed out that we will have a naval college, modelled on the lines of the military college at Kingston, in which young Canadians who wish to join the navy will receive their training, and if we are to judge by the success which has attended the Royal Military College at Kingston, then, hon. gentlemen on both sides will agree with me that we will have a splendid class of young men turned out from that naval college. It takes a good deal of time to train men for the naval service. I was told by Admiral Kingsmill some time ago that the imperial naval regulations are to be adopted in the Canadian navy, and under these regulations, officers or seamen in order to become thoroughly proficient must commence about the age of fourteen years and continuously work at their profession for at least five or six years so that they may become thoroughly drilled and qualified for the performance of their duties. We cannot make good gunners and good men-of-wars-men in a brief period, because long and intelligent service is necessary to qualify them. In the course of five or six years, we will have a number of young men who will be well fitted to take any position in the British navy which their age will permit of, and of course as they grow older they will become better qualified and more efficient. I believe that for the future navy of Canada, under this system, we shall have a class of officers of whom we will have every reason to be proud. I say that, because it is my opinion that we have in Canada the best young men on the face of the earth, and consequently I expect splendid returns from the young Canadians who will engage in that service. I hope that the imperial regulations will be adopted and carefully carried out, because I believe that work which is worth doing at all is worth doing thoroughly. It would appear to me that the proposal of the government is a wise one and that the amendment of the leader of the opposition simply amounts to a scheme to build the superstructure of a navy before the foundations are laid. In the old sailing days when you got good sailors on board your ship you had all that was necessary, and, we have as fine a class of sailors on the shores of the maritime provinces as are to be found in the world. But, the sea-faring men of the maritime provinces, excellent as they are, would be, without training of little more use than landsmen on board a modern man of war; they would certainly have the advantage that they would not be sea-sick, but that is about all. We heard during this debate a good deal of talk about the command of the sea, and we have had many learned references from history. The leader of the opposition during the opening of his speech quoted that eminent authority Captain Mahan as having said that at Trafalgar it was not Villeneuve, but Napoleon that was defeated. It is a good many years since I read the work of Captain Mahan, but I have a distinct recollection of the views expressed by him, and I will say that if in the public schools of this country the children were trained to have their thinking powers as well as their memory cultivated it would be a very good thing, and they could learn for themselves the lessons taught by Captain Mahan. I do not wish to be considered pedantic, but I may be pardoned for referring to two of the examples of effective sea-power as given by Captain Mahan. He cites from ancient history the second Punic war, and he points out that the Carthaginians, though a sea-faring race, owing to dissensions and factions at home, and possibly owing to a large extent to jealousy of the great family of Barca allowed the command of the sea to slip from them and to be captured by the Romans. The Carthaginians although under the command of a man who was probably the greatest military genius of history were not able to succeed. Their commander could not get supplies or reinforcements by sea and having to go by land through a hostile territory, the fate of the Carthaginians' army was sealed. The reason of their defeat was that the Carthaginian forces were in a hostile country, harassed by a hostile people, through which they could not get their supplies and reinforcements to the sea. But that does not apply to the present case at all.

The next example which is referred to is that of the British army in Spain during the Peninsular war, but in that case the British held command of the sea and they were always able to pour in supplies and reinforcements. That also was a different case from the present. It is true the British were in a foreign country, but they were in a friendly country and in addition to that they had command of the sea. That is a case different altogether from the position in which the Carthaginians found themselves, but it is more nearly parallel to the conditions which would confront us at the present day were Great Britain to be engaged in war. And, Sir, if Great Britain should be forced to war I have not very

much fear of the ultimate result. Of course, the great difficulty of Great Britain would be to obtain food supplies for her people. At present the time Great Britain does not raise, within herself, sufficient food supplies for her population, although possibly if some day or other the people should go back to the land she might be able to place herself in that enviable position. However, with the naval force that Canada could supply, under this proposal of the government, the ships carrying supplies to the old country would be well protected. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from Queens-Sunbury (Mr. H. M. McLean) the Canadian naval force could very well defend the approaches to the harbours of this country and the ships carrying food would reach the open sea unmolested, and when once ships are at sea it is very difficult to find them. It is possible that an odd ship might be captured, but one thing that surprises a man more than anything else when he crosses the Atlantic for the first time is the small number of vessels his ship falls in with. I had the experience, now becoming rare, of having crossed the Atlantic twice in sailing ships besides a number of times in steamships, and my experience has been that the appearance of a sail, during the voyage is so rare as to become almost a curiosity. Once you get your supply ships in the open sea they are practically safe and, the Canadian navy which it is proposed by the government to build would be amply sufficient to protect British commerce to that extent. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend, the vessels which are being built are no tin pot vessels. They are vessels with a formidable armament of six-inch guns, and are swift vessels, which are quite a match for any vessels that may attempt to prey on our commerce. I suppose it is not necessary to assert that neither Germany nor any other power in Europe, if at war with Great Britain, would send their Indomitables or Dreadnoughts out to sea to try to prey on the commerce of the enemy; that would be an absurdity. They would send out smaller vessels, and these would be well taken care of by vessels such as those of the Bristol type. They could not afford to send out those powerful ships to patrol the Atlantic ocean to intercept our trade and commerce, because they would be needed at home. Moreover, these vessels are built with a small coal-carrying capacity—a fact which has been put forward as an evidence that they are intended for use against Great Britain in the North sea—and therefore they could not keep out at sea for any great length of time.

Mr EDWARDS. How does the coal-carrying capacity of one of those German Dreadnoughts compare with the coal-carrying capacity of one of the German cruisers?

Mr. WARBURTON. I believe it is from four to six days. The powerful German cruisers could not be spared from the North sea in case of war with England. The lighter cruisers no doubt could be spared, and they would have sufficient coal-carrying capacity.

With regard to these small cruisers, I wish to quote a very distinguished authority. My hon. friend from North Grey, in discussing this matter the other evening, referred to Lord Charles Beresford as the greatest naval authority in England today. While I am not prepared to go quite as far as that, because I believe there are greater naval authorities in England today than Lord Charles Beresford, yet he is a great authority, and his words are worthy of our attention. I have not a copy of the speech he delivered ten or twelve years ago, on the occasion of the gift of a battleship to Great Britain by the Cape of Good Hope, but I have a distinct recollection of what he said. He expressed his warm appreciation of the gift, but he intimated clearly, without wishing to lessen his appreciation, that it would have been very much better if the people of the Cape of Good Hope had devoted the money which they had spent on that battleship to fortifying their local ports and providing for their local defence. We have heard it asserted repeatedly that a great many of the ships in the British navy at present are fit for the scrap heap. Lord Charles Beresford evidently does not think so, because he has criticised the present government for having sent a great many ships to the scrap heap. In a speech delivered in September last at Pembroke, he said:

> This government scrapped 150 ships and dismantled the repairing stations. This imperilled the safety of our trade routes. It cut, as it were, the arteries, and with the nation as with a man, if they cut the arteries of trade it would expire. Small cruisers were invaluable because they stopped armed tramps on our trade routes interrupting our commerce, and therefore the scrapping of them was a great mistake. Other nations saw this, and our colonies recognized it. He held that 18 small cruisers should have been built this year and 18 next year.

This quotation ought to go a long way to disabuse the minds of gentlemen both in this House and outside of this House of the idea that these smaller cruisers are not of much value. Great Britain herself does not seem to think that cruisers of the Bristol type are so worthless as some people represent them to be, because she is building more of them. My hon. friend from North Grey told us that it was not always the tonnage that counted, that although the tonnage and the numbers of an enemy's fleet might be much smaller, they might be much more powerful, and therefore would be likely to be victorious in case of a conflict. Again, I find it stated in a paper published in Montreal, the 'Cen-

tury', that it is guns and men that count; and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), not to be outdone by any one else, told us, as reported at page 3473 of 'Hansard':

When I find a nation like that putting on, with surprising rapidity and wonderful minuteness of detail, worked out to the very last degree, the construction and fitting out of a fleet which in four short years has waked up old England as she was waked up in 1909, and which comes close indeed to rivalling her in the effective counting power of war to-day, the Dreadnought and the super-Dreadnought—I told you when I look at all that and see Germany's allies, and see how few Britain has, and recognize that within sight of the homes of Britain all that immense fleet, like hounds in leash, are held compact, sheltered by their compact army and dominions behind, whilst the British dominions circle the globe and are exposed in every quarter of the earth, and have to be watched and guarded and warded by the British fleet.

Well, suppose we take it at that. To begin with, I do not suppose that any hon. member of this House on either side will be so disloyal to the race from which he sprang as to say that an Englishman is not as good a man as a German any day. I read an article which appeared in the Canadian 'Courier' in the beginning of the month. This is an independent paper published in Toronto. I do not know what are the political leanings of its editor, but I have been informed that he is personally a strong Conservative. But whether he be Conservative or Liberal, he manages to make a very independent paper. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read this article, written by the editor himself:

Opponents of the Canadian navy idea assert that Great Britain is in danger of being defeated by Germany 'now' or 'soon.' From this they argue that to be an effective aid to Great Britain we should construct a Dreadnought in Great Britain at once or contribute enough cash to enable Great Britain to construct one at once. They never tell us exactly why they think Germany will fight soon, nor why they think that if a fight occurred Great Britain stands the slightest danger of being defeated. Hon. R. P. Roblin recently made a long speech on the subject in Winnipeg, and the best he could do in the way of quoting an authority was to cite the opinion of ex-Senator Chauncey M. Depew. This was a joke. What the Hon. Chauncey knows about warships and European conditions would hardly fill as much space as one of the chestnuts he cracks in an after-dinner speech.

Now is there any authority whose word we can take any impartial observer with expert knowledge?

How would the Naval Department of the United States do? They issue an annual report on the standing of the navies of the world. If they think Germany is beating Great Britain in naval progress, that would justify the opponents of the 'tin-pot' Canadian navy and support a movement for a quick contribution. Their report for 1909 is just out and it should be examined.

In that report they group Dreadnoughts and cruisers of the 'Invincible' type because both are armed with big guns mostly eleven-inch or over. Of these Great Britain has seven completed and nine under construction. Total 16. Germany has two completed and nine under construction. Total 11. How long will it be before Germany can beat Great Britain in that particular? Won't it be sufficiently distant to enable us to build a few warships and train a few thousand men?

Of battleships of the first-class other than Dreadnoughts, Great Britain has forty-nine and Germany twenty-four. How long will it take Germany to catch up with Great Britain in that particular? Won't it be long enough for us to build several first-class cruisers in Canadian shipbuilding yards?

Of armoured cruisers other than the 'Invincible' type, Great Britain possesses thirty-five and Germany nine, and the British vessels average more tonnage than the German. How long will it take Germany to catch up with poor decrepit Great Britain in that particular? Can she do it in ten years? Can she do it in fifteen?

Of torpedo-boat destroyers Great Britain has 148 and Germany 79. Can you see Germany gaining on Great Britain in that particular? Can she catch up before the little Canadian fleet is built and organized, and Canada given a real place in this naval game?

The truth is that in either present tonnage of war vessels or projected tonnage, Great Britain has nearly three times the strength Germany has, presuming, of course, that the United States naval department knows what it is talking about, as well as a discredited ex-senator of Congress.

Those who examine the facts will be surprised to know that Germany's present fleet does not equal that of the United States. Uncle Sam could go up against the Kaiser at the present moment, with a fair chance of success. And even Uncle Sam admits that Great Britain's fleet is unmeasurably superior to his.

The real truth of the matter, as pointed out by the 'Scientific American,' is that Germany had to get into a feverish haste over warship-building or the United States would have had a fleet unmeasurably superior to Germany's. That journal says: 'As late as a year ago, when Germany had no Dreadnoughts afloat, she actually possessed only fourteen battleships capable of fighting effectively at modern ranges, as against twenty-five flying the United States flag, and forty-nine under that of Great Britain.'

Think of that ye self-appointed protectors of crest-fallen Great Britain! Think of that, ye followers of Chauncey Depew! Think of that, ye blindfolded politicians who would rush Canada into an ill-considered naval policy! A year ago, the German fleet was about one-half the strength of the United States fleet in long-range work, and only one-quarter the strength of the British fleet. Germany had reasons for her haste. The fight in the Sea of Japan proved to Germany that her fleet

was badly constructed and feebly armed. Her ships were too light for modern guns. Her 9·4 guns, which were her main armament, were practically useless in the first line of fire. One year ago, Germany was down and out as far as fleet efficiency was concerned.

The following table which will be found in the recent report is commended to the kindly and serious consideration of those who would have us believe that if we don't send a few millions over to London in the next few weeks, that Britannia will cease to rule the waves forthwith.

RELATIVE ORDER OF WARSHIP TONNAGE.

Name.	At present. Tonnage.	With all Vessels completed. Tonnage.
Great Britain..	1,758,350	2,005,873
United States	682,785	785,687
Germany..	609,700	820,692
France..	602,920	766,909
Japan..	396,368	489,704
Russia..	259,263	412,250
Italy..	216,038	257,818
Austria..	114,897	167,297

In confirmation of this view, many British utterances might be quoted. Just one week ago to-day, the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking at Reading, paid his respects to the scare-makers 'who mistook the rattling of the milkman's cans in the mornings for the jingle of spurs of German Hussars.' On the sea, he declared, Great Britain has three times as many men and three times as much material as Germany. Did these scare-makers think a German would eat three Britishers as if they were three frankfort sausages?

The people who imagine that the Germans are roaring lions going about seeking whom they may devour have a difficult task on hand when they attempted to prove their case by authentic evidences. A certain labour representative has been making quite a fuss in England about German aggression, but the Rt. Hon. John Burns tells us not to worry as the man's views are warped. Otherwise, no prominent voice in Great Britain argues that the danger from Germany is immediate, and few admit that it is even remote.

'Why all this recent fuss in Great Britain, then?' some one will ask. The question cannot be satisfactorily answered, except to say that it was mainly political. Times were bad, and the builders of naval vessels were afraid the building of ships would be seriously lessened. They and other interested people got up a scare. The contest between Lord Beresford and Admiral Fisher further added fuel to the flames.

The best proof of this is that the fuss is nearly over. Very little is heard about it. The House of Lords has supplied a new topic for people who must talk. Canada's manifest duty is to keep cool. We have seen flags waved before and it should not be allowed to drive us into frenzy on this particular occasion.

It seems to me that this article is well worth considering. Let me now take up the question of guns, which the hon. member from North Grey (Mr. Sproule) and others have dealt with. I find in the navy year-book of the United States of 1909, to which my hon. friend from Queens and Sunbury Mr. McLean) referred the other night, that the tonnage of Great Britain as compared with that of Germany is as 5 to 2 all round, and the number of battleships about double. Again, in battleships, Great Britain has 51 first class and 13 second class. Of the 51 first-class, 42 are armed with ½-inch guns and a few with 13·5-inch guns, and I believe that some of those which are being built are to be armed with 13-inch guns. These guns are the most powerful in the world. Compare Germany's position in this respect. Germany has 30 battleships in the first class, that is with 3 Dreadnoughts; 4 in the second class, and her heaviest guns are 11-inch. So that if you take the matter of guns, the British fleet altogether outclasses the German. And they are not falling behind in the making of guns. Take another matter: The British battleships range in speed .from 17·5 knots to 21 knots; the Germans' fastest battleships have a speed of 21 knots. A difference of one knot in twenty means a difference of five per cent, which. I should think, would be a most important matter in time of battle. And the British are building several strong armoured cruisers with a speed of over 22 knots. The Germans are building a number of powerful battleships, but the highest speed attained by them is 20 knots.

But the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) told us to look around and see Germany's allies and see how few Great Britain had. I join issue with the hon. member on that point. You will find that Great Britain has more and better allies than has Germany. The best of feeling does not prevail between Russia and Germany, and, as to the next most powerful military nation to Germany, France, it is clearly not to the interest of that nation that Germany should prevail over Great Briain. Living along side of her Germany is a continual menace to France. It must be remembered that France has a powerful fleet already, and is beginning to build battleships. Besides, she has a splendid army. Military men will tell you that France is not in the position, from a military point of view, in which she was when she went into the Franco-German war some forty years ago. At the time of the Franco-German war, while the men of her army were as brave as any men who had ever lived in France—and that is saying all that a man could say of men—nevertheless, owing to the corruption of government and the maladministration of the army, the men were badly led, badly officered and badly equipped. But, if we can believe the reports of military men who have considered the France

of the present, this is not the case to-day. The French army is a powerful engine of war. Nothing that has happened in the history of the world would be so menacing to France as that Germany should command the sea and overcome Great Britain. And, whether she willed it or not—and I believe she would will it—she would be compelled to take sides with Great Britain. I do not say that Great Britain would need such assistance; I am speaking of what the hon. member for North Toronto said as on the subject of allies. It is true, Germany has the triple alliance, with Austria-Hungary and Italy. But what does that alliance mean? It is certain that Austria-Hungary can hardy be called a naval power; it has a very small navy, and its people are not a maritime people. Besides it has been known to every one who reads the political history of the times, that the dual empire holds together only by a thread. It is generally believed, and has been believed for long, that the existence of this empire largely depends upon the life of the present aged ruler. Then, the other member of the triple alliance, Italy. As was said on this floor recently, she is the wooden leg of the triple alliance. The policy was laid down years ago by Cavour that Italy should be the ally of Great Britain; and, through evil report and good report, Italy has followed out the policy of her great statesman. It can be relied upon, when it comes to a time of emergency, that Italy with her great coast and her extensive interests will maintain the policy that Cavour laid down and that has ever since been maintained, and that she will be found with Great Britain and not on the side of Austria-Hungary and Germany.

At six o'clock, House took recess

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WARBURTON. At six o'clock, I was referring to the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when he was looking around to see how many allies Germany had and how few Great Britain possessed. I sought to show that in my opinion the facts were diametrically opposite to those which the hon. member stated, and that instead of Great Britain being practically without allies, she was really stronger in that respect than Germany was, and that without reference to Spain or any of the minor powers. Before parting with the hon. member for North Toronto, I wish to say a few words more in comment on his speech. He spent about three hours in a very eloquent address, nearly half of which was given to an effort to show why it was his party had made a change of base, and the other half was given to the impossible task of trying to show that the right hon. the leader of the government was not loyal to Great Britain. I think the mere statement of that proposition refutes itself. The hon. gentleman from North Toronto, as usual with him, was very keen in his remarks, he indulged in sarcasms, he indulged in denunciations like those with which hon. members of this House are familiar. He denounced the leader of the government and everybody else except himself and his own friends. He also referred to a speech which he said had been delivered by the present premier of this country a great many years ago at the time of the North-west rebellion when, moved with indignation, he denounced the persons responsible for the shedding of blood in that rebellion. I do not know whether the Prime Minister ever spoke as he was reported or not; but I have no doubt that he was indignant, and very properly indignant. But although the hon. member for North Toronto has practically lived for so many years in an atmosphere of sarcasms, of sneers, of invective and of denunciations, until that atmosphere has almost become the breath of his nostrils, how is it then that he has not seen fit to use his great powers of invective against the men who were really guilty of the blood and waste of treasure which the country had to deplore on that occasion? Is it because the hon. member, despite his long experience in denunciation, could not find it in his heart to denounce himself?

We have had during this discussion many references to Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty, and what he said about a year ago. He has been quoted frequently. But Mr. McKenna has spoken since then. A year ago or thereabouts he was seeking to arouse the British parliament to the necessity of taking active steps in ship building and in strengthening the navy, in which effort he was supported by Sir Edward Grey. That work has been done, and there is now no danger so far as Great Britain is concerned. A short time ago Mr. McKenna, in reply to some of the articles that were written against him, took occasion to make these remarks:

At this moment Great Britain has got seven Dreadnoughts in commission. Germany has got two. When Germany has four in commission Great Britain will have ten, when Germany has five in commission Great Britain will have twelve, when Germany has nine in commission Great Britain will have fourteen, and when Germany has eleven in commission Great Britain will have sixteen, and when Germany has thirteen in commission Great Britain will have twenty. That carries us right up to March 31, 1912. Up to the present no programme in either country has gone beyond that period. Next year will see its own programme, and I have no doubt the figures will be equally satisfactory,

giving absolute security to this country with regard to subsequent years. These are the facts, given you on official authority, and I think they are sufficient to substantiate the claim of the government that everything has been done with regard to the construction of these great ships. I have not referred to ships of an earlier type than the Dreadnoughts. We have an overwhelming superiority in that class of ships. The navy scare has not the slightest foundation in fact.

Then he goes on to say that it is grossly untrue to say that in two years Germany would have ten Dreadnought docks to Britain's three. As a matter of fact, Britain has at the present time twelve Dreadnought docks, and in two years time she will have sixteen, as compared with Germany's nine. So that if we take the well weighed words of the First Lord of the Admiralty spoken quite recently, I think we may safely conclude that so far as human knowledge can go, the British navy is quite prepared to meet the German navy, or any other enemy that may come along. Sir Edward Grey recently made the following remarks:

> The British navy is being maintained in a position to protect the country against any probable combination of fleets.

With the utterances of these responsible statesmen I think we may fairly content ourselves. We have heard much praise given to New Zealand and Australia for offering Dreadnoughts. I do not wish to belittle those dominions, I would give them all the credit to which they are entitled. I had occasion last session to look up the debt of New Zealand, and I find that she then owed $345 per head for every man, woman and child in the country, and she was getting into debt at the rate of $10 or $15 per head every year, right straight along. I have not seen the New Zealand Year-book since the one I saw last year, but it is safe to assume that if she has been going on at the same rate, her debt is now at least $365 per head. I have not been able to find what the debt of Australialia is since the Commonwealth was organized, or whether they have any as a commonwealth. But knowing as we do that the Australian, as well as the New Zealanders are a very progressive people in the way of running into debt, it would be a marvel, indeed, if Australia had not run up a considerable debt during the eight years of her existence as a united commonwealth. But the states of that commonwealth in the aggregate owe £57 10s. sterling for every man, woman and child of their population, and I do say that while it is nice for New Zealand and Australia to be furnishing Dreadnoughts and offering to furnish more if necessary, it may not be equally as nice for those who lend them the money. It is true that Australia sent a Dreadnought, but she went to England to borrow the money. It is one satisfaction to England, that she will have New Zealand's note and New Zealand will have the protection of the Dreadnought.

Then again in view of the facts as they now exist in the world, as far as we can judge, in view of what has been said by responsible British statesmen quite recently, the question must arise: Is there any reason whatever for this gift of $25,000,000, is it needed? Especially with the great preponderance in Britain's favour of tonnage, ships, guns, and men, an average of five to two all around, there does not appear to be any such need. In this connection, I would like to read an extract from a letter which I received on Saturday from a gentleman who was twice elected to this House in the Conservative interest, and who also contested the seat which I now have the honour to hold with Sir Louis Davies, a gentleman who has always been a strong Conservative, who is, I may say, the great source of strength to the opposition in the county from which I come, a gentleman who has such strength that if he were to withdraw his opposition to the government candidates and give them his support, or even to withdraw his opposition without supporting them, the path of the government candidates at the next general election would be rendered very smooth. I am referring to Dr. John T. Jenkins, formerly a member of this House, who wrote me as follows, under date of February 15:

> With regard to the Navy Bill, I say frankly I don't see the need for it at present, but as to Borden's resolution to give 25 or 30 millions to England (now when the German war squall, it was a hysterical squall, all screeching and kicking without any foundation, is over), I see nothing but lunacy in it. If we are to have a navy I am heartily in favour of the government policy. If we build here the money remains in the country and we get the good of it, but if we give millions to England, it is gone, and gone for ever. There is talk of a dissolution over it. If so you may say I will go against Borden's policy and support the government with all my force, and I think I have a little left. I feel very strongly over this matter. I never thought to change my politics (there is little to change now, anyway), but to fool away millions that England does not want and that we need most seriously in the development of our resources is, to my mind, the worst kind of folly.

Mr. Jenkins is becoming an old man now, but in his early manhood he served in the Crimea and has the British and Turkish medals.

The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) delivered an eloquent two-hour speech the other evening to which I listened with great interest, as I do to all of his eloquent addresses. While listening to him I could not help recalling a passage

in a speech which he delivered last session in which he undertook to prophesy. I remember the prophecy, because I thought at the time it was a daring prophecy, and I recalled the advice of Hosea Bigelow that a man should not prophesy unless he knows. The hon. member, speaking in almost poetic language, in language that might almost be grafted into one of the Old Testament books, told us that before the June sun melted the snow from the hills we would be at war with Germany. I could not find the passage in 'Hansard,' but I distinctly remember these words being uttered in this House. In view of that prophecy, and the force with which it was delivered and the importance attached to it, I need not devote more time to replying to that hon. member's speech.

It may not be a very easy matter to ascertain how this panic or scare arose; that it arose is beyond question. It seems to be inherent in the British mind that every 12 or 15 years they must have a panic or a war scare to relieve their feelings. There seems to be a certain amount of nervous fire-damp which collects in the British heart and which has to be let off in some way, and if there is no war or active work to relieve them of it, they must get into a panic or a scare. The scare was about due when it broke out last year, and there were political reasons at that time which made it convenient. There was this fire-damp in the air and it required something to touch it off. The elections came on, and they, with one or two other things were sufficient, and we had the explosion. But men forget these scares and panics, those who suffer most from them are as cool and collected as any one else, in the face of real danger. Should war break out their scare would pass away. In a short time this scare will pass away without war, we will hear no more panic, and the panic-mongers will be ready to take their part, the old fighting blood of their race will assert itself, and they will wonder that they were scared at a shadow.

Another scare will be due in another 12 years' time, and I have no doubt that those then living will see and understand it. What form it will take it is not possible at this distance to tell. The scares have been numerous. I was looking up the other day some points in connection with the maritime provinces representation case, and I found in the debates of Prince Edward Island, 1864, that one reason advanced by a gentleman in favour of confederation was that we would be protected from the danger of aggression from Russia. It seems that at this time there was fear of trouble with Russia. We have had since that the battle of the Dorking scare, the Fashoda scare, the scare about the Emperor William and the Boers. We have had lots of scares. It seems that the British people must have these scares, that they enjoy them just as some people enjoy ill health. It looks as if in the old country the scare-mongers or perhaps the yellow journalists of the Harmsworth type were trying to bring about war. If so, no course which man can conceive would be more mete for reprobation. The men in Great Britain and elsewhere who are now alarmed will forget this panic and scare. Personally, I have not the slightest faith or belief in any ground for the panic or the scare. But the men who are in a frenzy are the descendants of the old sea dogs of the race of the old vikings who raised and flew the flag in every sea and planted it on every land. They were never too curious as to the number of their foes, but were ever and always anxious to know where they were to be found and fought.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver City). Mr. Speaker, if instead of a navy Bill this were a Bill of attainder for the forfeiture of the estates and the corruption of the blood of the opposition members in this House, the speeches of the Prime Minister and his followers, and especially of the Prime Minister, would have been quite as apt and appropriate as they have been in relation to the question before this House. For myself, I had hoped that in the measureless importance of this question to Canada, in the intricacy of its many problems and in the necessary inexperience of this House in dealing with these problems, the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister would have found sufficient reasons and very cogent reasons for avoiding in his opening speech in this debate that regrettable exhibition of bitter party rancour and that regrettable display of a desire to whip this Bill through this House as a party measure, and not at all to treat it as a measure for the defence of our common country.

I cannot help thinking that the right hon. gentleman would have been better advised had he followed the non-partisan example set by the leader of the opposition, because then he would have been following the best traditions and the unvarying practice of the British House of Commons where questions of defence have always been placed far and away above and beyond all considerations of party politics. It would have been expected from the right hon. gentleman that he should set a high tone to this debate, but he did not see fit to do so. Instead, he directed the battery of his great rhetorical powers against the Conservative record, against the Conservative citadel. He fulminated and fretted and fumed at opposition silence; he trained his other guns, Krupp and Popp, upon the opposition. His followers, after his example, hurled their little party javelins and party missiles at our devoted heads on this

side of the House until the whole place is belittered and bestrewn with party bombs and party shells and javelins and missiles of every calibre, with the result—I cannot help thinking, with the intended result—that the Prime Minister's little toy navy is almost buried out of sight in the debris. To exhibit that toy in all its childish proportions, to bring it once more into public view we, on this side of the House, must first exhume it; we must first remove this political debris. Disinterment is always a disagreeable task; it is doubly so when the material to be removed, foul from the first, is covered, as in this case, with all the must and mould of ages. But the task is ours, and it must be faced, and although the last speaker thinks he has found a reason why the Minister of Inland Revenue was defeated in Victoria, he will pardon me if I turn first to the missiles of the Prime Minister. As first in eloquence and office, if not in accuracy of aim, the first favour is perhaps his due. First Jove, then the satellites of Jove. Let us turn then to the speech of the Prime Minister. In it the party gong is sounded and the party whip is cracked, and at once the faithful followers chant: There is leadership, there is statesmanship, at the same time they mutter: But no battleship or any other ship fitted or intended to add to the fighting strength of the imperial navy, or fitted to be a credit or of service to Canada. Leadership in that speech? Yes, there is leadership, I grant you; a leadership, consistent, absolutely consistent with the record of the right hon. gentleman's attitude towards British connection as leader of the Liberal party in Canada for the past twenty years, a leadership towards what he himself has so often described, both in and out of this House, as the goal of his aspirations—the independence of Canada. 'I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of indepenence,' the right honourable gentleman has actually declaimed on the floor of this House, an independence to be achieved, of course, by means of an independent navy as 'naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.' Let me epitomize the history of that parent tree and its fruit. In 1852 Great Britain was without a colony. Prior to that date she had acquired possessions beyond the seas, but her seapower had not been great enough to hold them. Since that date, that parent tree has gathered within her ample foliage no less than 70 clustering British colonies, and by the command of the sea she has held them—with one or two exceptions—and sheltered them from every withering blast. Many of these possessions she has peopled with her own breed and get, has this mother and nurse of our public and our private virtues, until to-day her territory covers more than one-fifth of the earth's surface, and her liege subjects number more than one-fifth of the earth's population. To these peoples she has given the freest constitutions and the most absolute guarantee of their sacred rights and privileges, and in good faith she has executed that guarantee, has this home of splendid models, this classic land of liberty, until to-day these clustering dominions beyond the seas are as firmly attached in affection, in sentiment, and in loyalty to the motherland as are the people of Great Britain themselves attached to the sea-girt isles that are their home. Within these clustering dominions no renegade abuse of Britain or Britain's diplomacy can breed disaffection; no insect of independence, no woolly aphis, can blight that fruit or sever it from the parent stalk. There it is, and there it will remain. 'Down through the grooves of change' it will be and remain, let us hope, for ever unhurt. Amidst the wars of prejudice within her borders, or the crash of worlds without. But, the right hon. gentleman holds out to his fellow countryman the idea of independence with the King of England as suzerain. This language, Mr. Speaker, cannot be explained as the mere flourishings of rhetoric. On whatever occasion uttered, it is not to be lightly brushed aside as mere words 'full of sound and fury signifying nothing.' It is language fitted to estrange and alienate the hearts and minds of His Majesty's subjects from their dutiful obedience; it is language fitted to create in Canada a great national movement for independence; a movement conceived without grievance, originated by wrong, a movement which for the last twenty years has been instilled into the hearts and minds of the people of Canada in many headed form—and which in one of these forms in 1891, as we have been told in this House, drove the Hon. Edward Blake, and many another loyal subject, out of the ranks of the Liberal party—a movement which it is now sought to have consecrated in this Bill in its ugliest shape. Here we have the leadership of a great man whose brilliant qualities and charm of manner disarm suspicion and invite good will, but whose fixed purpose in this matter has ever steered a straight course towards a definite goal and has raised for the first time in this House and in this country a straight issue between independence and British connection. Let us then turn to the Bill; and, in turning to the Bill, let us remember that it is introduced as the strong and consistent policy of the man who 'in thoughts that breathe and words that burn,' has declared that the independence of Canada is the goal of his aspirations.

Our deeds still travel with us from afar,
And what we have been makes us what we are.

We will turn, then, to the Bill. That Bill

provides for a permanent navy separate from and independent of the imperial navy, By section 18 it is provided that the government may send that navy to the defence of the empire. If the government does that, then by section 19 the government must convene parliament within 15 days to have that Act ratified or the fleet recalled. For the whole people of Canada, speaking through parliament, to recall that navy at a time when between the empire and its enemy a state of war exists, and the international laws and usages of war obtain—what does it mean? What would the other nations of the earth, whose sacred duty it is to enforce those laws and usages, be bound to declare that Act to mean? What but Canada's neutrality on the high seas as between two belligerents? And then what follows? By those same laws and usages of war, and by such treaties as the treaty of Washington, negotiated in 1871, it follows, as the night the day, that the Canadian government is bound to prevent either belligerent, either the empire or its enemy, from fitting out, arming or equipping in Canadian waters any vessels with which to cruise or carry on war against the other—from using Canadian ports and Canadian waters as a base of naval operations against the other belligerent. So that worse than useless to the empire shall then become not only the Canadian navy, but Canadian ports and naval stations and coaling stations and dockyards—yes, and Canada herself. Because what does a declaration of neutrality mean but a declaration of independence? Not only are those provisions silly and unworkable beyond the dream of folly; not only is there planted in them the seed, the loathsome seed of separation and independence, planted at a time when every dictate of conscience and honour tell us that we should be adding to the fighting strength of the British navy, instead of striking a fatal blow at British prestige; not only all that, but there is a reverse side to this picture, a negative side to this provision—a side more offensive still, if that be possible, more out of joint with Canadian manhood, Canadian aspirations and Canadian sentiment. As I have said, by section 18, the government may send the navy in defence of the empire; in other words, the government may place that navy at the disposal of the King. The obverse side of that permission, the reverse side of that picture, the negative side of that statement, is that the government may not send that navy to the defence of the empire. In case the government withholds that navy from the defence of the empire in case it is kept at anchor in Canadian ports at the hour when the empire is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with its enemy, then, forsooth, the government does not need to convene parliament to have that Act either ratified or reversed. The Bill assumes that the citizens of this part of the empire, the people of Canada, will endorse beyond peradventure that do-nothing policy. The Bill assumes that the people of Canada will say to the government; Well done, thou good and faithful servant; true, the empire is in danger, but what care we? By your wise statemanship our little navy is not endangered; to make assurance doubly sure, however, have that navy seek further safety and security up the shallow creeks of Canada beyond the reach of bomb and battleship.

Take the reverse side of that picture, and I contend that that is the only meaning of that side. What a spectacle we are presenting to the gaze of the world. We cannot find any parallel for it in colonial history. The American colonies, the most fanatically independent and self-contained of all the colonies, at a time when they, unlike ourselves, had a real grievance against the motherland, expressly declared their willingness to continue contributing, as they had done in the past, to the defence of the empire and to tax themselves for that purpose, and they spurned the suggestion that they were cowardly enough to shirk that duty. Before the bar of the British House of Commons, in 1764, Mr. Benjamin Franklin made this clear, when he said that the colonies were willing to raise a special revenue to be devoted without an 'if' or a 'but' by parliament to the defence of the empire. And, as we know, the American colonies, in the great wars of the 18th century, out of their own blood and treasure in a foreign field, without waiting for the ipse dixit of parliament, did valiant service in defence of the empire. For Canada to do less, for Canada, without a grievance of any kind against the motherland, and while professing lip loyalty, and accepting protection from the British navy, for Canada now to do nothing but take the power to be in waiting until the empire becomes embroiled in a life and death struggle with her enemies, and then with a kiss to betray that empire into the hands of her enemies—that act could have but one parallel in all the annals of the human race. But it is said, and may be said again, that although power is given by this Bill to the government to withhold the navy from the defence of the empire and although power is given parliament to recall the navy from that defence, yet no government in Canada will exercise that power to withhold and no parliament in Canada will ever exercise that power to recall. If that be so, why give the power, why insert that provision in the Bill? But let that Bill once pass, with that provision in it, and let the empire be again engaged in

another war such as that in South Africa, ten years ago, and I very much fear that we may have some doughty Canadian premier rise in his place and cry out: Canada is not menaced; I will not be stampeded.

But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most mischievous, the most insidious feature of this Bill, is that it is an attempt, an unconstitutional, an unpatriotic attempt, to change the relations of Canada to the motherland. By section 15 of the British North America Act, the command in chief of all the naval forces of and in Canada is declared to continue in the King. I regret I have not the section here to read it, but hon. gentlemen can refer to it for themselves. By that Act, the command of all naval forces of and in Canada is to remain in the King after confederation as before. How was that command vested in the King prior to confederation? If you will turn up the old statute of 16, Charles II, you will find the answer. That old statute was in force at the time of confederation and is still in force. By that statute it is declared that the sole supreme command, government and disposition of all sea forces is the undoubted right of the King, and that either or both Houses of parliament cannot pretend to the same. It is that undoubted right which is continued in the King by section 15 of the British North America Act. Of course, not even by this old statute, may the King act in person or upon his own arbitrary impulse. Indeed, in none of his executive acts may he do so. He must always act upon advice. But there are two kinds of executive acts exercisable by the King. There are the executive acts concerned with the administration of parliamentary enactments. In these the King acts upon the advice of his cabinet or government, but there is another kind of executive act exercisable by him. There are executive acts done in the exercise of the discretionary power placed in the hands of the sovereign by virtue of the common law without any express parliamentary sanction or provision. Of such is the command of the navy under the old statute of Charles II, which I have cited, and of such also is the command of all the naval forces of and in Canada, under section 15, of the British North America Act. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been good enough to give me a copy of that Act. Section 15 reads as follows:

> The command-in-chief of the land and naval militia, and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the Queen.

I would draw your attention to the fact that the old statute of Charles II, which I have cited, and the British North America Act, are both imperial Acts, and under both the command given to the King is exercised and administered in exactly the same way and upon the same advice. Again, I have to regret that I have not my authorities with me. But I remember them. If you will turn to volume 6 of Lord Halsbury' Laws of England, page 419 —as I remember it—you will find exactly in what way and upon what advice that command is exercised and administered. You will learn that that command is not exercised and administered upon the advice of the King's cabinet or government; you will find that that supreme command is exercised and administered by the Commissioners of the Admiralty who now exercise all the powers and jurisdictions enjoyed by the Crown at common law. By the orders of the admiralty, and their orders alone, all ships are built, repaired, and put to sea, all ships are laid up in reserve or sold, or sent to the scrap-heap, all ships are put in commission and put out of commission. By them all ships are employed, either on the home station, or on foreign stations, or sent on voyages of discovery. All admirals, vice admirals, rear admirals, hold their commissions from the admiralty, and all appointments and all promotions in rank are made by the admiralty. By the admiralty all orders for the payment of naval moneys are issued, and by the admiralty the annual estimate of the expense of the navy—the naval budget—is prepared and laid before parliament for its sanction. All that parliament or government can do in reference to the navy is to vote the supplies. Neither parliament nor government can at its own will or caprice place the navy at the disposal of the King or withhold it from the King. So that we now see, that, under section 15 of the British North America Act, command of all naval forces in Canada is to continue in the King. By the constitution, that command, and continuance of that command, in the King is not that our Canadian navy shall be placed at the disposal of the King or withheld from the King at the caprice of the Canadian government. But the Bill before the House would change all this, the Bill before the House aspires to amend section 15 of the British North America Act. By that Bill the command of all naval forces in Canada is not to continue in the King and be vested in the King, but it is to be placed at the disposal of the King or withhheld from the King at the will or caprice of a political body, namely, the government of Canada. The Bill before the House, like the right hon. the leader of the House, has a goal for its aspirations. That Bill aspires to make the Canadian government independent of section 15 of the British North America Act, just as the right

hon. gentleman would make the whole of Canada independent of the whole of that Act. 'Independence for me', says the Prime Minister; 'independence for me,' says the Bill we are considering. But, 'the lack of independence for us'. say the slavish supporters of both. So that this Bill, I say, is void in conscience and in principle. This House has no authority to alter or overthrow the constitution; this House has no mandate from the people to change the relations between Canada and the motherland, this parliament was elected to make new laws, but not to make a new constitution. This parliament has no autonomous right—oh, how they love that word, 'autonomy'—to change the constitution of Canada. This parliament was elected by the people of Canada as their trustees. The people of Canada are our masters and we are their servants, and we have no right, without a mandate from those masters, to change the relationship and weaken the tie that binds this country to the motherland. If this parliament, or any parliament, were to introduce a Bill to do away with the appeals to the privy council, or, as the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) would seem to wish, to do away with the Royal assent and the services of the Governor General, would any man assert that such an act would be valid? Would any man be insane enough to assert it? And, would the insanity of that assertion be mitigated by the insertion in the Bill of the provision that the government 'may' allow appeals to the Privy Council, the government 'may' treat the Governor General as the King's representative? Everybody will admit that it would not. As well might a man imagine that the blow by which he destroys his wretched body at the same time annihilates his immortal soul, as for this House to imagine that by the abuse of its own constitutional rights it can destroy the King's power in this country.

Of course, the right hon. gentleman the leader of this House assumes, and perhaps rightly assumes, that the home authorities, especially in the present crisis, will not openly and actively resent this invasion of their rights. 'His ambition, he tell us, is to exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by the consent of both countries, and in such a way as to preserve the good feeling and good will of the motherland.' But what a time, Mr. Speaker, is this to make that exhibition, and what an exhibition! The present now, when there is a call, unvoiced it is true, but none the less urgent, a call from Great Britain to her own protected kith and kin across the seas, not a call to build separate navies, that cannot fight in defence of the empire, and perhaps would not if they could, not a call even to help Great Britain—Great Britain has yet to utter the Macedonian cry—but a call to help ourselves, a call to be men, a call to share in the glory of preserving the peace of the world. to share in that glory by giving and giving at once not to the royal navy, but to the imperial navy, by giving to that navy a giant that no rival power will dare to test. Why not forego our lip loyalty and hearken to that call? Why not, with the faith of freedom, make that sacrifice for the sake of ourselves and the world's peace? And we shall find that the new wine of Canadian patriotism will burst the old vessels of the constitution and will give us and the other dominions across the seas, better than anything else and quicker than anything else, the right to prompt the mother's voice when it speaks abroad, and that before we have even had time to settle down to a permanent naval policy.

Separation and independence! That is not the tendency of the time, the great force of the age is democracy, and it is a federating force. Amongst its great works are the federal union of the states to the south of us, the union of this great Dominion, the union of the Australian commonwealth, and more wonderful still, the recent union of the South African colonies. The task to which democracy will next address itself will be that of moulding the different parts of the British empire into a closer and firmer union under one kingly head. But the right hon. gentleman the leader of this House, would reverse the hands on the dial of our destiny, he would block the wheels of democratic progress. Why not, Mr. Speaker, close now, and close for ever, the gate that leads to separation and independence? Why not give, and give now, according to our means? Why not give, and give now, to that imperial navy which all admit is the best guarantee, and in fact the only guarantee, of our permanent peace and of the empire's peaceful progress? In support of his policy of a permanent navy independent of the imperial navy, the right hon. gentleman goes gunning for authorities. The only author in the old land that he can find is Kipling:

> Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own,
> The gates are mine to open as the gates are mine to close,
> And I set my house in order.

Thus the poet makes Canada speak. Of course every school boy knows that the gates to which the poet refers are the customs gates, and the lines were written merely to point out that each country has absolute control of its own tariff. But does the right hon. gentleman not know that out-

side these gates, and beyond the reach of these tariffs, there is between these two Houses, the mother's and the daughter's, an ocean pathway, an ocean pathway which the mother and the daughter, actuated both by the same self interest and the same sentiments, are determined by organized, organic and united effort, by effort at once,—by blood and iron, if necessary, to keep open and under their joint control? Does the right hon. gentleman not know that over that self same pathway the daughter sent to her mother's house last year no less than 88 per cent of her enormous animal and agricultural exports, and no less than $134,000,000 out of the $260,000,000 of her total exports last year? Has it not occurred to the right hon. gentleman that as an insurance, an insurance which every sane man would place on his own private property, as an insurance of this great and growing trade en route, it would be good business for mother and daughter to join in the common task of keeping open for their mutual trade that ocean pathway between their houses? The component parts of the British empire have at least this in common, it is a condition not only of the prosperity, but of the very existence of each, that it shall at all times have a goodly portion of its wealth afloat upon the sea. That is true, as I say, of all the daughter states. But it has been left, as far as Canada is concerned, to the parent state to guard that trade route. Surely out of self interest we all should assume our share of the guardianship. But let us look at that in another way. From Halifax to Plymouth, from Quebec to Plymouth, of all the imperial trade routes, these are the shortest and most easily protected. To accept that short trade route between Canada and the motherland, as the main supply route will solve the most knotty problem in imperial defence, the problem of the food supply of England and the market of Canada in time of naval war. If we will but accept that route as the main supply route for the empire, and will join with the motherland in the common task of not only developing that trade, but protecting that route, we will do more than anything else could do to establish the market of England as the preserve of the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian producer.

Let us then, as I have said, join with the motherland in developing that trade and that imperial navy to protect that trade route, and we will be joined with the mother country in interest as well as in heart, and we will be better prepared to maintain intact, in domain and untarnished in honour the splendid inheritance received from our forefathers.

But, Sir, apart altogether from these trade considerations, there is the relationship which the right hon. gentleman has pointed out of mother and daughter. Out of that relationship there has been ever an increasing flow of affection, such an increasing flow of affection that not even the right hon. gentleman himself a few years ago was permitted to call a man from the old land either a foreigner or a stranger. 'So flows the stream and shall for ever flow.' Yes, Mr. Speaker, Kipling is correct—'Daughter, am I in my mother's house.' There is in Canada a love of the old land as the love of a mother, a love that comes uncalled, one knows not how. It comes in with the very air, with the instincts, with the first taste of the mother's milk, with the first beatings of the heart—

A mother is a mother still,
The holiest thing alive.

What ruthless hand would tear asunder those ties and make the daughter a stranger or a foreigner in her mother's house? I have spoken of the sacred relationship of mother and daughter. The right hon. gentleman seems to be unable to take any account of that relationship, and it would seem that his whole attitude in the public life of Canada, and especially as embodied in this Bill, is to absolutely ignore that feeling. I say that the time has come when the people of Canada, the free people of Canada, cannot allow this—shall I say this nonsense about independence and an independent navy to continue, even if we would. We owe it to our Canadian ancestors of whatever race, we owe it to the fathers of confederation, to preserve entire our rights of inheritance in that empire, the greatest empire the world has seen. We owe it to posterity not to suffer these rights to be severed, sundered or destroyed. But if it were possible for us to be insensible to these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation which we owe to ourselves and from which nothing can acquit us. To make the present necessity for empire-defence the stalking horse to a mean ambition for independence and an independent navy, and then, in the hour of struggle, before the eyes of the world and in the face of the common foe to withhold or withdraw that navy from that defence, would be a betrayal as much worse than open rebellion as a life of honour is better than one of disgrace. And, if that life be the bounty of heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of that gift, if by our own act and our own ignominy we find ourselves and our children rifled and bereft, in the eyes of the nations, of that fair name for national honour and national good faith without which no people can be otherwise than miserable and contemptible. That the Canadian people, if they had an opportunity of expressing their views at this moment, would be so utterly degenerate as to suffer this, as to allow us to pass an

Act which is intended to give us the power, in the hour of struggle, to withhold our fleet and so declare the neutrality and therefore the independence of Canada—that the Canadian people would be so utterly degenerate as to suffer this—I refuse to think so meanly of them. The national honour of any country is the bulwark of its national interests. There is this distinction between individuals and nations: if you lower the honour of a man in the eyes of his equals he may still say: my fortune is not attacked, my estate is not impaired, the laws will protect my rights and my person, I have my independence. But, if you lower the honour of a nation in the eyes of the other nations of the earth you not only deface her colours, you strike down her shield, her credit is injured her commerce suffers. If you take the awe from her flag, you take the wealth from her merchants, and from her people you take the power to check violence and wrong in behalf of liberty and right. No, the destiny of Canada is not in separation as provided by this Bill. But if separation must come, which heaven forbid, let it come without dishonour, and discredit, and disgrace to the people of Canada.

Now then, I would ask the House to recall the revelations made in the British House of Commons on the 16th of March last, as to the defences of the empire, revelations made by the leaders on both sides, and which revelations alone awoke Canada from her policy of drift, and awoke a desire not only in Canada but in all parts of the empire; a desire not to build separate navies, but a universal desire to strengthen the arm of whom?—to strengthen the arm of King Edward the peace maker by adding to the fighting strength of his navy. And in this connection Mr. Speaker, I cannot help remarking that there is not only in Canada, but throughout the whole of the British empire a rising tide of what I would call an inter-imperial brotherhood and interest, a rising tide of imperialism if you please; a tide of which this Bill takes no account and which the supporters of the government seem to mistake for little Canadianism. Blink their eyes to it as they please, there is that tide. In Canada that tide first set in with force as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the South African war in 1899. And on that occasion you will also remember that the right hon. the First Minister mistaking the backwash for the flood of that tide ordered it to recede, mark you, saying: Canada is not menaced. But, Sir, you will remember also that on that occasion history repeated herself, and, that full ebb and tide kept rolling steadily on and swept along with it the best of our Canadian boys to the defence of the empire, and the undying glory of their native land. Since that South African war that tide has still been rising, growing with our growth, gathering volume and velocity, until to-day it must be reckoned with as a force-making for the stability of the empire and the strength of its rulers in the world. But the right hon. gentleman cannot see that; he is still unable to distinguish that great general ebb of the tide felt through every part of the British empire, from the little recoil, the little backwash which he detects in certain small portions of Canada. He still thinks that it is a spasmodic thing, as he himself has said: a mere wave of enthusiasm which manifests itself only when Great Britain is in danger. He does not realize and he will not learn from the lesson of 1899, that that rising tide is nothing in Canada but manly, robust, self-reliant, self-respecting Canadianism bent on maintaining British connection for Canada. By that feeling is demanded a navy built and equipped in Canada by Canadians so far as that can be done; a navy officered and manned in Canada, and provisioned by Canadian merchants, so far as that can be done. But, a navy one and indivisible with the imperial navy, a navy that will build up in Canada a buttress of that great arch of empire, the imperial navy, under which we have no pledge of permanent security, and the empire no guarantee of peaceful progress. But after all is it a navy Bill or is it a Bill of attainder against the opposition that is under discussion, or rather what do the government speakers take it to be? Let us examine? Again, let me follow that order of precedence I mentioned at first, namely, first Jove, then the satellites of Jove, and follow it in lighter vein than I have been pursuing. Perhaps the followers of the Prime Minister will prefer that instead of that metaphor I should adopt that rather impious metaphor used by the right hon. gentleman on the 5th of January last, in Toronto, and that I should call them not sattelites of Jove, but the chickens, which, even as the hen, the right hon. gentleman has warmed and hatched into political existence if not significance.

Whichever you will, the order remains the same. Let us, then, examine the speeches made by the gentleman on the government benches and their followers. Let us take first the speech of the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister, it is true, tells us that he gets his naval policy from Kipling, but he quickly drops it at that; and then he charges full steam ahead a la 'Rainbow' at the member for North Toronto, and he says of him that: 'He is one of those who carry abroad upon their foreheads imperial phylacteries, who boldly walk into the temple and there loudly thank the Lord that they are not like other British subjects, that they give tithes of everything they possess, and that in them alone is to be found the true incense of loyalty.' The right hon. gentleman's

imagery here scarcely jumps with nature, and his metaphors are somewhat mixed. It is not usual to find incense of any kind inside a man. The right hon. gentleman charges Pharisaism. I will not admit that he is a judge even of that article in which he is a wholesale dealer. But let that pass. What the House will notice is that he is not not at all dealing with the subject of a naval Bill, but he is dealing with the subject of a Bill of attainer. And so, too when he trots out Talleyrand and charges loquacity, and Peter the Hermit, and Papineau, and the fiasco of 1837, and Lord Durham, and Lord Elgin, and Lafontaine and Baldwin, and periodical contributions, and Sir Charles Tupper, and Lord Milner, and Sir Walter Scott and 'Quentin Durward'; and these references happen to cover fifteen out of twenty-seven pages of his speech. However, the right hon. gentleman does find time to say in one part of his speech that he had said in the speech in which he introduced this Bill, that 'when England is at war we are at war', and he there defended that statement. But later in his speech he says: 'It does not follow that because England is at war we are at war'. To say nothing of the sense of those two statements, would not the sound of them jar a stone wall? 'When England is at war we are at war,' but 'it does not follow that because England is at war we are at war.' To the satellites of Jove that may be symphony, but to my mortal ear it is mere cacophony. But bad as the sound is, the sense is confusion worse confounded—'when England is at war we are at war.' but 'it does not follow that because England is at war we are at war.'

Perhaps a remark of the hon. gentleman the Postmaster General would afford a clue to the meaning. It may be that one of these statements is intended for consumption in Quebec and the other for consumption in Ontario. The right hon. gentleman tells us that he has been assailed in Quebec because there it is said that under no circumstances shall his little navy go to England's war; and he has been assailed in Ontario because there it is said that under all circumstances his little navy shall go to England's war. And he tells us that he speaks from a double standpoint and his policy is the expression of a double opinion. What a Janus-faced policy! Why the thing is cross-eyed. It looks two ways. It is like the little nigger's coon trap, set to catch them 'gwine and comin'. Now the right hon. gentleman is a very intelligent and very able man, and he knows that those two statements cannot agree together. When England is at war, we are at war, but it does not follow that when England is at war we are at war. He knows that those two statements cannot get into bed together, and he knows too that his policy, because it pretends that both these statements are true, is in itself mere opportunism and not true. By the way, I am reminded that this double-jointed statement and policy is very much on a par with that statement which he made at Toronto on the 5th of January last with all the ambiguity of an oracle. It was reported in the Toronto 'Globe' of that date, whose editor was chairman of the meeting at which the statement was made. The statement is this:

> We are under the suzerainty of England; we are the King's loyal subjects; we bow the knee to him, but the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our own Canadian parliament. If this is not a nation, what then constitutes a nation? And if there is a nation under the sun, which can say more than this, where is it to be found?

Again in those remarks, there are no two statements that will agree. If the one be true, the other must be false. And indeed both and all are false. The whole thing is compact of error and misstatement. Those remarks are the very concentrates, the very quintessence of error and unwisdom regarding the relations of Canada to the motherland. Let us examine them. If the King of England is suzerain of Canada, then we are not only not his loyal subjects but we are not his subjects at all. Prior to the South African war, the King of England was suzerain of the Transvaal republic, but the citizens of that republic were not citizens of the King and could not be. That suzerainty gave to Great Britain a certain control over the external relations of that republic with the other nations of the earth, but it did not give and could not give to the King, as such, any rights over the people of that republic as his subjects. So that if the King of England be suzerain of Canada, the people of Canada are not his subjects, and those two first statements of the right hon. gentleman cannot agree together.

Again, the right hon. gentleman says that we are the King's loyal subjects, but that he has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our Canadian parliament. I venture to assert that no loyal subject can say that the King of England has no more rights over us than are allowed him by our Canadian parliament. The King has the right to assent to every Bill of this parliament before it can become law. That right was not allowed him by this parliament, but reserved to him by the British North America Act and cannot be taken away. The King, by his representative, has the power to dissolve this parliament at this moment. These powers were not 'allowed' him by this parliament; these powers were reserved to him by the British North America Act. And

we might resolve and resolve that we would not dissolve but we would dissolve just the same, if the King's representative, with or without the advice of his cabinet, saw fit to dissolve this parliament. So that I say there are no statements that agree. If we are his loyal subjects, we cannot say that he has no more rights than are allowed him by this parliament, and to say so is an assault, and nothing less than an assault, on the King's constitutional right in this country. Then the right hon. gentleman adds:

If there is a nation under the sun that can say more than this, where is it to be found?

And by that he means that we are as independent of Great Britain and her King as any other nation under the sun. If he does not mean that, his words are without meaning, or else language has been given the right hon. gentleman, as Talleyrand said, to conceal his thoughts. If that be the case, then what a sinful profusion there has been in the case of the right hon. and learned gentleman, who has two living languages, and, no doubt, several dead ones, in which to conceal the most disloyal and unconstitutional thoughts in regard to the relations of Canada and the motherland that have ever been entertained by any public man in Canada.

But, to return to the right hon. gentleman's statement, I think I told you that fifteen out of twenty-seven pages were devoted to the subjects I enumerated. The remaining part of the speech is addressed to Quebec. Again, with painful reiteration he trots out the Plains of Abraham—Lord Durham — Lafontaine — Papineau — Lafontaine again—Baldwin. What has Peter the Hermit done? When addressing his people in Quebec, the right hon. gentleman says nothing about Peter the Hermit. And he winds up by saying that these names and these events are his supreme inspiration in turning this page of the history of Canada. Incidentally, however, he drops a hint that may be taken as a reference in some way to the Navy Bill. He drops a hint that this little Canadian navy is to go to England's wars only if Canada is attacked. He points out that this navy will be to Canada just what the police are to Montreal, and he hints, not obscurely, that this navy is fitted and intended to be of just as much service in one of the naval wars of the empire, as a policeman of Montreal is fitted or intended to command a battleship in such a war.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COWAN. I have heard from the fringe. I am very glad to hear from the fringe,—delighted that they appreciate that sentiment, and that they let us know what their sentiment is. Perhaps I can learn further that they too, like the right hon. Prime Minister, have a goal for their aspirations. I wonder if my hon. friend who called out, hear, hear', regards the independence of Canada as the goal of his aspirations. I wonder if my hon. friend who called out, 'hear, hear', means by that that the Canadian navy is not to join in the wars of the empire except when Canada is attacked. I wonder if he means by that that the Canadian navy is not fitted or intended to be of any more service in a naval war of the empire than a policeman is fitted or intended to command a battleship in such a war. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who said, 'Hear, hear' will be good enough to tell us.

This, then, is the speech, and the whole speech, of the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada. Let us turn then, to the next in order. Let us turn from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux)—again from Jove to a sattelite of Jove. As that gentleman attitudinized and swelled to his theme, he led this House to expect one of those performances described in the playbills as 'imitations of popular performers.' And let me assure the hon. gentleman that his audience on that occasion was not disappointed. But let me tell the hon. Postmaster General that the malignant indelicacy of his reference and allusion to the distinguished and noble ancestry of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) did but little credit to himself and did injustice to the people of Quebec. Because that reference, that allusion, could be made only on one assumption—namely, that a distinguished and noble ancestry unfitted a man for public life in Quebec.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman also that he did not, to my mind, illumine this subject of the navy to any marked extent, by dwelling at such length and with such particularity on his own personal history and ambition, but when he reached that point of self-inflation where he declared he was the knight of labour in this House, well, Mr. Speaker, I did pity the Minister of Labour and the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). But I recollected the attitude of all these gentlemen towards technical education and the Eight Hour Bill, and I was ready to concede that the Postmaster General was not only the (k)night, but the Egyptian darkness of labour in Canada. Well, then, the hon. gentleman, leaving the entrancing subject of his own personal importance and by natural sequence and in further illumination of the subject of the navy, he recalled the guillotine and Madame Roland and then exploded in this apostrophe, 'Oh loyalty what crimes are committed in thy name.' Whereupon, by a trick of memory, I was translated in imagination away from this Chamber and its stifling atmosphere, away to the sunny slopes of the broad Pacific, where last fall on the banks of the Fraser

the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) and myself watched, in our light hearted way, a dirigible balloon ascending into the heavens, into the clouds, and when the steering gear went wrong, the balloon became not less a balloon, but less dirigible, and descended into the waters of the Fraser, and was carried away to the ocean of oblivion. 'Oh loyalty, what crimes are committed in thy name,' the hon. gentleman cries, and forthwith he proceeds to perpetrate the crimes. He asks:

At the time of the South African war, were we disloyal when we sent——

Mark that, my countrymen:

—when we sent to South Africa the young men of this country to fight the battles of Great Britain?

The government sent the Canadian boys to South Africa! It was the other way about, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian boys sent the government about their business, and despite the technical obstacle they put in their way, they went to South Africa, as I have had occasion to say in this House before, they rushed to South Africa as to a festival. The hon. member for Sunbury and Queens, (Mr. H. H. McLean) made what, in many respects, was an excellent speech. It was the first note of Canadian manliness we have heard from the government benches. That brave soldier of the King stood up in his place in this House, and told his leader, man-fashion, that he did not share his aspirations for the independence of Canada, that his proposed fleet was but a sorry substitute for the fleet unit recommended by the admiralty, that the right hon. gentleman's denial that there was anything in the nature of an emergency or crisis was but the song of a dying swan, sweet in tone, but of brief duration. For my part after hearing that right hon. gentleman, I could not help thinking of that fabled goddess, fair to look upon and tempting to follow, but, when embraced, turning into a cloud. Had the member for Sunbury and Queens commenced his inquiry, instead of on the 7th of October, 1909, on the 3rd of October, 1899, he would have found something to indicate that there was a holding back on the part of the Prime Minister in regard to sending our boys to South Africa. Everybody in this House remembers that on the 3rd of October, 1899, the right hon. the Prime Minister granted an interview to a representative of the 'Globe' in this very city, wherein he said that the Militia Act would not allow us to send our boys to the front. and that anyway Canada was not menaced. Every one will remember that a few days afterwards, on the 5th of October, 1899, Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the Conservative party in this House, wired the Prime Minister expressing the hope that the Canadian boys would be allowed to go to South Africa, and assuring the Prime Minister that if the government allowed them to go, it would receive the support of the Conservative party. The hon. member for Sunbury and Queens, seemed also to overlook the fact that after the publication of that interview in the Toronto 'Globe,' on the 4th of October, 1899, there arose from the people of Canada a ground swell of indignation, expressed in telegrams, in resolutions, in memorials, such a ground swell that it swept the Prime Minister and the government away from the position they had taken of putting petty obstacles in the way of the Canadian boys going to the front.

The Postmaster General exclaims: Are we disloyal when we are the first in the history of this Dominion to give His Majesty the King a navy? If that navy is to be taken as the measure of Liberal loyalty to the King, then heaven help the King. If that act is the measure of Liberal loyalty, the Postmaster General and his party are free to suck such comfort out of it as they may. The Postmaster General tells us what apparently he thinks we did not know before, that we have a double sea-board, and he asks us not to cast any aspersions on this so-called tin pot navy because there, across the Pacific, was Japan awakening and putting on the forms of European civilization and government, and China, and this navy was intended to protect British Columbia from the attacks not only of China and Japan, but also of Russia and the United States. He forgets that we, the people of Canada, know that the admiralty realize that the completion of the present naval programme of Japan will synchronize with the termination of the treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Japan, and that the admiralty realize the significance of that fact, not only to Great Britain, but to that part of Great Britain, that portion of Canada, British Columbia. For that main reason, the admiralty suggested that Canada should provide a fleet unit on the Pacific because the Atlantic sea-board is within striking distance of the royal navy, and its trade routes can be protected without any help from Canada. But in that policy of putting a fleet unit on the Pacific, the right hon. the leader of the government and his followers see no votes, it is not the necessity of Canada or the defence of the empire, it is votes they are after, and the Postmaster General would have us believe that this mutilated fleet, emasculated of its only fighting ship, emasculated of the battleship, this mutilated fleet, divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific, would be sufficient to resist the attacks, not only of China and Japan, but of Russia and the United States. The childish absurdity of this schoolboy rhe-

toric, in the face of facts, not only known to the laymen of Canada, but set forth with great particularity by the experts of the admiralty!

I could go on and refer to the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald). I could refer to the speech, the volcanic eruption from Red Deer. Usually that gentleman is content to belch forth the burning lava of Cobdenism on his friends in this House, and especially, infandum dictu, on our own and only Cobden-medalist, until that right hon. gentleman finds himself buried and suffocated in the slag and ashes and forgotten things, of a dead doctrine. I could refer to the other speeches, but I wish to repeat in conclusion that manly, robust Canadianism is well content with a fleet if it conforms to these conditions: it may be a fleet built and equipped in Canada by Canadians, officered, manned and provisioned by Canadians, but it must be an integral part of the imperial navy just as Canada herself is an integral part of the British empire. Canada has grown on the gaze of the world, a signal example of internal expansive energy, but Canada has not yet found herself, Canada has not yet realized the significance of her peculiar, her unique position in the empire, and has not been fruitful in the more salient and striking characteristics of nationhood. How can that be brought about? Let us cease to seek shelter under, let us cease to be parasites upon, the British taxpayer and the American taxpayer. Let us give, and give at once, to the imperial navy, which all admit is the best guarantee of Canada's future greatness and safety. Let us remember that armed and equipped by nature with all the wealth of boundless wheatfields, of inexhaustible mineral resources, of vast forests and teeming fisheries, Canada occupies in the British family in these vigorous latitudes of the north, a peculiar, a pivotal position. Midway between Europe and Asia, midway between Europe and Australia, on the direct line of commerce between the occident and the orient, stands Canada, that young giant of the north, with hands outstretched, the one for the trade and commerce of the Atlantic, the other for the new and growing trade of the Pacific. How essential to that trade and to the protection of that trade it is that the imperial navy shall continue to be our navy, and shall continue to hold the supremacy of the seas. With these two conditions satisfied, who will deny that Canada, owing to that central position she occupies in the empire's circle, will one day become the centre of the merchant fleet, the commercial progress and the transportation facilities of the British empire. Long may the day be distant when any party or propaganda in Canada will be able to swing the pendulum of our destiny outside that empire circle; that circle within which lies not only our present freedom and liberties, but our future permanence and greatness as a people, a nation and an empire.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo.) I find as such difficulty in controlling the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) as he and my good friend the member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) found when they were operating that balloon on their fishing trip last summer. I have listened carefully to every word my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) has said and to every argument he has tried to present, and I say that no hon. member in this House has submitted to this parliament a depreciation of the leading men of this country in any way equal to the denunciations of the hon. member. He began by telling the House how very important it was that we should eliminate politics from this debate, and I submit to the intelligence of every fair-minded man in this parliament that the hon. gentleman strayed very far from his own advice. He went on to argue in his own way that the Prime Minister was propagating, preaching and proclaiming a doctrine of absolute independence and that he was using his influence at every opportunity upon the hustings in certain portions of this country in favour of a spirit of alienation from Great Britain. Mr. Speaker, that is a charge not against the Prime Minister but against the intelligence of the British people in this country. There is no one man in this country to-day—even if the Prime Minister had the disposition the hon. member speaks of—strong enough to use an influence that could alienate the attachment that the great mass of the Canadian people have for Britain and British institutions. But that is not the doctrine that hon. gentlemen opposite preach all the time. In one portion of the country they cry out that the right hon. gentleman is too British, and in another portion of the country they declare—and I know full well where that portion of the country is—that the right hon. gentleman is not British enough. We never have gone through a federal campaign in British Columbia, but that the principal declaration of hon. gentlemen opposite is—the repeated statement that the Prime Minister of Canada is not loyal to British sentiment, or to the interests of the people of the west. No question has ever been submitted to this parliament of greater importance or of more far reaching effect, and no question was ever submitted to this parliament that ought to receive the sober deliberation, of this House more than the question now under discussion. And yet I submit, Sir, and I think the members of this House will agree with me, that to-night we have had to listen for two hours to the performance of a political mountebank.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I submit that that statement of the hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That term is unparliamentary.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I did not say that the member for Vancouver was a mountebank, I said his performance could be likened to that of a political mountebank.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ralph Smith) to say that he had been listening to a political mountebank.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I submit myself to the Speaker of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I don't think the term is parliamentary.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I will be glad to withdraw the term mountebank, but I submit, Sir, that if evidence of right about face is to be taken, evidence of political manœuvering on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite and of my hon friend (Mr. Cowan) with reference to the principle of a Canadian navy, I do not know what word better than 'mountebank' can describe that position. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this contention before the House at the present time and the consideration of this important question, originated where? It originated in the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) a year ago. And what was it in favour of? It was not in favour of sending Dreadnoughts to Britain. Neither the member for North Toronto nor the leader of the opposition, nor any member opposite said anything about that. It was in favour entirely and absolutely of the commencement and the formation of the nucleus of a navy in Canada. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) went further, and he contended that in the Bill before the House the British North America Act, the constitution of this country, is infringed upon. My hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) read section 15 of the British North America Act to prove his case, but to demonstrate his simplicity it is only necessary that some one else should read section 4 of the same Act. Section 15, that my hon. friend read and made so much out of states that the authority should rest in the King, and, he said that the Bill before the House removed this authority from the Sovereign.

The command in chief of the land and naval militia and of all naval and military forces, of and in Canada, is hereby declared to continue and be vested in the King.

Now, what is the section in the Bill? I read this to show that the hon. gentleman has dwelt for twenty minutes or half an hour in his speech on this very principle, and yet had demonstrated to the House that he has never read the Bill. Section 4 of the Bill is the very section of the British North America Act that I have just read; it is worded in exactly the same way:

The Command in Chief of the Naval Forces is vested in the King, and shall be exercised and administered by His Majesty, or by the Governor General as His representative.

My hon. friend from Vancouver founded an argument, and declared upon the foundation of that argument the disloyalty of the government towards the constitution of this country; and yet he had not examined or understood this section of the Bill of which he complained. Now, before I move the adjournment of this debate, I want to make this remark. The whole contention of my hon. friend is that the development by this country of its own land and naval forces has only one meaning, that is, that it is promoted and intended to develop the independence of Canada apart from the British empire. The development of this country, and its protection on land and on sea, are the greatest security that can be given to the British empire to-day; and if hon. gentlemen opposite twenty years ago had recognized, in any degree at all, the responsibility which they seek to have others recognize, and had done then exactly what this government is providing to do to-day, what position would Canada have been in to-day to send her fleets across the Atlantic to assist the empire in any emergency that might arise on the other side? But because they did nothing, and because things have to have a beginning, and because it takes time to promote them and bring them about, the whole blame is cast upon the present government. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that very little is being done by the government, and yet in their very amendment they object to the enormity of the provisions already made. They say, you are making a tin-pot navy, and then they declare that the question is sufficiently important to have the opinion of the people of this country upon it before you carry out the project. I have no hesitation in saying, and I think I shall be able to prove to this House at a later time, that there never was a proposition placed before the parliament by the leaders of any great party, in view of the position that was taken by those leaders years ago, that represented such mixed and contrary opinions, while it is only intended to appease the fanatical wrath of hon. gentlemen belonging to their own party, but does nothing to establish the principles on which this country can be defended or can ever hope to be of any important assistance to the motherland. I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1909-1910.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., Northwest Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ques.) 1789 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193, 7234 (iv).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5643 (iii).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Budget, The (remarks) 2080 (ii).

Census of 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigations Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7892 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 84) 1° m., 1587 (i); on M. for 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6360; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).

—— Consideration of Bill (remarks) 6110 (iv).

Conservation Com., Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

—— Names of Members (Ques.) 1196 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3293 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3918 (ii).

Electrical Measure Units B. 7 (Mr. Fielding) on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ques.) 1016 (i).

Free Mail Delivery, Closing of Post Office Distribution (Ques.) 1196 (i).
See 'Rural.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 183; on M. for 2°, 717 (i).

French Treaty, Similar Treatment to Germany (Ques.) 1196 (i).

German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3679 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Dairy Products (remarks) 3832 (ii).

German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

—— Similar Treatment *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 785 (i).

—— Value of Exports, &c. (Ques.) 261 (i).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1366 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions, &c. (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ques.) 4309 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5809 (iii).

Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Insects, Pests and Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 211 (i); in Com., 5628 (iii).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmt., 2812 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 1196 (i).

—— Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1546 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5901 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4423 (iii); in Com., 7452 (v.)

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5293 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertisements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ques.) 267 (i).

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ques.) 5779 (iii).

Post Office Mail Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).

Printing outside of Govt. Printing Bureau, Payments *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

—— Inquiry for, 2713 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i); on M. for Com., 6492 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 6008 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 4812, 5625 (iii).

R. M. College Buildings, Total Cost *re* Maintenance (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Boxes (Ques.) 1783 (i).

—— Locks furnished, &c. (Ques.) 784 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 1380 (i).

See 'Free.'

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5332, 5345 (iii), 6234, 6346, 6736 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7090 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2638 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376; (cold storage) 7383 (iv); (experimental farms) 227 (i), 5726; (exhibitions) 5728 (iii); (Patent Record) 7371 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3107; (Newmarket) 3109; Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (printing) 252 (i); Post Office salaries) 6650, 6683 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 249 (i).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 7863 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (Eastern Block) 572; (Museum) 570; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Que. immigration sheds) 961; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4761 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv.).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Lennox Island) 2694 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecœur) 3889; (Fort William) 3892; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Rivière) 3903; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Grosse Isle) 3906; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Ste. Croix) 4238; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3098; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ques.) 2429 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5960, 5989 (iv).

'Toronto World,' Ownership by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Maclean) 5998 (iv).

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'German.'

Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7288 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6942 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Zinc Ores Smelting, Investigation, B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

ARTHURS, Mr. J., *Parry Sound.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9 (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ques.) 445 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.Cs. *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for Copies, 3526 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ques.) 1194 (i).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Magnatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214, 6970 (iv).

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

SUPPLY.

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers —Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).

Trent Canal Water Powers, Control by Govt. (Ques.) 2185 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution, Commutation, &c., on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

—— (correction) *re* Action of Crown, 2712 (ii).

B.C. Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c. (reply) to Mr. Borden, 11 (i).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice and National Trust Co. (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

Capital Cases and Action of the Crown, Correction (remarks) 2712 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

—— Instruction, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6391 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 147 (i).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 2°. 2163; in Com., 2166 (ii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Customs and Fisheries Protection Act Amt. (B. 138) 1° m., 3290 (ii); 2° m., 6190 (iv).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Rep., 7650 (v).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c., *re* Dom. Election, 1907 (Ans.) 1007 (i).

Dubuc, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 1976 (ii).

—— (remarks) 2278 (ii).

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1268 (i).

Escheats to the Crown (B. 206) M. for Com. on Res., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974 (iv); in Com., 8384 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. accidents) Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 4996; in Com., 6182 (iv).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

Franking Privilege *re* Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank (remarks) 7792 (v).

Georgian Bay Canal, and U. S. Privileges, *re* Waterways Treaty (Ans.) 3160 (ii).

Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track', &c.

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2043 (ii).

Judges, Defence of, 7163 (iv).

Judicial Business, Montreal District, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 1797 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers, Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 852 (i).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ans.) 4847 (iii).

—— Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Quebec Judges, Superior Court (prop. res.) 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; in Com., 8383 (v).

National Battlefields Act Amt. (B. 188) 1° m., 5888; in Com., 6598 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7403 (v).

New York Canals, Use of by Canadian Vessels, Authority *re* (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5206 (iii).

North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1552 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Obscene Literature, Sale of, Skill and King, release from Central Prison, Political Pull, &c. (remarks) 7069 (iv).

——— (further explanation) 7183 (iv).

——— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8348 (v).

Offences against the Person, B. 71 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2040 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1309 (i).

Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. (Ans.) 3490 (ii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 7867; in Com., 8382 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Legal Work to Lawyers in Toronto, 8362 (v).

Quebec Superior Court at Montreal, Number of Cases standing (Ans.) 1370 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., 6541; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

——— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 6717 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 457 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, Amt. (Mr. Graham) 6 m. h., 487 (i).

Railway Act (general) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8416 (v).

Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release of (remarks) 924 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7163 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard (Ans.) 1375 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 253 (i).

Victoria Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 5889 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3432 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2°, 2039 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6906 (iv).

De Mar., Edna Shibley Relief (B. 223) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5685 (iii).

Gaspereau River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1138; in Com., 1148 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Halifax Round-house Property, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2948 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7183 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5865 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7951 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5905 (iii).

N.T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2406 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

——— change in rep., &c., on M. for Sup., 5570 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6041 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8305 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5676 (iii), 6963 (iv).

Nicholl, Emily Maud Relief (B. 222) 1°*, 8361 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1558 (i).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1365 (i).

Post Office, Outside Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6675 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 609 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 892 (i); on M. for Com., 6476 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7102 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7347 (iv).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (tool grinder) 3105 (ii)
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6675 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3454; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Richibucto) 3442; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3452; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3456; (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii).
Railways (board of commissioners) 3092 (ii).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (revenue) 3091; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946 (ii).
Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.. 5247 (iii).
Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).
Railways (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8092 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods, B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8012 (v).

Western Power Co's B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars *re* (Ques.) 5929 (iv).

Budget, The, 1673 (i).

Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c., (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

Criminal Code (race-track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 886 (i).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ques.) 1529 (i).

Dredging Inspection of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1017 (i).

——— Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 3170 (ii).

Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Conc. of Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8032 (v).

Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c. (Ques.) 2145 (ii).

——— Supply and Use of Field Guns, &c. (Ques.) 1790, 1799 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1259 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep of Com., 2920 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4182 (iii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6214 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236 (iii).

Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c. (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

Public Works, B. C., Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4279 (iii).

Public Works Engineers, Number of Resident, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2293 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Campbell) 4276; (Columbia river) 4277; (Nitinat Lake) 4715 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4775 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6117 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Tiffin) 6122 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste Croix) 4236-4237 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

——— Number of Inmates, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

"William Joliffe," Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Banking Act, Expiration of, Issue of Currency, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6. (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1294 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6609 (iv).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1248 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4989 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 8204 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Martin's Island) 3474 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. A., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 175) 1°m., 5620 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv., 7066 (iv).

I.C.R., Prosecutions *re* Damages by Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3683 (ii), 4568 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (facilities) 2946 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ques.) 642 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4108 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1392 (i).

BEST, Mr., *Dufferin.*

House of Commons, Sessional and Temporary Employees, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4392 (iii).

Peace River Country, Portions opened for Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8588 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2655 (ii).

Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in January (Ques.) 4514, 5001 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5254 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Clean Currency, &c. (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 756 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5553, 5861 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6605 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6291 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8051, 8423, 8596 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 172) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5657 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1108 (i).

I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos. (prop. res.) 2299 (ii).
—— Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1303 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6293 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5407 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749; (hatcheries) 5752 (iii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1393 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R. *Peel.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5646 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Light-keeper, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

Brownridge, James Thornton, Relief (B. 202) 1°*, 6802 (iv)

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6874; in Com., 6923 (iv); 7905 (v).

Conservation of Natural Resources Commission, B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res. 5885 (iii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty, B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6997 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6624 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii); 5774 (iii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8694 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Ministers (remarks) 2490 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Employees, Crown Residences, Inquiry for Ret., 3058 (ii).
See 'Senate.'

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

House of Commons and Senate Officials, Estimated Cost of Occupancy of Living Rooms, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1023 (i).
See 'Senate.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5829 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 523, 811 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5646 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. King) to conc., 2425, 2887 (ii).

Lethbridge Post office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7435 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5675 (iii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821 (iii).

Newspapers, List *re* advertising Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1569 (i).

Patronage List and Tory Whip, Par. in Toronto 'World,' (personal explanation) 7070 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).

Post Office Patronage List (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Post Office Regulations *re* Mails to Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6961 (iv).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (amt.) 612 (i).

Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Race-track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 455 (i).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7657 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5363 (iii), 6227, 6341 (iv).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 121 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 809 (i).

Senate and H. of C. Residents in Parliament Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House.'

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7763 (v); (census) 7374; (farm bulletins) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122; Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Trent (damages) 3120; (Newmarket) 3119 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (clerks) 7764 (v); Finance (salaries) 335; Indian Affairs

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(salaries) 366, 414 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8195; (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6651 (iv); Public Works salaries) 333 (i).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1333; Inspectors (salaries) 1331 (i).

Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).

Militia (rifles, &c.) 8562 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Greenwood) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Bathurst) 580; (Grand Falls) 582; (Lunenburg) 576; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7503; (Kincardine) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 8170; (Uxbridge) 8178; (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 539 (i); (deptl., new) 7169 (iv); (military stores) 601; (museum) 569 (i); (National Art gallery) 6158 (iv); (parliament driveway) 8174; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Senate redecorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachine, heating) 667; (Megantic) 700; (Plessisville) 704; (Roberval) 944; (St. Roch) 830; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, repairs, &c..) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4772 (iii); Man. (generally) 6138 (iv); Mar. Provs. (generally) 4782, 4805 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125 (iv); dredging (new plant) 4740, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1167, 1174; (Saw Pit) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101; (Victoria) 6123 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (Courtenay Bay) 6151; Ont. and Que. (Chapeau) 6150; (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 2873; P.E.I. (construction) 3102; Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3096, 3128; (Quebec bridge) 3073 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Yukon Govt. (administration salaries) 8487 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1396 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8187 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6378 (iv); in Com., 8399 (v).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5796 (iii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

French Canadian Party in Parlt., Ques. of Priv., 8115 (v).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Grand Mere Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2598 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4453 (iii).

St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ques.) 5931 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 932; (Shawinigan Falls) 951 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Airships, Devlopment of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 1369 (i).

—— Govt. Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin (Ans.) 446 (i).

Armouries, Govt. Policy *re* Building (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Armouries and Drill Halls, on Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii).

Army Service Corps, Charges against two officers, &c (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

See 'DelaRonde.'

Artillery Horses *re* Petewawa Camp, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 786 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*
Artillery, Re-armament of, Reasons for (Ans.) 1372 (i).
See 'Garrison.'
Baby Farm Sale (B. 181) prop. Res., 2634 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5791 (iii); in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).
Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt (Ans.) 2146 (ii).
See 'Garrison.'
Cartwright, Sir R., Lease of Lands: *See* 'Frontenac.'
Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 636 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).
DelaRonde, Major and Capt., Charges *re* (Ans.) 135 (i).
—— Report of Justice Dept. (Ans.) 5500 (iii).
See 'Army Service,' 'Ottawa,' &c.
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 637 (i).
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ans.) 6801 (iv), 8837 (v).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transportation of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1018 (i).
Esquimalt Fortifications, Dismantling of, Imp. Conc. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).
See 'Garrison,' 'Halifax,' &c.
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).
—— Request *re* Indemnity (Ans.) 5560 (iii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ans.) 133 (i).
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes (Ans.) 1371 (i).
—— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, &c. (Ans.) 262 (i).
Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of Guns, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).
—— on Question being put by another Member (remarks) 1791; (Ans.) 1800 (i).
—— Strength, &c. (Ans.) 2145 (ii).
See 'Esquimalt,' &c.
Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ans.) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) 1802 (i).
—— Observations of Sir Wm. White, Stmnt. (read) 1961 (ii).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes 843 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 783 (i).
BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payments *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ans.) 1193 (i).
Lambton Barracks, Acquiring of Property (Ans.) 271 (i).
See 'Baby,' &c.
Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 275 (i).
Military Lands: *See* 'Baby,' &c.
Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Militia Active Service, Standards *re* Efficiency in Rifle Shooting (Ans.) 1596 (i).
Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examinations (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Militia Clothing, Life of, Purchase of New Material (Ans.) 1018 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 781 (i).
Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ans.) 1779 (i).
Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ans.) 1202 (i).
Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors (Ans.) 1535 (i).
Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers (Ans.) 1595 (i).
Militia Pension Act Amt. (B. 194) prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097, 1°*, 6098; 2° m. and in Com., 6190 (iv).
Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ans.) 1019 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 1378 (i).
Militia Provisions *re* Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 842 (i).
Militia Stores Building, Ottawa, Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ans.) 838 (i).
—— Loss of Clothing by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 845 (i).
—— Value of Damage by Fire (Ans.) 386 (i).
Militia Tents, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).
Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System re (Ans.) 1200 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3296 (ii); in Com., 7440 (iv).
Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2798 (ii).
Naval Service, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Meaning of 'Upkeep,' &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ans.) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Stores, Kingston, Repairs and Lease, &c., (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority *re* Emplymt. of Horses, &c., (Ans.) 2289 (ii).
See 'DelaRonde.'

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators (Ans.) 8837 (v).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Permanent Force, Average Cost per man, annually (Ans.) 1013 (i).

——— Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 1781 (i).

——— Increase in Establishments, &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c. (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

——— Officers Entertaining Allowance (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Requirements *re* Instructions, &c., (Ans.) 1011 (i).

——— Scale of Payments, &c., (Ans.) 1012 (i).

——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c. (Ans.) 1531 (i).

——— Total Strength and Expenditure (Ans.) 266 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c. (Ans.) 1790 (i).

Queen's Own Rifles at Aldershot, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Patterns, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practices, Facilities *re* (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 134, 273 (i).

——— on ques of priv. (Mr. Staples) 339 (i).

Ross Rifles, Mark I and Mark II**, Defects, Issue of, Contracts *re* &c., (Ans.) 1533; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Answer to Mr. Worthington (withdrawal) 1597 (i).

——— Number received, contracted for, &c. (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

——— Submission to N. R. Association *re* Bisley Meet (Ans.) 4082 (iii).

——— Weight of (Ans.) 8678 (v).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

R. M. College Act Amt. (B. 180) Prop. Res., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii); 2° m., 6098 (iv).

R. M. C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ans.) 5781 (iii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK—*Con.*

St. Johns, Que. Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 3738 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5492 (iii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1780 (i).

Savard, Lt.-Col., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot, &c. (Ans.) 8659 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment (Ans.) 6800 (iv).
See 'Eighteenth.'

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment (Ans.) 8109 (v).

S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1204 (i).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

South African Scrip, Location in B. C. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

S. A. Volunteer Scrip, Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

S. A. War, Reinstatement of Aud. Gen.'s Messenger (remarks) in Com of Sup., 8568 (v).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c. (Ans.) 2952 (ii).
See 'Baby.'

Subtarget Rifle Machines, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 1779 (i).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (armoury to 65th Reg.) 8570; (arms, rifles, &c.) 8556; (civil employees) 8574; (engineers) 8569; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (pay, &c.) 8559; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec barracks) 975; (citadel drill shed) 967; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted and delivered, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowances for 1907 (Ans.) 6800 (iv).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 1778 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 33 (i).

Address to Earl Grey, on Closing of Term of Office (seconded) 8740 (v).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Alien Labour Law, Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (iii).
Aud. Gen. Messenger, Re-instatement *re* S. A. War (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (vol. II) Inquiry for, 1445 (i).
Bank Act Amt., Inquiry for, 2061 (ii).
Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).
Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'
B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 5 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 531 (i).
Budget, The, Date of Delivery (remarks) 1002 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 2081; Ques. of Order, 2085 (ii).
Canadian Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7296 (iv).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S. (remarks) 8585 (v).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res. 6806 (iv); in Com., 7890; on M. for 3°, 7995 (v).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. King) 7188 (iv).
Conservation of Natural Resources B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6359; on M. for 3°, 6619 (iv).
Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) in Com., 8730 (v).
Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6632 (iv).
Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3056 (ii).
—— Translators, Apptmt. of, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Dog-Fish Reduction Plant, Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c. (M. for ret*) 109 (i).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3916 (ii).
Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8689 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).
Fisheries Commission *re* Man., on Inquiry for Report, 1963 (ii).
—— Signing of Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7823 (v).
French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 707, 715; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).
French Treaty, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).
French Treaty (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).
—— Explanation *re* Negotiations (remarks) 3681 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3829 (ii).
Govt. Railways Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4403 (iii).
Government's Railway Pension Amendment B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on M. for 3°, 2637 (ii).
G. T. P. *See* 'Natl. Transcl.' &c.
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Condition of, Observations of Sir Wm. White (remarks) 1802 (i).
Halifax Harbour and Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 315, 323 (i).
Horse Racing. *See* 'Race Track.'
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5523 (iii).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia, Papers (remarks), 207 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion, 119 (i).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. B. on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7943 (v).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2827 (ii).
—— Board of Management, Rep. to Hse. (remarks) 2791 (ii).
—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1106, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°. 2214 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

——— and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Fund B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i); on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii).

——— Low Rates, Inquiry for Information (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill 8481 (v).

——— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) 332, 343 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6201 (iv).

Judges Act (Man. and Que.) Amt. (B. 207) in Com., 8383 (v).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

See 'B.C.'

Labour Hours on Public Works, on 1st Rep. of Com., 1586 (i); on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105, 8233 (v).

See 'Marine.'

Lumsden, Mr., Resignation, Letter to Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 622 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl.,' &c.

Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6507 (iv.)

Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8160 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520; in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

See 'Lobster.'

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6191 (iv).

Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).

Motions to Adjn., Ruling of Mr. Speaker, on Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 127 (i).

Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts., &c. (remarks) 1609 (i).

National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6599 (iv).

N.T.R. Commissioners' Rep., Printing of (remarks) 97 (i).

Nat. Transcl. Ry., Lumsden, Mr., Resignation as Chief Engineer (remarks) 97 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Resignation, Reps. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 258 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Additional letter to Prime Minister, (remarks) 448 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Printing Papers, 377, 1302 (i).

N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2367, 2601 (ii).

——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report, 6055 (iv).

——— 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).

——— Errors in Rep. of Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196, 5277 (iii).

——— on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 5597 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).

N.T. Ry., on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8326 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 8310 (v).

N.T. Ry., Counsel, &c. (remarks) 4516 (iii).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt. (remarks) 7291 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1738 (i); on M. for 2°, 2979, Amt., 2991 (ii); Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101 (iii); in Com., 7396; on M. for 3°, 7528 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* withdrawing stmnt., 4940 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Inquiry for, 520, 1100, 1600 (i).

Naval Defence Conference (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).

——— Further Documents, Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Naval Service, of Canada, Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Upkeep, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6208 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B, 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4836, 5289 (iii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1560 (i).

N.S. Judges: *See* 'Judicial,' &c.

Ontario Legislation, Disallowance, Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Permanent Force, Number of re-enlistments, &c. (question) 3735 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) on Ques. of Order, 3744 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 6603; in Com., 7316 (iv).

P.E.I. Rys., Royal Junction, Surveys, Reps. &c., (M. for copies*) 3170 (ii).

Prison and Reformatories Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8382 (v).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 140 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6564, 7262 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep. of Special Com., 6399 (iv).

——— on Procedure in Com., 6558 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6170 (iv).

Returns, Careless Arrangement of (remarks) 522 (i).

Reynolds, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7741 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7630 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6196 (iv).

R.M.C. Servants' Quarters, Occupation, &c., (Ans.) 263 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res., (Mr. Lewis) 1538 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i).

——— in Com. on Rep., 8374 (v).

St. John Valley Railway, Legislation re Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5366 (iii), 6169, 6246, 6721 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7524 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 811 (i), on M. for 2°, 2637 (ii).

Select Standing Committees, Organization of (remarks) 343 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).

See 'Volunteer.'

SUPPLY—

Canals—Cornwall (lock 19, entrance) 3123 Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3105; Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Indian Affairs (salaries) 359; Labour (contingencies) 241; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248; (salaries) 247 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v).

Fisheries (oyster culture) 8545 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8567 (v).

Mines (ore deposits) 8553 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8498 (v).

N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).

Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8512; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 597 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6133 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Kouchibouguac) 3392 (ii); (St. John) 6112 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900 (ii); (Laprairie) 4224; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. Andre de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4235; (Ste. Croix) 4236 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127; (Quebec bridge) 3071 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., Stmnt. re (remarks) 5278 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Stmnt., 6100 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1076 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8742 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8722 (v).

Waterways Treaty with the U. S., Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copy) 169 (i).

——— on Order for Cor. (remarks) 1536 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6100 (iv).

Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).

——— Information *re*, 3481 (ii).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).

——— Printing of Papers (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Ways and Means, on M. *re* Procedure (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).

——— U.S. Trade Relations, &c., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 8742 (v).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c., by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4238 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii), 4428 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Algoma Rural Mail Delivery, Application *re* (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewal (Ques.) 3735 (ii).

Budget, The, 2093, 2102 (ii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5219 (iii).

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 104 (i).

——— Sault Ste Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 105 (i).

See 'Port Arthur,' 'Sault Ste Marie.'

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693, 8695 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Gifts.'

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Roads, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 635 (i).

Gifts to Ministers of the Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation (M. for cor.*) 171 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8631 (v).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 635 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2677; in Com., 3152 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1783, 1970 (i).

——— Expenditure (remarks) on the Budget, 2106 (ii).

——— Repairs, &c., Recommendation (Ques.) 3736 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2921 (ii).

McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 3829 (ii).

Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 783 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7437 (v).

Naval Policy, Support of (remarks) 1649 (i).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers purchased, Description, &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6972 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).

Obscene Literature, Skill and King, Release of from Central Prison, Par. in 'Can. Municipal Journal' *re* Political Pull (remarks) 7068 (iv).

——— Detention of Books, &c., (Ques.) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attorney General (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8345 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy (M. for pets.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).

——— (remarks) 5003 (iii).

See "Dry Docks."

Pulp and Pulp Wood Exports from Sault Ste Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 836 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6982 (iv).

Race Track Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5765 (iii).

Rush-Bagot Treaty, Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 5762 (iii), 7520 (v).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief B. 158 (Mr. Nesbitt) on M. for 2°, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8427, 8594 (iv).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5476 (iii); (amt.) 6735 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 171 (i).

——— (remarks) 3833, 3945 (ii); 5278 (iii).

Sault Ste Marie Locks, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 837 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 106 (i).

SUPPLY—

Excise (distilleries) 1331 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6116 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3463; (Kensington) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Rainy River) 3472; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Sibley) 3475 (ii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2666 (ii).

Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

U. S. Claims: *See* 'Adjudication.'

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: *See* 'Rush-Bagot.'

Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 77) 1° m., 1441 (i).

Census, Decennial, Date of Taking (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Sauve, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign (M. for cor.) 2032 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4490 (iii).

Quebec Fisheries, and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c. (Ques.) 6940 (iv).

Savings Bank Act Amt (B. 76) 1° m., 1440 (i).

Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*

C. P. R. Teulon Branch, Extension, Govt. Approval, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine (Ques.) 106 (i).

See 'Combines Bill.'

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7311 (iv).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7979 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8033, 8059 (v).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost (Ques.) 632 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

See 'Manitoba.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duty, &c., on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Location since Jan., 1910 (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5552 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fisheries, Letter from Mr. Wold (read) 6720 (iv).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2667, 2683 (ii).

——— Report, &c. (remarks) 3391 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 1963, 3480 (ii). 5894 (iii).

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6292 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4833, 5236, 5279 (iii).

Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 850 (i).

Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7871, 8237 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ques.) 129 (iv).

——— Instructions sent to Agent *re* Surrender (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

——— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell (remarks) 1963, 2279, 2636 (ii).

——— Instruction to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents (M. for papers*) 1380 (i).

——— Investigation by Dept. *re* Surrender, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

——— Letter from Rainway missing from Ret., Inquiry for, 1802 (i).

——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Negotiations with Mr. Wm. Frank (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

——— Payments to E. Raynor, Ques. of Priv., 7520 (v).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7012 (iv).

——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey (M. for copies*) 1976 (ii).

——— Rep. of A. S. Williams, &c. (M. for copy*) 3494 (ii).

——— inquiry for, 5689, 5762 (iii).

——— Report *re* Investigation, on M. for Sup. (amt.) 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165 (iv).

——— Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

——— Treatment *re* Surrender of Lands (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Stone Industry Protection, on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals, health) 7349 (iv), 7759 (v); (experimental farms) 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 348 (i).

Fisheries—(Marine fishways) 8534; (salaries) 8537 (v)

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 592 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540; (museum) 569; (military stores) 601 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Man. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli) 4262; (Red River) 4266; (St. Laurent) 4259; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3864; (Gaspé) 3895 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8073 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8435 (v).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6849; in Com., 6905 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1281 (i).

Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, &c., on M. to adjn. debate, 5600 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, 7567 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6967 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8175 (v).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8755 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A. *Dundas.*

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5511 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2813 (ii).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King, to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6308 (iv).

Morrisburg Ferry Dock Co.'s incorp. (B. 177) 1°*, 5759 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3822 (ii).

New York Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5335, 5342 (iii), 6268 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5560 (iii).

Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8754 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

Arcand T., Dismissal as Light Keeper at Carousel (Ans.) 2288 (ii).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. of Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Bait Freezers, Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Bait, Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Canadian Shipping Act (inspection) Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Sinclair) on M. for 2°, 513 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of (Ans.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant at Barrington, N.S. Govt. Assistance, Application *re* (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector (Ans.) 1529 (i).

Deep Water Weirs, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance (Ans.) 633 (i).

——— Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ans.) 266 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Completion of Rep. and Evidence (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302 (i).

Fisheries Commissions since 1896, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Fisheries, Revenue in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Fish Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Fish Hatcheries at Berens River, &c., Total Cost (Ans.) 633 (i).

Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid per ton (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ans.) 133 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ans.) 1004 (i).

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 2430 (ii).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ans.) 107, 108, 130 (i).

——— Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Copies, 302 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).

——— (presented) 1297 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 640 (i).

'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 788 (i).

Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ans.) 107 (i).

Light-house Keepers, Increase in Salaries (Ans.) 1589 (i).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns (Ans.) 259 (i).

——— Licenses, Number issued (Ans.) 1970 (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Naval Cadets, Instruction *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ans.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Service, Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).

Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost &c., (Ans.) 1972 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c., (Ans.) 108 (i).

See 'Hestia.'

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

Public Wharfs leased under Act of 1909 (Ans.) 260 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Monk) 431 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners (Ans.) 129 (i.)

——— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ans.) 625 (i).

Seal Cove Life Boat, Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ans.) 2147 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ans.) 2294 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).

See 'Can. Shipping.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 252; (salaries) 250 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1034 (i).

Tonnage Tax imposed by U.S. on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes (Ans.) 1530 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 25) 1° m., 258; 2° m., 1299; (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 1302 (i); in Com., 8004 (v).

'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals, on M. (Mr. Macdonell) to adjn. House, 1599 (i).

——— Stmnt. (read) 1684 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 444 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Cor., 644 (i).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7812 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries vote, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4546 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7266 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Justice—Administration of N.W. Ters. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799; Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. JACQUES—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings, Que. (Shawinigan Falls) 949 (i); Harbours and Rivers Que., (Becancour) 3870; (Doucet's Landing) 3890 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8004 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Agriculture Dept., Adminstration of, on M. for Sup., 7242 (iv).

Apples grown in B.C. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ques.) 5001 (iii).

B.C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 16 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 533 (i).

B.C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 529 (i).

Budget, The (remarks) 2067 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

——— Surveys, &c., (M. for field notes*) 4315 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7899 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetable Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5846 (iii).

Insurance Act B. 16 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 380 (i).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2900 (ii).

National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3245 (ii); in Com., 7472; on M. for 3°, 7540 (v).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Nechaco and Stewart Rivers, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 380 (i).

Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Foster) 2484 (ii).

Pests to Vegetation Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 211 (i); in Com., 5630 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7322 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6584 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 1444 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5726 (iii), 7765 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6681 (iv).

Ocean and River Service—B.C. (wrecking plant) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 425 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Fort George canyon) 4727; (new plant) 4775; (Queen Charlotte) 4718 (iii).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops-Fenelon) 6156 (iv).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1878 (i); 2° m., 2101 (iii); in Com., 4841 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8438, 8721 (v).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*

Agriculture, Criticisms of Deptl. Methods, Ques. of Priv.. 1364 (i).

Agriculture Dept.. Administration of. on M. for Sup.. 7204 (iv).

Arts. Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286 (iv).

Budget, The. 2259 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2091 (ii).

Buttonshaw, George Robert Relief (B. 117) 1°*. 2710 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts.. 8657 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7309 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 5000, 5560 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6914 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i); in Com., 7264 (iv).

Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Doukhobours, Comparison to hon. Member for Dauphin, Explanation *re*, 5532 (iii).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) *re* Bill, 6802 (iv).

Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Evidence and Rep., Completion of (Ques.) 276 (i).

Fisheries Investigation *re* Man. and N. W. Ter, Inquiry for Rep., 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 744 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7821 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3060 (ii).

G. T. P. Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 1783 (i).

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ques.) 1784 (i).

Horses exported from Ont. to N. W. Ters. disinfecting Stockyards (remarks) 4812 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 4209 (iii).

House of Commons (B. 60) 1°*, 1102 (i).

See "Dual."

House of Commons Members, Names of (M. for ret.*) 1547 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5504; in Com., 5532; on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).

Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications &c. (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Ques. of Privilege *re* 'up to date,' 2151 (ii).

See "Fisheries."

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5175 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1573 (i).

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1324 (i).

——— Prime Minister's Resignation (remarks) 1446 (i).

Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1542 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115, Plans *re* (remarks) 5560 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts, &c. *re* Spawn (M. for copies*) 277 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7286; (experimental farms) 7346 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) conc. (M.) to reduce vote, neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540; (legal expenses) 8544; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (surveys) 8555 (v).

Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 686; (St. Lambert) 956; Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1178 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv); in Com., 8072 (v).

CARRIER, Mr. L. A., *Lévis*

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 6390 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*

Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 215) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Criminal Code Act (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8732 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 896 (i); in Com., 6546 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3137 (ii).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2323 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 510 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2047; in Com., 2154 (ii).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt. *re* (remarks) 851 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3143 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2520 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5241, 5282 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 607 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s. B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) 2° m., 4842 (iii); in Com., 6169 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7650 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* stmnt. of Judgeship, 7676 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, 3847 (ii).

St. John River Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5319 (iii).

Scott, Elmer Walker, Relief (B. 165) 1°*, 5557 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5701 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8570 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663 (i).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5251 (iii).

Trent Canals, Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5216 (iii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1192 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 515 (i).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 63) 1°*, 1192 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *East Huron.*

Airships, development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 446, 1369 (i).

Budget, The, 1858 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186; on M. for 2°, 725; on M. for 3°, 822 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5807, 5839 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6306 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3697 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5240 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5727 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8396 (v).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907, 5911 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7327 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3202 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7352 (iv).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com on Res., 7005 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3915 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8062 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 164) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s (B. 218) 1°*, 7975; 2° m., 8055, 8380; in Com., 8618 (v).

Lillie, Clifford Buell Relief (B. 224) 1°*, 8361 (v).

N.T. Ry. Co., Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., (M.) to conc., 3985 (iii).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4073 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc in 4th Report of Com., 6037 (iv).

——— Changes in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5595 (iii).

St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2651 (ii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8006 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Budget, The, 1880 (i).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6862 (iv.)
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8847 (v).
Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8629 (v).
Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 6611 (iv.)
Labour, Hours on Public Works on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2912 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3269 (ii).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8426, 8598 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7147 (iv).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T., *Yukon Territory.*
Budget, The, 1903 (i).
Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6587 (iv).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7829 (v).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1122, in Com., (amt.) 1131 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3720, 3748 (ii); in Com. 7417 (iv).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8444, 8710 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com. 6912 (iv), 7939 (v).
Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2166 (ii).
Criminal Code Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7267 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. employees) Amt. (B. 109) 1° m., 2184 (ii).
Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5918 (iii); in Com., 8065 (v).
International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2329; 2° m., 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*
L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6964 (v).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5296 (iii).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Control by Americans, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2191 (ii).
—— Control by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 2490 (ii).
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).
Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 108) 1°* 2184 (ii); in Com., 5765 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5326 (iii), 6269 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5749 (iii).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7840 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6105 (iv); Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Sibley) 3475 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8097 (v).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver City.*
B.C. Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 118) 1°*, 2329, 2° m., 2671 (ii).
Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 879 (i); in Com., 7266 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1256 (i).
Kitsilano Reserve Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
'Leebro,' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re* (Ques) 788 (i).
Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3962 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7543 (v).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5304 (iii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).
Excise (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 599 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4281; (Lockport) 4715; (new dredging plant) 4769, 4772; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Stewart) 4726 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4842 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Loggie,' 'Gaspereaux,' &c.

Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Charges *re* Inspectors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Dalhousie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, N.B., Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ques.) 6508 (iv).
See 'Loggie.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant to, 3060 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 188 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2489 (ii).
—— Total Payment to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* sub-letting, &c. (Ques.) 383 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 643 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. *re* Investigation, &c., on M. for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 318 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104; in Com., 1131 (i).

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2915 (ii).

Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5622 (iii).
—— Total Payments to (Ques.) 2488 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' 'Dredging,' 'Gaspereaux.'

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ques.) 2928 (ii).
See 'Loggie.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B .N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2761 (ii).

Mayes Contracts, Charges *re* Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4873 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf, Par. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3740 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv, *re* 'Globe's' criticism, 3476 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7592, neg. (Y. 63 N. 111) 7746 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3840 (ii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370 (v).

St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c. (M. for copies*) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580 (v).

St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction (remarks) 122 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7376 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 236; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i).
Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 596 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 587; (Hillsborough) 587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575; (Parrsboro) 577; (Shelburne) 579 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542 (i);

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i), 7169 (iv); (Museum) 566; (Royal Mint) 559 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que.—(Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (Roberval) 927 (i); (St. Roch) 831 (i).

Public Works—Dredging, Generally (plant) 4780; Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper) 3391; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Lorneville) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3396 (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3428; (Richibucto) 3428, 3439; (St. John tributaries) 3447; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1163; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2947; (Halifax) 2884; (Indiantown) 2884; Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton-cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2934; (Riviere du Loup) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5260 (iii).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3064 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3209 (ii).

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5650 (iii).

Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co., &c. (Ques.) 6799 (iv.)

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6954 (iv.)

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7893 (v).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track gambling) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6560 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1289 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman, in Com., 8033, 8058 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1145 (i).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re* (Ques.) 3672 (ii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 2430 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c., (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1249 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2793 (ii).

House of Commons Corridors, Ejecting of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5804, 5538; Ques. of Order, 5538 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5650 (iii).

I.C.R. Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8236 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6310 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6366 (iv).

Negro Clergymen: *See* 'House of Commons.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8698 (v).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2473 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Post Office Clerks Salaries (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 2429, 3292 (ii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8126 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (wharfs and basins) 3103; Soulanges (leakages) 3106 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767 (v).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 8544, (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8547 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7778 (v).

Immigration (agents) 8206 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Rivere du Loup) 5712; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Militia (pay, &c.) 8560 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7866 (v).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8173 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 5612, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Black Point) 977; (Burk's Head) 979; (Dover) 989; (Eastern passage) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1172; (West Dublin) 1190 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que.—(Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7766 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (new machinery) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (St. John) 2946 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5713 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1059 (i).

——— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remark) 3208 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6380 (iv); in Com., 8100 (v).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *West Elgin*

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2488 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Budget, The, 1894 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 7293 (iv.)

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M. for Sup., 5574 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6060 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2587 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4583 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Speech of Minister of Militia, 4711 (iii.)

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1327 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. Bill 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Indian Affairs (salaries) 367; Labour (salaries) 238 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6796 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*

Trent Canal Damage Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry (remarks) 5211 (iii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *North Simcoe.*

Apples grown in Provs., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5640 (iii).

Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for (Ques.) 1371 (i).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5942 (iv).

Bread: *See* 'Inspection.'

Budget, The, 1701 (i).

——— (remarks) 1806 (i), 2076 (ii).

Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lakes Shipyards, and Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ques.) 844 (i).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7295 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6880; in Com., 6911 (iv), 7882; on M. for 3°, 7985 (v).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i); in Com., 7265 (iv).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6989 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6637 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8852 (v).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1688 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8690 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5915 (iii); in Com., 8068 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Ret. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5681 (iii).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8773 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building (Ques.) 1004 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8621 (v).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139, 6753 (iv).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

House of Commons Classification, Discussion *re* (remarks) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5802, 5849 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5640 (iii).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 516 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7945, 8473 (v).

I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1121 (i).

—— Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidy Bill, 8482 (v).

I.C.R. and N.T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8766 (v).

Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ques.) 7519 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2903 (ii).

Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on prop. Res., 520 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 88) 1° m., 1689 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6284 (iv).

Military Lands: *See* 'Baby.'

N.T. Ry., Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ques.) 8835 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5042 (iii); in Com., 7400 (v). *See* 'Can. Navy.'

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6212 (iv).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8771 (v).

Petroleum: *See* 'Crude.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).

Pure Food Act (B. 131) 1° m., 2792 (ii).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).

Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ques.) 2926 (ii).

—— (remarks) 4533 (iii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8408 (v).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. (B. 174) 1° m., 5621 (iii).

Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Ques.) 8834 (v).

—— (remarks) 8586 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).

Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4526 (iii).

Rules of the House, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7527 (v).

—— in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6737; on M. for 3° (amt. 6 m. h.) 7256 (iv).

—— Plans, &c. (remarks) 5560 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1348 (i).

Canals, Ont.-Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; Sault Ste. Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124; Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5697; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5712 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 8566; (gratuities) 8571; (monuments) 8575; (rifle ranges) 8561 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8499 (v).

Ocean and River Service (steamers) 8511; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 561; Que. (Quebec ordnance stores) 969 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5736; (Victoria) 5747 (iii).

Railways—G. T. P. (director's remuneration) 3131 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5915, 5982 (iv).

Telegraph Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S. (Ques.) 1530 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii); in Com., 8091 (v).

War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i). *See* 'Can. Navy.'

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C. B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8458, 8706 (v).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5936 (iv).

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*

Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ques.) 3934 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6897 (iv).

Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop (Ques.) 3934 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4201 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7303 (iv).

Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders, &c., *re* Dredging (Ques.) 3156 (ii).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6621 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8693 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8036 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1146 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps., Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance of Old Proprietor Ledge Buoy (M. for copy) 290, 326 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1880 (i).

See 'Life,' &c.

'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Canada and Australia (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7942 (v).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).

I. C. R. Employees Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).

——— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).

Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia' (Ques.) 107 (i).

See 'Hestia,' 'Old Proprietor.'

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3141 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 2149 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106 (v).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2746 (ii).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6192 (iv).

Milledgevile, Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4367 (iii); in Com., 7434 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6968 (iv).

Old Proprietor Light Buoy, Defective Condition, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

See 'Hestia.'

Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4737 (iii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7318 (iv).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6169 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8431 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 924 (i).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8120 (v).

See 'Courtenay.'

St. John River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).

Sailing Directions to Capt. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373, 7376; (Dom. exhibitions) 7388; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt—Justice (salaries) 254; Labour (salaries) 237; Fisheries (contingencies) 253; (salaries) 251 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation), 8525; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811 (v).

Marine (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8522 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8557 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8504 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, saving life) 8515; (patrol vessels) 8521 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Hartland) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (St. John) 591 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Parrsboro') 577 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 542; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Museum) 566, 572; (standarizing room) 573 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Quebec ordnance stores) 967 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 4776; Generally (new plant) 4738, 4760; (vessel repairs) 4737 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6136 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2698; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3453; (Cumming's Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3451; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Richibucto) 3445 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John tributaries) 3447; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Seal Cove) 3449 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3836; (St. Lawrence River channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3880 (ii); (Shigawake) 4227; (Three Rivers) 4248 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2941; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (St. John) 2945 (ii).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. 8019 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7517 (v).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*

Bank Act Amt. (B. 56) 1° m., 922 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4396 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3536 (ii)

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1258 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2914 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4197, 4316 (iii).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Quebec and Ungava Ry. Co.'s incorp (B. 190) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6931 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8461 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6297 (iv).

Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund incorp. (B. 13) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4124, 4129 (iii); in Com., 7419 (v).

——— on Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6981 (iv).

Trust and Loan Co. of Canada (B. 98) 1°*, 1878 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6385 (iv); in Com., 8086, 8399 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 101 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8009, (amt.) 8025 (v).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8437 (v).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *South Bruce.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 731 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4618 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 569 (i).

Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 380 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. (B. 89) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 2671 (ii).

Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1528 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8095 (v).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4611 (iii).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 22 (i).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*

Armouries and Drill Halls, Erection of, Cost of Site, Places for Construction, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 5689 (iii), 8742 (v).

Budget, The, 2227 (ii).

—— Remarks, 1817 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 74) 1° m., 1362 (i); 2° m., 2158 (ii).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land *re* Timber, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

See 'Frontenac.'

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

—— Payments to *re* Supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Fish Fry Application Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 752 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7806 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Routes, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

—— Pets. *re* (Ques.) 7066 (iv).

See 'Post Office.'

Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 1371 (i).

—— Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 262 (i), 2717 (ii).

Green, John, Relief (B. 201) 1°*, 6802 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5528; in Com., 5536, 5831, 5879 (iii).

Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1217 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2910 (ii).

Mail Contract with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 1379 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4064, 4083, 4937 (iii); in Com., 7481 (v).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Naval Defence Bill, Report of Speech in Toronto 'Globe' (personal explanation) 4533 (iii).

Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Post Offices in Frontenac County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

See 'Frontenac.'

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3847 (ii).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5788 (iii).

R. M. C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 381 (i).

R. M. College, Servants' Cottages, Removal of (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

—— Completion, Total Cost, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 263 (i).

Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid to for Public Works, Kingston (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757 (v); (census) 7374; (cold storage) 7363; (exhibitions) 7389; (seeds) 7390 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3118 (ii); Welland (surveys) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6654 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5696; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176; (Fergus) 7180 (iv); (Kingston) 7505; (Listowel) 7507; Ottawa (deplt., new) 7170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Joliette) 663; (Maisonneuve) 673; (Marieville) 697; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 703; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6111 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1171; (Shelburne) 1176; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (West Dublin) 1180 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Dale, Mr. Sydney) 6168; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (telephone memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6154; B.C. (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Quarantine (Tracadie) 7391 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships, Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

—— (M. or O.C.'s) 135 (i).

'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing (Ques.) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3494 (ii).

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c. (Ques.) 7287 (iv).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3461 (ii), 6164 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Banking Act, Consideration of (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Gaspereau Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4781 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8635 (v).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Order for 2°, 1803 (i); on M. for 3°, 2191 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8403 (v).

I.C.R., Repairs to Car 37, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

——— Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4847 (iii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. (remarks) 8581 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5003 (iii).

——— Vote *re* Amt. (Mr. Northrup) Ques. of Priv., 5195 (iii).

Naval Service, Appointments, &c. (remarks) 8838 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6971 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4824, 5288 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8735 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8587 (v).

Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re* (Ques.) 630 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5337 (iii), 6255 (iv).

——— Original Report, Inquiry for, 5559 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3109 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4781; Generally (new plant) 4744, 4759 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Moncton) 3394; (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii); (St. John) 6108 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Three Rivers) 4250 (iii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5255 (iii).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3434 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3055 (ii).

Montreal Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 515 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1192 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queens, N.S.*

Alien Labour Law Violation, &c. (remarks) 4813 (ii).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. I and III (presented) 7 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

——— Vol. II. (presented) 1730 (i).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 6947 (iv).

——— Expiration of, Issue of Currency (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 2061 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 56 (Mr. Demers) on M. for 2°, 2038 (ii).

Bank Deposits in 1909 (Ans.) 5001 (iii).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Barriefield Camp, Objections *re* Site, Removal of Ranges, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 532 (i).

B. C. Public Works—Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii).

Budget, The (annual statement) 1446 (i).

——— (remarks) 1002 (i).

Canadian Associated Press Subsidy (B. 228), prop. Res., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8680 (v).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ans.) 1967 (ii).

See 'Currency.'

Cement Merger, Protection *re* Combine, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 123) on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justice, Apptmt. of by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Civil Govt., Increased Expenditures (remarks) on M. for Sup., 216 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) on Senate Amts., 8772 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6889 (iv); on M. for 3°, 7992 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Customs Laws, 8002 (v).

Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Congregational Union of Canada incorp. B. 142 (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com., 4754 (iii).

Conservation of National Resources Commission, Names of Members (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Criminal Code B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on Order for Com. (remarks) 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (B. 195) in Com. on Res., 6188; in Com., 6620 (iv).

Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ans.) 8238 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. (B. 233) 1° m., 8763; 2° m., 8841, 8849 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053, 3914 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (B. 229) in Com. on Res., 8687; in Com., 8763 (v).

——— (M.) To discharge Order, 8003 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1286 (i).

Estimates, The (1909-10)—(presented) 154 (i).

——— Suppl. (1910)—(presented) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1911)—(presented) 7519, 8577 (v).

——— Suppl. (remarks) 3987 (iii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 1446 (i).

Fisheries Commission, Report (remarks) 2061 (ii).

Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease, &c. (Ans.) 3934 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3059 (ii).

——— Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie (read) 3295 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12, in Com. on Res., 172; 1°*, 200; 2° m., 705; agreed to (Y. 107; N. 33) 780; 3° m., 812, 816, 822 (i).

——— (clerical error) Amt. (B. 126) 1° m., 2486 (ii); 2° m., 6620 (iv).

French Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 6 (i).

——— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 8665 (v).

——— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (remarks) 1690 (i).

——— Provision *re* Termination (Ans.) 276 (i).

——— Ratification of (announcement) 2797 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment to Germany (Ans.) 1196 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3944 (ii).

See 'Race Track.'

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3573 (ii).

German Surtax, Error in Memorandum (remarks) 4712 (iii).

——— Explanation *re* Negotiations, &c., (remarks) 3679 (ii).

See 'French Treaty.'

German Tariff, Agreement with Canada (remarks) 3830 (ii).

——— Similar Treatment as France (Ans.) 785 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°*, 4922 (iii); 2° m., 6329; in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 7512 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

——— Precedence on Monday (M.) 3829 (ii).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Inquiry *re* Ret. (remarks) 3945 (ii).

Grain Trade from West, Tel. *re* Terminal Elevator Co. (remarks) 8240 (v).

G.T.P. Bonds guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).

See 'Natl. Transcl.'

Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

House of Commons Staff, Increases, &c. (M.) 8830 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 5617 (iii); 2° m., 7940; in Com., 7943, 8459 (v).

Insurance Bill, Consideration of (remarks) 5893 (iii).

——— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ans.) 787 (i).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1111 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 511 (i).

——— Laying Letters on Table (remarks) 502 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 231) in Com. on Res., 8705; in Com., 8764 (v.)

Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re* (remarks) 4083 (iii).

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., &c., with Mr. W. T. R. Preston, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 331 (i).

Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Judicial Apptmts. in N.S. (remarks) 623 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Loans, Temporary, since June 1, 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

——— since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Outstanding on March 1st, 1910 (Ans.) 8237 (v).

Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty (Ans.) 6391 (iv.)

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8230 (v).

Lumsden Charges: *See* 'N.T. Ry.,' &c.

Mail Delivery, Free, Closing of Distribution Offices (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Militia Stores, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Montreal Govt. Weigher, Apptmt of (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Subsidy (B. 191) Prop. Res., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1° m., 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601 (iv).

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ans.) 3671 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com. 3985 (iii).

——— on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) Ques. of Order, 8309 (v).

——— Payments to Counsel (remarks) 8841 (v).

——— Payment of Fees, &c., on M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).

Natural Resources: *See* 'Conservation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7467; on M. for 3°, 7535 (v).

Naval Defence Documents, on Inquiry for, 2797 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5303 (iii).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2279 (ii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission (B. 230) (prop. res.) 6801; in Com. on Res., 8697; in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 8663 (v).

Pensions: *See* 'Govt. Annuities.'

Pilots' Association, Receipts and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 3744 (ii).

Port Arthur Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Dock.'

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Preston, W. T. R., Claims *re* Libel Suits, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor. 656 (i).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 289 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 604 (i).

Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps. &c, (Ans.) 1208 (i).

Quebec Bridge Ry. Co., Payments to by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 628 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6569 (iv).

——— Reintroduction of Bill 6 (remarks) 7258, 7263 (iv).

See 'Gambling.'

Railway Men, Rules *re* Employment (remarks) 8587 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 8239 (v).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 654 (i).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Mint, Total Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).

See 'Currency.'

Rules of the House, on prop, Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1539 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5394 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Ques. of Order, 7148 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7522 (v).

Saskatchewan Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Dock Subsidies (remarks) 3945 (ii).

See 'Dry Dock Bill.'

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded (Ans.) 630 (i).

Senate Bills, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. B. 87 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 2056 (ii).

S.A. War, Reinstatement of Messenger *re* Aud. Gen.'s Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).

Supply (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

Supply B. 173 (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com., 5606; 1° m., 5626 (iii).

——— (B. 196) 1°*, 6398 (iv).

——— (B. 235) in Com., 8856 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Gordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

Charges of Management (foreign coin) 5607 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7768 (v); Finance (salaries) 335 (i); Interior (salaries) 7768; Militia (salaries) 7767; Secretary of State (salaries) 7767; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 8808 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8805 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 1358 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1335 (i).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769 (v).

House of Commons (library) 8802; (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Canada and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5692 (iii), 8810; (Can. and G. B.) 8809 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5690 (iii), 8809; (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte) 8809; (Rivière du Loup) 8810 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Miscellaneous (conservation commission) 7806; (Naturalization Act) 7865; (royal mint) 7866; (royal society grant) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 574; (Shelburne) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7508 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (eastern block) 572; (museum) 567; (royal mint) 558 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 688; (Quebec customs) 827 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4783, 4805 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Coquitlam) 4293 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 982; (Diligent) 989; (Piper's Cove) 1160; (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1170 (i).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

Senate (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (Chinese Immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ans.) 1021 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 7089 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* 'Loans.'

Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of (remarks) 5278 (iii).

See 'Cus. Tariff Bill,' 'German,' &c.

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4713, 5278, 5690, 5762, 5891 (iii).

——— (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5942; Resolution laid on Table, 5967 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

U. S. Tariff, Importations, &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).

——— Maximum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

——— Minimum Tariff, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Par. in New York 'Sun' (remarks) 6393 (iv).

——— on Ques of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5760 (iii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 93 (i).

——— The Budget, 1446 (i).

——— Supply Bill (M.) *re* Procedure, 6397 (iv).

Ways and Means, Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (M.) for Com., 5942 (iv), 8705; in Com., 8762 (v).

FISHER, Hon. S. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7191 (iv).

Agricultural and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Agricultural Machinery Imported into Canada. 1909 (Ans.) 383 (i).

Alfalfa: *See* 'Seed Control Bill.'

Animal Feeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons (remarks) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov., (remarks) in Com., on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c. (Ans.) 642 (i).

Census for 1911, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1371 (i), 2429 (ii).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 205) Prop. Res., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; in Com., 7295 (iv).

Conservation Commission, Committee, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 4845 (iii).

Conservation of Natural Resources (B. 185) Prop. Res., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5885; 1°*, 5885 (iii); 2° m., 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3° m., 6619 (iv).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. B. 41 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 1°, 430, 806 (i).

Currency Act Amt. (Prop. Res.) 2632 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Diseases to Vegetation: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

——— Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

See 'Poultry.'

Farm and Dairy Produce, Quantity exported for 1909 (Ans.) 1017 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c (Ans.) 1965 (ii).

Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c. (Ans.) 631 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 735 (i).

See 'Milk.'

Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, Results, &c. (Ans.) 790 (i).

Holstein and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms (Ans.) 4309 (iii).

Horses imported into N.W. from Ont., Examination of (remarks) 4210, 4813 (iii).

Insects Bill: *See* 'Pests,' &c.

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (cargoes, &c.) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 429 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (B. 51) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).

See 'Milk Glass.'

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ans.) 1374 (i).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 520 (i); in Com. on Res., 657; 1°*, 661 (i); on Order for 2°, 5674 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 5929 (iii); 2° m., 6279; in Com., 6279; 3° m., 6618 (iv).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, &c. (Ans.) 639 (i).

Milk Glass Inspection (B. 184) prop. Res. 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884 (iii); in Com., 6005-6 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification, on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse. adjourn, 2562 (ii).

Natural Resources: *See* "Conservation."

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Pests to Vegetation, Prevention (B. 20) Prop. Res., 200 (i); in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); in Com., 5627 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

Population, Method of Estimating, &c. (Ans.) 4846 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation Report *re* (Ans.) 5782 (iii).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 4519 (iii).

See "Supply."

Quarantine Boat Service at Halifax, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ans.) 5561 (iii).

Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt. (Ans.) 2926 (ii).

——— Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture (remarks) 4532 (iii).

Restigouche Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. J. Reid) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, on Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 171 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5444 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7525 (v).

Seed Control Act (alfalfa) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 204; M. to discharge order for 2°, 656 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. (B. 55), in Com. on Res., 808, 1°*, 811 (i); 2° m., 2637; in Com., 2638 (ii).

S. A. War, Expenditure by Canada for Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 632 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c., (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit), London) 7380; (census) 7373 (iv), 7763 (v); (Charlottetown exhibition) 7766 (v); (cold storage) 7362, 7383; (dairying and fruit) 7362; (Dom. exhibitions) 7385 (iv); (exhibitions) 5728 (iii), 7389; (experimental branch stations) 7392 (iv); (experimental farms) 5725 (iii), 7333 (iv), 7764 (v); (farm bulletins) 7377; (fumigating stations) 7380 (iv); (live stock industry) 7748 (v); (Patent Record) 7371; (seeds) 7390; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (experimental farms) 227 (i); (extra clerks) 7764 (v); (salaries) 219 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (usn transportation) 5748 (iii).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5713 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Can. Handicrafts guild) 7865 (v); (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160 (iv).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (immigration sheds) 960; (Rock Island) 948 (i).

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv); 7766 (v); (Tracadie 7391 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. Sydney.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3129 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board 5714; (trade commissioners) 5714 (iii).

Swine Commission, Report of (Ans.) 2429 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Rep., 5689 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup. 2665 (ii).

Thornton, Dr., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 626 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Perley) 1432 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Ways and Means Com. (M.) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

FORGET, Mr. R. *Charlevoix.*

Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

FORTIER, Mr. E., *Lotbiniere.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*

Address, The, 60 (i).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 521 (i).

Analytical Index to Hansard (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Adminstration, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 2142 (ii).

Bank Act Amt., Consideration of (remarks) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).

Budget, The (reply) 1474 (i).

—— Remarks, 1002 (i).

Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

—— Amount of U.S. Silver, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c. (Ques.) 2717 (ii).

See 'Naval,' &c.

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Civil Government Expenditures, Increase of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 212 (i).

Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Coal Oil Lands, Areas sold, leased, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 277 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re* (M. for ret.) 1977 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Turriff) to introduce, 1689 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re* Expenditure by Canada (M. for ret.*) 1977 (ii).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditures *re* Preparation, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

French Floods, Relief Fund, Grant to (remarks) 3059 (ii).

French Treaty, B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 174 (i).

French Treaty, Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 8664 (v).

—— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France, 1690 (i).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Question put by another member, Ques, of Order, 1791 (i).

Govt. Business (remarks) 926 (i).

Govt. Business, and Unopposed Motions (remarks) 4308 (iii).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137 (i).

See 'Annuities.'

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2184 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry.. Lands Sale along the Lines (Ques.) 1966 (ii).

—— Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from the Throne (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

—— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ques.) 1205 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per mile, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 129, 623 (i).

See 'Nat. Transcl,' &c.

Hansard Analytical Index, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2138 (ii).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).

See 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land sold (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ques.) 128 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 206 (i).

—— Instruction to Canada's Representatives (remarks) 923 (i).

—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c. (M. for copy of cor.) 388 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 3138 (ii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-Keeping, Capital and Income (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2936 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).

—— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1113; in Com., 1131 (i).

—— Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay-Lists on Windsor Branch, &c. (M. for papers*) 801 (i).

—— inquiry for ret., 2634 (ii).

Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S. Officers (remarks) 853 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2424, 2891 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).

—— Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Lumsden Charges: *See* 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'

McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ques.) 3678 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Accidents *re* Pintsch and Acetylene Gas (M. for ret.*) 802 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).

N.T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2617 (ii).

—— (M.) to adjourn Hse., 2561 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1734 (i); on M. for 2°, 3344 (ii).

Naval Defence Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).

Naval Service, Further Cor., Inquiry for, 2931 (ii).

—— Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).

—— 'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).

——War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C's. *re* (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

N. B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit (Ques.) 168 (i).

North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).

Old Age Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'

Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, &c., Information *re*, 623 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 8662 (v).

Party Patronage System (prop. res.) 2432 (ii).

—— Patronage Distribution, Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).

—— Notice of Motion, 1792 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Party Patronage System, on Order being called (remarks) 2151 (ii).

Pensions: *See* 'Annuities.'

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3478 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Ry. (Ques.) 3295 (ii).

—— Right of Way, &c. (Ques.) 8661 (v).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1967 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 618 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907 (Ques.) 1969 (ii).

—— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1205 (i).

Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure re (Ques.) 3678 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 8580 (v).

Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing (remarks) 170 (i).

Royal Mint, Loss in Operation (remarks) re Answer to Question, 784 (i).

—— Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).

Rush-Bagot Treaty: *See* 'U.S.'

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2644 (ii).

S. A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can. (Ques.) 1204 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Scrip, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 2144 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 219; Indian Affairs (salaries) 345, 415; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Labour (salaries) 235; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 416 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 539; (deptl. buildings, new) 549 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 675 (i); (Marieville) 679; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital 823; (Que. immigration sheds) 926; (Que. observatory) 823; (Quebec P.O.) 824; (Rock Island) 947; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawinigan Falls) 950 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3423; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3067 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (draw bars) 2882; (Indiantown 2884; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935; (original construction) 2943 (ii).

Miscellaneous—Railways (Quebec bridge) 3070 (ii).

Railways—N. T. R. (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1030 (i).

Temporary Loans: *See* "Loans."

Toronto sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 3677 (ii).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadians entering U.S. (remarks) 1101 (i).

U. S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).

——— Decision *re* Canadian Exports (remarks) 3058 (ii).

——— Negotiations *re* (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Trade Relations with U. S. (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com., 8754 (v).

U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes (M. for cor., &c.) 791 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8737 (v).

War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2713 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 1968 (ii).

Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909 (Ques.) 260 (i).

FOWKE, Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*

Budget, The, 1613 (i).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 379 (i).

Foreign Capital invested in Canadian Enterprises, Location, &c. (Ques.) 631 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3236 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1053 (i).

Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 116) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 6768 (iv).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *Kings, P.E.I.*

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6798 (iv).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2777 (ii).

P. E. I. Mail Service, Increased Facilities, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ques.) 7518 (v).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Reps. *re* Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for copy, 288 (i).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3197 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res., 2005 (ii).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P. E. I. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).

Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5728 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6714 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Canada and Cuba) 5705 (iii).

Post Office—Outside Service (rural delivery) 5754 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside) 580 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5735 (iii).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

I.C.R., Rivière du Loup-Coal Shed, Erection of (Ques.) 4128 (iii).

——— Workshops at Rivière du Loup, Electrical Development, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Lighthouse-keepers Salaries, Increase in, &c. (Ques.) 1589 (i).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ques.) 8238 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ques.) 1778 (i).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

British North American Mining Co. (B. 27) 1°*, 379 (i).

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 169) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4070 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6056 (iv).

——— 6th Rep. of Com. (M.) 8737 (v).

——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5196 (iii).

——— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5575 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4444 (iii).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Botterill, Roland James Relief (B. 225) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 1878 (i); in Com., 3150 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6910 (iv).

Criminal Code (race track) B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6550 (iv).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3944 (ii).

Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6128 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion (remarks) 3986 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6667 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6125; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 6110 (iv).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*

'Canada Gazette,' French Edition (remarks) 8585 (v).

Chambly River Dam and Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6949 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6933 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 514 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 2424; (M.) to conc., 3052 (ii).

——— Translator, Apptmt. of (M.) 3914 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Res., 6508 (iv).

House of Commons, Officials' Increases, Mr. Laplante (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller)on M. for 2°, 507 (i).

Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).

Retail Merchants Association incorp. (B. 210) 1°*, 7286; 2° m., 7287; in Com., 7868 (iv), 8043, 8422, 8587 (v).

SUPPLY—

Fisheries (salaries) 8538 (v).
Labour (technical education) 8800 (v).
Mines (peat bogs) 8554 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (polytechnic school) 8822 (v).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel (Ques.) 2288 (ii).

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments (Ques.) 7870 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).

GIRARD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Du Tremblay, Mr. Arthur, Instructions *re* Proceedings (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay Lists (Ques.) 6800 (iv), 8837 (v),
See 'Savard,' &c.

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 128) 1°*, 2792 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ques.) 8837 (v).

McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Oyamel Company, Payments *re* Tamarac Wood (Ques.) 7870, 8834 (v).

Pay Lists of 18th Regiment, Personators, &c. (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c. (Ques.) 4515 (iii).

Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ques.) 8837 (v).

Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Booms (Ques.) 7871 (v).

Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Reg., Retention of Money from Capt. Talbot (Ques.) 8658 (v).

——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Natashquan) 3910 (ii).

Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment of Allowance for 1907 (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Tremblay, J., Payments *re* Wood (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ques.) 8836 (v).

Wurtele, Col., 18th Regiment, Resignation, Refund of Moneys, &c. (Ques.) 6800 (iv).

GLADU, Mr. J. E. C., *Yamaska.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4953 (iii).

Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5647 (iii).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*
Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt. (Ques.) 1016 (i).
Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7306 (iv).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 379 (i).
Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (repairs) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6998 (iv).
Currency Acts Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6623 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5808 (iii).
Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5647 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2904 (ii).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6368 (iv).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3659 (ii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4828, 5297 (iii).
Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii), 6348, 6727 (iv).
Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2005 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7349 (iv).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422, 548 (i); (grounds) 8192 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Arrow lakes) 5614 (iii).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6373 (iv), 8715 (v).
Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5800 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 123) 1°*, 2426 (ii).
Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 124) 1°*, 2426 (ii).
Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3860 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*
Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 5617 (iii).
Criminal Code (silver ore thefts) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 1588 (i); 2° m., 2162 (ii).
Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).
Gowganda Junction Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands, Compensation *re* Names, &c. (Ques.) 2295 (ii).
Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ques.) 1014 (i).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 2189 (ii).
North Bay Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7863 (v).
Robinson, Mrs., Imprisonment of, Pets. *re* Release (remarks) 924 (i).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3108 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (printing) 253 (i).
Miscellaneous (Ottawa mint) 7866 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7863 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval 940 (i).
Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3081 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*
Address, The, Ques. of Order, Denial *re* reported speech, 81 (i).
Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1194 (i).
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2299 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).
—— Lease to McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Operation by G. T. Ry Co., Remedy *re* (Ans.) 102 (i).
Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal by N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 3166, 3676 (ii).
Bout de L'Ile Bridge Repairs, &c. (remarks) 6396 (iv).
B.C. Railway Subsidies, Particulars re (Ans.) 5929 (iv).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Application re Removal (Ans.) 3735 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 89 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 2671 (ii).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 227) prop. Res., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483 (v).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. Cash) in Com., 3150 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8784 (v).

——— Control of other Ry. Co.'s, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1208 (i).

C.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. German) in Com., 3150 (ii).

C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval, &c, (Ans.) 1974 (ii).

Canal Statistics, Report (presented) 5759 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5214 (iii).

——— Total Amount of Account with Dept. (Ans.) 5781 (iii),7516 (v).

See 'Trent.'

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 913 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty (B. 208) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

See 'Petroleum.'

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 2°, 1271, 1290 (i).

Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

——— Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ans.) 2928 (ii).

See 'Lachine.'

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ans.) 1207 (i).

Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Indemnity for Damages on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

Govt. Railways (claims) B. 151, 1° m., 4402 (iii).

See 'Rys.'

Govt. Railways Act (damages) Amt. (B. 232) in Com. 8772 (v).

See 'I.C.R'.

Govt. Rys. Provident Fund Amt. (B. 19) 1° m., 206, 2° m., 1136; in Com., 1139 (i); on Order for, 3°, 2637 (ii).

Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

G.T.P., Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance by Govt. (Ans.) 2137 (ii).

——— Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c. (Ans.) 1366 (i).

G.T.P. and N.T. Ry. Commissions, Investigation *re* Classification (Ans.) 260 (i).

G.T.P. Classifications, Letters from Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 387 (i).

——— Memorandum of Chairman to Prime Minister (Ans.) 2139 (ii).

——— submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ans) 262 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl.'

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits (Ans.) 388 (i).

——— N.B., Provisions re sub-letting (Ans.) 383 (i).

G.T.P., Cost of Winnipeg and Edmonton Sections, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Engineers' Complaints *re* Arbitrators (Ans.) 2141 (ii).

——— Entrance into Brandon, Res. re (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

——— Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost of (Ans.) 1784 (i).

——— Progress Estimates, Amount claimed in District 'A' (Ans.) 2140 (ii).

——— Terminals, Expenditure by Govt. *re* (Ans.) 1205 (i).

———Winnipeg to Edmonton, Cost per Mile, &c. (Ans.) 624 (i).

Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ans.) 6799 (iv).

Gulliver's Cove, Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 1206 (i).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N.T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services (Ans.) 7064 (iv.)

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 170, 626 (i).

———Corrected Answer, 1099 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Hudson Bay Ry. Estimates, Stmnt. (read) 3206 (ii).

——— Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Hungary Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

I.C.R., Account-keeping, Charges to Capital and Income (stmnt. read) in Com. of Sup., 2937 (ii).

——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).

——— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ans.) 627 (i).

——— Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 99 (i).

——— French Representation (Ans.) 7519 (v).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease (B. 17) 1° m., 205; 2° m., 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3° m. 2191, 2206 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8402

——— Agreement *re* Senate Amendments, 8828, 8854 (v).

I.C.R., Coal Shed at Rivière du Loup, Erection of (Ans.) 4128 (iii).

——— Cunard Property, Halifax, Acquisition by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2938 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Dismissals by Commission, &c. (Ans.) 128, 164 (i).

—— Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908, to March, 1909 (Ans.) 1776 (i).

—— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ans.) 835 (i).

—— Employees' Passes, Number issued for Oct., Sept. and Nov. (Ans.) 2716 (ii).

—— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 1367 (i).

—— Facilities, Prosecutions *re* Fire, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2947 (ii).

—— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

—— Low Rates, on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).

—— Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods (remarks) 1208 (i).

I. C. R. and N. T. Ry. Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Passes alleged to be stolen, Prevention re (Ans.) 3292 (ii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2635 (ii); 4812 (iii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Ry. Employees Benefit Fund (B. 19) on Order for 3°, 2637 (ii). *See* ' Govt. Rys."

I. C. R., Purchasing Agency, Names, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

—— Repairs to Car No. 37 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

—— Riviere du Loup Workshops, Electrical Development (Ans.) 6182 (iv). *See* " River du Loup."

—— Safety of Travel, (remarks) 2279 (ii).

—— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ans.) 4847, 5105 (iii).

—— Standard Pay for Machinists, (Ans.) 259 (i).

—— Water Supply on Passenger Trains (remarks) 1304 (i).

—— Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 344 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 263 (i).

Krick, Mr. W. W., Date of Apptmt. as Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland (Ans.) 836 (i).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work done *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ans.) 1964 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Cost, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 627, 1006 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

—— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c. (Ans.) 1368 (i).

—— Electrical Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damage to (Ans.) 5104 (iii). *See* " Evers.'

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,109, &c. (Ans.) 2428 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of (Ans.) 1194 (i).

Level Crossing Protection, Rep. of Mr. J. Murphy (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Little Nation River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 8479 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Lumsden Charges: *See* ' N. T. Ry.'

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absences, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging coming Season (Ans.) 1194 (i).

N. T. Ry., Accidents, Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ans.) 4512 (iii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, 8263 (v).

—— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2358 (ii).

—— Classification, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) that Hse adjourn, 2563 (ii).

—— Commission, Board of Arbitrators, Contractor's Claims *re* Over-Classification (Ans.) 836 (i).

—— Commission, Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Payments to (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

N. T. R., Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).

—— Profits re Supplies (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

—— (M.) to print, 97 (i).

N. T. Ry., Construction Contracts, Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer, 447 (i).

—— Contract to O'Brien and Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantity, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2715 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

——— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Date of Contract for Winnipeg to Superior Junction, &c., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

——— Estimated Cost of Excavations on District 'F' (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug., 1907 (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

——— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c. (Ans.) 839 (i).

N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 6393 (iv).

N. T. Ry., Surveys by G. T. P., Change in Location, &c. (Ans.) 2283 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Shops at St. Boniface (Ans.) 8835 (v).

——— Tunnel East of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ans.) 2284 (ii).

——— Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ans.) 1206 (i).

——— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Junction, Completion of (Ans.) 2285 (ii).

——— Winnipeg to Superior Junction, Opening for Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 165 (i).

See 'G. T. P.'

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4816, 5235 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8612 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1364 (i).

Patronage Distribution, on Inquiry for Ret., 3134 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill, prop. Res., 6608 (iv).

See 'Crude.'

Port Colborne Elevator, Expenditure *re* Railway (Ans.) 3295 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

——— Right of Way, &c. (Ans.) 8661 (v).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4840 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch Survey (Ans.) 7518 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c. (Ans.) 104 (i).

——— Consideration *re* Quebec Bridge Franchise (Ans.) 261 (i).

——— Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans (remarks) 3390 (ii).

——— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29, 1907 (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Payments to Company at time of Collapse (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

——— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

——— Total Cost, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1205 (i).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 451; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 451 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 462; (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 1°, 95; on M. for 2°, 474 (amt.), 478; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 478 (i).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 480, (amt.) 6 m. h. agreed to (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

Railway Act (fires) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Papineau) on M. for 2°, 2034 (ii).

Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 2° (M.) to ref. to Ry. Com., 2156 (ii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Ry. Act (board of ry. commissioners) Amt. (B. 145) 1° m., 3914 (ii); 2° m., 8405; in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Govt., Adjudication of Claims (B. 151) in Com., 6600 (iv).

See 'Govt. Rys.'

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 8733 (v).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Min., Apptmt., Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Ry. Code of Train Rules, Approval of Ry. Commission (Ans.) 8834 (v).

Ry. Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death (Ans.) 131 (i).

Railway Statistics Rep. (presented) 1729 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 8477; in Com., 8480 (v).

Rivière du Loup, I. C. Ry. Crossing, Protection *re* (Ans.) 1778 (i).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1195 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 842 (i).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6233, 6354, 6666, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Lock, Investigation *re* Accident, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 837 (i).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

Sunday Traffic: *See* 'London,' &c.

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 4519 (iii).

Supply.

Canals—Chambly (Canton wharf) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Cornwall (concrete wall) 3123; (levelling) 3123; (lock 17, entrance) 3123; (lock 19, entrance) 3123; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 3103; (wharfs and basins) 3103 (ii).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 3127 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macadamizing roads) 3122; (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 3106; (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Soulanges (leakage) 3105; (tool grinder) 3105 (ii).

Canals—Trent (construction) 3106; (damages) 3120; (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3107 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121; (lock 2, channel) 3122 (ii); (Port Colborne) 8821; (surveys) 8822 (v).

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247; (salaries) 246 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsborough) 578 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3067 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (board of commission) 3094; (bridge strengthening) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874, 2947; (Chaudiere junction) 2873; (draw bars) 2882; (facilities) 2946; (Halifax) 2883; (highways) 2882; (Indiantown) 2884; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (Loggieville) 2885; (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2933; (new machinery) 2942; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas) 2943; (revenue) 3091; (Riviere du Loup) 2945; (Robinson's crossing) 2945; (St. John) 2945; (Ste. Rosalie) 2946; (side ladders on cars) 2945; (Sydney Mines) 2946 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 3127; (litigation expenses) 3131; (ry. commission) 3127; (remunerations) 3131; (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v); (Quebec bridge construction) 3070 (ii), 8821 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 3065; (construction) 3102; (Georgetown) 3065; (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke)in Com., 6768 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ans.) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 6097 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

Trent Canal, Expenditures on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7 (Ans.) 446 (i).

——— Floods in Township of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3733 (ii).

——— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ans.) 170 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control of by Govt. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

See Holland,' 'Newmarket.'

Vancouver, Victorian and Eastern Ry. & Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

——— Running through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 8660 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Fall and Spring 1909 (Ans.) 5777 (iii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, Running Rights of Dom. Atlantic Ry. (Ans.) 1370 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8055; in Com., 8621 (v); 3° m., 8652, agreed to (Y. 91; N. 26) 8652 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction incorp. (B. 110) M. to refund Fees, 7512 (v).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21, (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1218 (i).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6301 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4820 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2450 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8417 (v).

Railway Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5324 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re* Investigation of Needs (prop. res.) 1023; Neg. (N. 78; Y. 56) 1098 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Technical Education, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2062 (ii).
——— Replies from Provl. Premiers (Ques.) 3160 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8096 (v).
Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8439, 8706 (v).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3435 (ii).
HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Address, The, 67 (i).
Congregational Union of Canada incorp. (B. 142) 1°*, 3481 (ii); in Com., 4754 (iii).
Dubuc, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. of Successor (remarks) 2277 (ii).
——— Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of a Successor (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 751 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5549 (iii).
Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 8468 (v).
Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).
Manitoba Bench Vacancy, Delays, &c. (remarks) 5624 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; (amt.) 8141; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 661 (i).
Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Ruttan) in Com., 4817, 5240 (iii).
Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada (B. 33) 1°*, 380 (i); on order for 3°, 2279 (ii).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders (M for cor.*) 4315 (iii).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench (Ques.) 3489 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (construction) 3106 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 8185 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4261; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4263; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (board of commissioners) 3099 (ii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1039 (i).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays, &c. (Ques.) 3672 (ii).
——— Representations *re* (M. for cor.*) 4315
——— (remarks) 4134 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).
Budget, The, 2067 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2230 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6951; in Com., 7313 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5217 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6869 (iv); in Com., 7904 (v).
Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
Currency Act Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 6636 (iv).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com. 3920 (ii); 5772 (iii).
Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6975 (iv).
Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5906 (iii).
Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7833 (v).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8619, 8636 (v).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6765 (iv).
Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5922, in Com., 5926 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (warehouses) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on Prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 152 (i).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt. (reply) 2840 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1103 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 3139 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).
Lumsden Charges, Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5598 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5900; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).
N.T. Ry., Classification, &c., on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2582 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2417 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7454 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6202, 6970 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5236, 5284 (iii).

New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5208 (iii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8617 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7321 (iv).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6977 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6571 (iv).

—— Procedure *re* Discussion, 6559 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8407 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6197 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7100 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 1999 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Justice, Administration of, Supreme Court (law books) 8798 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5692; (Canada and Mexico) 5690; (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3406 (ii); (St. John) 6107 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933; (Moncton shops) 2935 (ii).

Railways—N. T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5231, 5249 (iii); 8359 (v); (surveys, &c.) 3065 (ii).

Railways (Quebec Bridge) 3070 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Trade and Commerce (Grain Inspection Board) 5714 (iii).

Water Power in B. C. Ry. Belt, B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5888 (iii).

HARRIS, Mr. L., *Brantford.*

Co-operation (B. 50) 1° m., 705 (i).

Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt (B. 75) 1° m., 1363 (i); in Com., 8731 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association (B. 111) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 6139; 6739 (iv).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3929 (ii).

Toronto Central Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1360 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6783 (iv).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8468 (v).

Kingston, Smiths Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 4128 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4763 (iii); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; Que. (Aylmer) 3864 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agriculture, Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7224 (iv).

Agriculture, Machinery imported into Canada, 1909 (Ques.) 382 (i).

Bank Shareholders List, &c. (Ques.) 4846 (iii).

Budget, The, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2229 (ii).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).

Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 277 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8486 (iv).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6995 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6622 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 233 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 8841 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5912 (iii), 8071 (v).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Fisheries, Regulations *re* International Fishing, Inquiry for Rep., 1880 (i).
See 'International.'

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°. 770 (i).

—— B. 126 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 6620 (iv).

French Floods, Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3062 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreements, &c., *re* Rys. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6762 (iv).

Horse Races and Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593; on M. for 3°, 7270 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (cigarettes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 3°, 812 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, asks for Names of Companies, 502 (i)

I. C. R. and N. T. R. Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109; in Com., 1136 (i).

International Fisheries Regulation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 381 (i).

—— (remarks) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3155 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair to conc., 8229 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6279 (iv).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3° 2280 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2258 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3985 (iii).

N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior Jct., Open for Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6205, 6966 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Newspapers in Ont., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iv).

Northern Mortgage Co. of Canada B. 33 (Mr. A. Haggart) on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7313 (iv).

Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Miller) to suspend Rules, 8362 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 232 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 466 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 266 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8480 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Rules of the House in Com. on Rep., 8367 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115, on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv); (live stock industry) 7751 (v); (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (cribwork) 3124; (repairs) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (macdamizing roads) 3122 (ii).

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3112 (ii).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3120 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (salaries) 7768 (v); Customs (salaries) 246; Indian Affairs, (salaries) 346; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 232 (i); Interior(salaries) 8194 (v); Justice (salaries) 253; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 253; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 250 (i); Militia (salaries) 7767 (v); Railways and Canals (contingencies) 247 (i); Secretary of State (salaries) 7767 (v).

Excise (tobacco stamps) 1342 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7777 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8200 (v).

Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837; (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 8565; (monuments) 8575 (v).

Mines (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally— (tobacco curing) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8183 ; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 584 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7179 (iv); (Guelph) 8169; (Waterloo) 8178, (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 422; (deptl. buildings, new) 553 (i); (grounds) 8191 (v); (Royal Mint) 558 (i); (ventilation) 8172 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 669; (Marieville) 688 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington) 3457 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3881; (Gaspe) 3892; (Godfroy) 3899 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3127 (ii).

Senate (sesional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6769 (iv).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2098 (ii).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8397 (v).

Ways and Means, on M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).

Ways and Means—Tariff with U. S., in Com., 8757 (v).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7209 (iv).

Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5894 (iii).

Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6934 (iv).

Immigrants from U. S., Remarks of Mr. Bruce Walker (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548, 5817, 5847 (iii).

Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 119 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8473 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6321 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4888 (iii).

Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal or Sale of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1801 (i).

——— Open for Homesteading Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).

Pincher Creek Sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7326 (iv).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6200 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2641 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363; (experimental farms) 7348 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Macleod) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (North Saskatchewan river channel) 4273; B.C. (Chilliwack) 4299 (iii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8202 (v).

Indians—Alberta (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5999, Res. *re* Farmers, 6000 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv); in Com., 8099, 8400 (v).

Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5801 (iii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6825 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, &c., 3539 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 1366 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5793 (iii); in Com., 6005 (iv).

Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re* (remarks) 3057 (ii).

Budget, The (remarks) 2069 (ii).

Can. Associated Press Subsidy B. 228 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8685 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Champlain, Samuel de, Monument, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Civil Service Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7304 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number Passing Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 2286 (ii).

—— Apptmts. under the C. S. Act, Temporarily, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3170 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7885, 7900; on Amt. (Mr. King) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 150 (i).

Cotton's Weekly, Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5897 (iii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 897 (i).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6993 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep., 3053 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8688 (v).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1276 (i).

Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of (Ques.) 1207 (i).

Franking Privilege, and Political Literature &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps (Ques.) 133 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1137; in Com., 1139 (i).

Horse Racing: *See* 'Criminal.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); in Com., 5810, 5834 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8031 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3152 (ii).

Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canada's Rights (remarks) 5761 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1236 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2893 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr Martin) in Com. 3140 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 660 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 105 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3760 (ii); in Com., 7399; on M. for 3°, 7562 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1572 (i).

North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2711 (ii).

Ochre River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8699 (v).

Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2137 (ii).

Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).

Ross Rifle, Ques. of Privilege, 338 (i).

—— Regulations of National Rifle Association re (M.) to adjn. Hse., 4519 (iii).

R.M.C. Cadets, Visit to Ottawa (remarks) 8584 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Fredrick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8122 (v).

St. Johns, Que., Govt. Land, Occupation by Militia (Ques.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5336 (ii), 6226, 6343, 6663, 6724 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7084 (iv).

S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue (Ques.) 133 (i).

—— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8580 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (experimental farms) 7348; (farm bulletins) 7378 (iv).

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337, Finance (salaries) 336; Indian Affairs (salaries) 356; Mines (salaries) 336; Public Works (salaries) 333 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armouries) 8570; (gratuities) 8571; (instructions) 8573; (pay, &c.) 8559; (rifles, &c.) 8563; (topographical survey) 8574 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7497; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8178 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8171 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (Joliette) 663; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Levis) 669; (Maisonneuve) 674; (Marieville) 679; (Megantic) 700; (Montreal P. O.) 702; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (New Mills) 3395 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (South Cove) 1177; (Tusket Wedge) 1179 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Christian Island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; (Haileybury) 3469; (Juniper Island) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin's Island) 3474; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Rainy River) 3472; (Rondeau) 3474 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles) 6102 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3069; I. C.R. (Moncton cut-off) 2933 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3074 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5944 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1090 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6768 (iv).

U.S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Number, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4996 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6379 (iv); in Com., 8096 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying (Ques.) 130 (i).

Zinc Ores Bounty B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5937 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5655 (iii).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ques.) 1536 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Rep. from Capt. Bernier *re* Cruise (Ques.) 1014 (i).

Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1965 (ii).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of new Office (Ques.) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4313 (iii).

Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Centreville Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Conservation Committee, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 4845 (iii).

——— Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

See 'Natural.'

Customs Act Amt. (B. 200) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Herring.'

Digby Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 4811 (iii).

Fishing Vessels Licenses (B. 199) 1° m., 6607 (iv).

Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign (Ques.) 133 (i).

Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ques.) 1206 (i).

Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity packed, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

See 'Deep,' &c.

Herring Fisheries Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5513; in Com., 5805, 5821 (iii).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5655 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1134 (i).

——— Employees, Payments to, Names, Apptmts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1021 (i).

——— Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 5059 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3149 (ii).

Lobster Canning Licenses, Number issued (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with, &c. (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2779 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6363 (iv).

Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1971 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1762 (i); in Com., 7489 (v).

Naval Service in Can., Number of Applicants, Policy of such Appointments, &c. (Ques.) 1970 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1973 (ii).

N. S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. in B. N. A. Act (Ques.) 1965 (ii).
See 'Mar. Provs.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8703 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Divisions, Decision of Prime Minister (remarks) 413 (i).

Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to N. B. and N. S. (Ques.) 3166 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5341 (iii).

Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, Cor. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2798 (ii).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

Senate Vacancies in N. S., Names of Appointees, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (tobacco) 7382 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v).

Fisheries (customs bureau) 8547 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamers) 8528; (salaries) 8524; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Militia (armouries) 8572 (v).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 573; (Halifax) 575; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4788, 5717 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6134 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Brooklyn) 978 (i); (Centreville, &c.) 8817 (v); (David's Cove) 985; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Habitant River) 992; (Little River) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Nyanza) 1000; (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1169; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E.I. (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810 (v).

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S. (Ques.) 1020 (i).

Westport Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

Weymouth Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, Ont.*

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2660 (ii).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE (Minister of Labour), *North Waterloo.*

Aliens Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 272 (i).

—— Violations *re* (remarks) 4814 (iii).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination (Ans.) 2297 (ii).
See 'Combines Bill.'

Combines Investigation Act (M.) for Com. on Res., 2489 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act (B. 101) 1° m., 2056 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 6802; 2°, m. and in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881; 3° m., 7977, 7981; on Senate Amts., 8777 (v).

——(amt.) *re* Title, 8003 (v).

Combines Bill, Rep. of Speech (personal explanation) 7188 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i).

Extension B. C., Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 23 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).

—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. (B. 198) Prop. Res., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603 (iv); in Com., 8027 (v).

Industrial Disputes, Increase in Wages, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1590 (i).

KING, Hon. MACKENZIE—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration from U. S., entering B. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1229 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1586 (i).

—— Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 2424, 2887; conc. in (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).

—— 4th Rep. of Com (M.) to conc., 8830 (v).

Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Priv., Res. read by Minister of Militia (explanation) 4710 (iii).

Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5446 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Labour (contingencies) 243; (salaries) 235 (i).

Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1061; (M.) to adjn. debate, 1076, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1097 (i).

—— Letters to Premiers, &c. (read) 2666 (ii).

—— Replies of Provl. Premiers (Ans.) 3160 (ii).

Technical Education, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade (remarks) 3208 (ii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2662 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*

Fleming, Helena Mellor Relief (B. 179) 1°*, 5759 (iii).

Hudson Bay Insurance Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 515 (i).

Industrial Disputes Act, Legislation *re* Amt. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond, N. S.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (i).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. re B.N.A. Act (prop. Res.) 2718 (iii)

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4848 (ii).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7993 (v).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6526 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7359; (tobacco) 7381 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 2950 (ii).

Budget, The, 1828 (i).

Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c. (Ques.) 5001 (iii).

Compensation to Alta. and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

Dom. Land Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3290 (ii).

Fisheries Revenue in Alberta and Sask., &c. (Ques.) 1021 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re* (Ques.) 5931 (iv).

Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908 (Ques.) 847 (i).

Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ques.) 275 (i).

Homestead Pre-emptions, Alberta and Sask., Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).

Last Mountain Lake Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).

Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).

Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

See 'Warwick.'

National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec (Ques.) 3671 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1737 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5158 (iii).

Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-30-9, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 1686 (i).

Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Prime Minister Speech at Toronto, Rep. of 'Globe,' 2430 (ii).

Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies, Aggregate Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 5930 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid Additional Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1002 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution to Homestead Holders Quarter Sections 24 (Ques.) 1195 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 251 (i).

Dom. Lands (salaries) 8490 (v).

Immigration (salaries) 8494 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8497 (v).

Post Office (P. O. guide index) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain) 4272 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8819 (v).

Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ques.) 2289 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8394 (v).

Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).

See 'Mudie.'

Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50 (Ques.) 4079 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2079 (ii).

Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).

Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 1009 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 721 (i).

German Surtax, Explanation *re* Negotiations, (remarks) 3680 (ii).

German Tariff and U. S. Rates, &c. (remarks) 3833 (ii).

Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt. (Ques.) 835 (i).

Long Sault Rapids, Deputations *re* Building of a Dam (remarks) 2061 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5031 (iii).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7661 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 540 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 6104 (iv); Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3837 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2016 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6925 (iv).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8731 (v).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8763 (v).

Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 172; on M. for 2°, 739 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8772 (v).

Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8618 (v).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6748 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5554, 5844 (iii).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 6604 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8470 (v).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2812 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on Senate Amts., 8404 (v).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5763 (iii).

Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4844 (iii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 125 (Mr. Oliver) on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Lobster Fisheries Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8235 (v).

Lumsden Charges, N.T. Ry. Classification, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6094 (iv).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6360 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5016 (iii); in Com., 7418 (v).

Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8600 (v).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6400; on M. for

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Com., 6407; in Com., 6503, 6548; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6582 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 413, 448 (i).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 94; 2° m., 452, 462; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 95; 2° m., 467; Neg. (Y. 87; N. 53) 479 (i).

Railway Act (appeals) Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8406 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6601 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).

Ry. Committee (M.) to reduce Number, 8734 (v).

Rainy River Radial Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5767 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8596 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5784 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8370.

St. John Harbour, Wharfs, &c., B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8124 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5465 (iii), 6355, 6735 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

Senate, Abolition, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, Prop. Address to His Majesty, 1977, Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Excise (distilleries) 1332; (translation) 1343 (i).

Fisheries (legal expenses) 8543; (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8540 (v).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7771 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8206 (v).

Justice—Administration of—N. W. T. (stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).

Militia (monuments) 8576 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro') 578 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 426; (military stores) 597; (museum) 568 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 928; (St. Roch) 830; (Shawenegan Falls) 949 (i).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5721 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8391 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8005, 8436, 8706 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*

Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants Burial Ground, Repairs (Ques.) 8889 (iii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

I. C. Ry., Board of Control, French Representation (Ques.) 7519 (v).

——— Instructions *re* Sleeping Car Conductors' Residence (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4547 (iii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID, G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*

Address, The, 40 (i).

——— (M.) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex. (presented) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on Closing of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4618 (iii).

Alcoholism, International Congress, Canadian Representation (remarks) 522 (i).

Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'

Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1020 (i).

Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax (remarks) 3057, 3210 (ii).

Allard & Provost, Govt. Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2489 (ii).

——— (remarks) 2636 (ii).

All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Annuities Act. Expenditure *re* Administration, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2142 (ii).

——— Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 385 (i).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 3057 (ii).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 201 (i).

Barrie and Allandale, Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ans.) 169 (i).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Maintenance, &c., Cost (Ans.) 2426 (ii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2014 (ii).

Boundaries: *See* 'Manitoba,' 'Provincial.'

B. C. Judicial Apptmts., Delays, &c. (remarks) 6, 8 (i).

B. C. Lt. Governorship, Apptmt. of Mr. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 527 (i).

—— Recommendations *re* from Political Organizations (Ans.) 382 (i).

Business of the House, Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Camborne Postmaster, Pet., *re* Apptmt. (Ans.) 1016 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1583 (i).

—— Agent at Washington (remarks) 4710 (iii).

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Canadian Navy, Number of Applications for Positions (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

—— Pet. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ans). 5782 (iii).

—— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ans.) 2931 (ii).

See 'Naval.'

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 74 (Mr. Edwards) on M. for 2°, 2161 (ii).

Canadian Shipbuilding, Tenders from Ship Yards on Great Lakes, Conflict with Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 844 (i).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657 (v).

Chartered Banks, Shareholders' Rep. (presented) 5759 (iii).

Chinamen, Paying Capitation Tax (Ans.) 7870 (v).

Christmas Adjournment (M.) 923, 1298 (i).

Claims Adjudication Treaty, Ratification, &c. (remarks) 5003, 5278 (iii).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Damages (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7937 (v).

—— (remarks) 1363 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5, 22 (i).

—— Lists (presented) 155 (i).

—— (M.) to add Names, 1001 (i).

Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditures *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1977 (ii).

Conservation Commission, Meeting of Com. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 854 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

—— Consideration of (remarks) 2711, 3206 (ii).

Criminal Code (motor vehicles) Amt .B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on Order for 2°, 8729; in Com., 8730 (v).

Criminal Code (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8733 (v).

See "Motor."

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 921 (i).

Currency, Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Debates, Official, on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in Report of Com., 3053 (ii).

Disallowance of Ontario Legislation, on Inquiry for Reps., 7291 (iv).

Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 3166 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost (Ans.) 3159 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies (prop. res.) 6276 (iv), 8113 (v).

Dual Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 6802 (iv).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

'Earl Grey' Str., Names of Crew, Wages, (Ans.) 3467 (ii).

Easter Adjournment (M.) 5688 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6186 (iv).

Fenian Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (v).

Fielding, Mr., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers,' &c.

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5921 (iii).

Fisheries in Man. and N. W. Ter., on Inquiry (Mr. Campbell) for Rep., 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).

See 'Manitoba.'

Fish Fry, Applications for Forms (remarks) 3058 (ii).

Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 4812 (iii).

French, Sir John: *See* 'Petawawa.'

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 189; on M. for 2°, 765 (i).

German Trade Relations *re* Par. in New York 'Herald' (remarks) 2635 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2221 (ii), 4315 (iii).

Govt. Business for Session, &c. (remarks) 5893 (iii), 6100 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Govt. Ry. Bills, Conference with Senate (M.) 8834 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1138, 1142 (i).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896 (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Governor General, Address to on Close of Term of Office (M.) 8737 (v).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Grain shipped and received at Lake Ports, Ont. (Ans.) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Port Arthur and Fort William, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
G.T.P., Winnipeg to Lake Superior Div., Opening of, Ref to in Speech from Throne (Ans.) 3677 (ii).
See 'N. T. Ry.'
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ans.) 2427 (ii).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8380; in Com., 8623 (v).
Halifax Harbour and Big Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen (remarks) 4714 (iii).
Harland & Wolff, Rep. *re* Shipbuilding (remarks) 1363 (i).
Horse-Racing Regulations (remarks) 6617 (iv).
See 'Criminal,' 'Race Track.'
House of Commons, Reorganization of Staff (M.) 6389 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7071 (iv).
——— (M.) to disch. Order, 7872 (v).
See 'Sessional, &c.
House of Commons Corridors, Ejectment of Coloured Clergyman (remarks) 7182 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Conversion of Cost into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).
——— Distribution of French Edition (Ans.) 276 (i).
——— Instructions to Canada's Representative (remarks) 923 (i).
——— New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 207 (i).
——— Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 413 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Application *re* Service between Can. and Australia (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).
Inspection and Sales Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).
I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission (presented) 96 (i).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 3490 (ii).
——— Report re (remarks) 2153, 3059 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Iron and Steel Bounties (prop. res.) 8362 (v).
Japan-United States Treaty, Safe-guarding Canada's rights (remarks) 5762 (iii).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada (Ans.) 7519 (v).
Labelle Settlers Grievances, on M. for Sup. (remarks) 8782 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2426, 2890 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office, Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3140 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re* (Ans.) 2149 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7065 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) to Com. of Sup., 8142 (v).
——— Cor. &c., on M. (Mr. Roche) for Copies, 644 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 131 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Report, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Campbell) 2152 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 3480 (ii).
See "Fisheries."
Manitoba Grain Act Amt B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on Prop. Res., 520 (i).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2788 (ii).
Minister of the Crown, Gifts to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8789 (v).
Morning Sittings (M.) 6099 (iv).
Motions to Adjn, Rulings of Mr. Speaker (personal explanation) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts. (remarks.) 1601 (i).
Motor Vehicles, Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).
See "Criminal Code.'
National Anthem, Singing of during Naval Debate (remarks) 3208 (ii).
National Battlefields of Quebec B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6600 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden (M.) for Special Com., 2330, 2609, 2949 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
N. T. Ry. Classification, on Order being called for Com. (remarks) 2198 (ii).
—— Letter to Prime Minister, on Inquiry for, 448, 622 (i).
—— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).
—— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. (remarks) 5197 (iii).
—— Changes *re* Report, on M. for Sup., 5584 (iii).
—— Changes in Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5567 (iii).
—— Error in Res. of Com. (remarks) 5278 (iii).
—— on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).
—— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6017 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Printing, 377 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Imp Govt. *re* (remarks) 7292 (iv).
Naval Defence (B. 95) 1° m., 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952 (ii); Agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193 (prop. res.) 5195 (iii); in Com., 7393 (v); 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7591 (v).
Naval B. 95, Notice for prop. Res., Naval Dept., 6509 (iv).
—— in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv).
Naval Defence, Information from New Zealand (remarks) 623 (i).
Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 521, 1100, 1600 (i).
—— On Order for Com. (remarks) 6948 (iv).
—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Cor., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Pensions, prop. Res. (M.) to discharge from Order Paper, 8742 (v).
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8839 (v).
See 'Can. Navy,' 'Warships.'
N. B. Coal and Ry., Disputed Accounts, Settlements of (remarks) 169 (i).
New York State Canals, Reciprocal Use of by Canadians (remarks) 5207 (iii).
'Niobe,' Purchase of without Parliamentary Authority (remarks) 3481 (ii).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier (remarks) 2712 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act (Ans.) 1965 (ii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, *pro forma*, 3 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
—— (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
Ottawa and Quebec Representation in H. of C. (remarks) 521, 1446 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1315 (i).
—— Resignation, 1689 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers (Ans.) 167 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 4129 (iii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated (Ans.) 447 (i).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business (Ans.) 268 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Post Offices opened in Can., 1909, Weekly Mail Service in N.S., &c. (Ans.) 626 (i).
Private Bills, Consideration of (remarks) 8364, 8380 (v).
—— (M.) to extend time, 1597 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lake) *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Speech, 2431 (ii).
Proportional Representation in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 138 (i).
—— (M.) for Com., 429 (i).
Provincial Boundaries, Extension Res. Notice to N.B. and N.S. (Ans.) 3167 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen's Rep., 614 (i).
Quebec Fisheries, Special Regulations, Licences granted, &c. (Ans.) 6940 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) (M.) to consider Rept. of Special Com., 6398; on Order for Com., 6510; in Com., 6567 (iv).
Ry. Act (liabilities) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 452 (i).
Railway Act Amt. Bills, Delay in Committees (remarks) 925 (i).
Railway Committee, Rules re (remarks) 8833 (v).
Railway Subsidies (prop. res.) 7873 (v).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8598 (v).
Representation: *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Proportional.'
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 8580 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism (remarks) 3209 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Regulations *re* National Rifle Ass'cn, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).
R.N.W.M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 843 (i).
—— Report (presented) 1730 (i).
Rules of the House, Report, laid on Table, 7867 (v).
—— (M.) *re* Special Com., 1299, 1441 (i).
—— Progress *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii), 5894 (iv), 7528 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Rules of the House, (M.) for Com. *re* consideration of Rep., 8365 (v).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1537 (i).

Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, &c. (Ans.) 630 (i).

——— Locks furnished (Ans.) 784 (i).

Rural Free Mail Deliveries, Number in Operation, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 259 (i).

——— East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 265 (i).

Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of, &c. (remarks) 5762 (iii).

——— Violation of *re* War Ships on Great Lakes (remarks) 7520 (v).
See 'U.S.'

St. John Valley Ry., Legislation *re* Operation (remarks) 7292 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 6138, 6227, 6722 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8655 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 3169 (ii).

Saturday Sittings of House (M.) 8110 (v).

Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B. N. A. Act, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1993 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2006 (ii).

Senate Vacancy, Apptmt. *re* P.E.I. (Ans.) 1376 (i).

——— Names of Appointees (Ans.) 386 (i).

Sessional Employees, H. of C. under Pay in January (Ans.) 4514, 5001 (iii).

Souris Life-Saving Station, Ownership of Site (Ans.) 7065 (iv).

Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3293 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stenographers for Committees of H. of C., Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8677 (v).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); R.N.W.M. Police (salaries) 415; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 415 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 8509 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance, &c.) 8495 (v).

Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (steamers) 8510; (tidal service) 8512; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

R. N.W.M.P. (rifle ranges) 8802; (salaries) 8802 (v).

Suzerainty to King of England, Report of Minister's Speech at Toronto (Ans.) 2289 (ii).

Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5993 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5932 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID—*Con.*

Tourists Post Office, Number temporarily established (Ans.) 170 (i).

Trade and Commerce Deptl. Rep. (presented) 621 (i).

U.S. Claims: *See* 'Claims.'

U.S. Minimum Tariff (remarks) 2153 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships, Number on Great Lakes, &c. (Ans.) 133 (i).

——— Passage through Canals, Consultation of Depts., &c. (Ans.) 108 (i).

——— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty (Ans.) 103 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Can. Canals, on M. (Mr. Edwards) for O. C.'s (amt.) 135 (i).

———on Great Lakes, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 800 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'

Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

War Ships on Great Lakes, Reps. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building (Ans.) 1367 (i).
See 'U.S.'

War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (remarks) 2714 (ii).

War Vessels purchased from British Admiralty, O.C.'s *re* &c., (Ans.) 2144 (ii).
See 'Naval.'

Waterways Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).

——— Rep. (presented) 209 (i).

Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c. (remarks) 2713 (ii).

——— Cor., Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copy, 109 (i).

——— Progress *re* (remarks) 1802 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).

Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition (Ans.) 3482 (ii).

Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3136 (ii).
See 'Supply.'

Year-Book, Expenditure *re* French Distribution (Ans.) 1020 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Arthabaska 'Gazette,' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges (M. for copies*) 2149 (ii).

Eastern Townships Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 379 (i).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51, on M. for 3°, 2280 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1095 (i).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 981; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Blairmore Station Mail Service (Ans.) 7871 (v).

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c. (Ans.) 5779 (iii).

——— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4313 (iii).

Cable Rates Bills: *See* 'Ry. Act Amt. B. 104,' 'Ocean.'

Camborne Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (remarks) 2713 (ii).

Central Park, B. C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing, &c. (Ans.) 2188 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).

——— Discontinuance of Mail Service (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Civil Service Act (P. O. inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) prop. Res., 6100 (iv).
See 'P. O. Inspectors.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6955; in Com., 7310 (iv).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage, &c. (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

——— Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756, 5895 (iii).

Dauphin Post Office Date of Opening (remarks) 3136 (ii).

Delisle, Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3293 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 4516 (iii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re* (Ans.) 4312 (iii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenues per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1590 (i).

Franking Privilege, Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7800 (v).

Frontenac Mail Contracts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 7066 (iv).

——— Routes, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 5105 (iii).

Frontenac County Post Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iv).

Gowganda Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Great Northwestern Tel. Co. and Night Letter *re* French Language (remarks) 8241 (v).

Grenville and Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Hansard Debates, Omissions from (remarks) 7880 (v).

Holland Post Office Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Kilmant and Shackleton Post Office, Application *re* Opening (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6651 (iv).

Lachute Post Office, Opening of (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Lethbridge Post Office Facilities, on Inquiry for Ret., 3683 (ii).

——— on M. for Sup., 7782 (v).

——— Total Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Mails addressed to Streets, Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 8119 (v).

——— (Ans.) 7869 (v).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs. (remarks) 8582 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration *re* (Ans.) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery at Sydney (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Mail Privileges of Members *re* Postal Regulations (Ans.) 2146 (ii).

Markham Post Office, Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metabetchouan Postmaster, Jean Gauthier, Removal of, &c. (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Milledgeville-Holderville, N. B., Mail Route, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3023 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4978 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4206 (iii).

Newspaper Postage to U. S., Classification, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 1973 (ii).

New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Application *re* (Ans.) 2952 (ii).

North Bay P. O. Inspector(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Ocean Cables Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 8388 (v).
See 'Cables.'

Parry Sound Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Postal Regulations during Parliamentary Recess (Ans.) 2486 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks inspectors) Amt. (B. 197) in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° m., 6389; in Com., 7313 (iv).

Post Office Act Amt. Bill (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service B., 6955 (iv).

Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Statmt. *re* (Ans.) 2932, 3673 (ii).

See 'Winnipeg.'

P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increases, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c. (Ans.) 5780 (iii).

Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examination, 1908, Accepted answer to question 4 (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c. (Ans.) 109 (i).

Quebec Judges Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6979 (iv).

Quebec-Levis Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 6941 (iv).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2136 (ii); 2° m., 6007; in Com., 6010 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6390 (iv).

——— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ans.) 5106 (iii).

——— Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).

Retail Merchants Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1380 (i).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Salmon River Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 2930 (ii).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 2290 (ii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, &c. (Ans.) 7517 (v).

Sunday Postal Office, Winnipeg, Closing of (remarks) 2932 (ii).

See 'Post Office.'

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv). Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Riviere du Loup and Tadousac) 5711 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (contingencies) 5607 (iii); Outside Service (contingencies) 8818 (v); (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii); (salaries) 5752 (iii), 7863 (v);

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865; (Bic) 3872; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3882; (Gaspe) 3893; (Godfroy) 3899; (Grand Mechin) 3901; (Grand Riviere) 3903 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Malbaie) 3907 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (St. Andre de Kamouraska) 4230; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste. Croix) 4241 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159 (iv).

Telegraphs Act Amt. (B. 105) 1° m., 2138 (ii); in Com., 6011 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8389 (v).

——— (B. 234) 1° m., 8776; in Com., 8777 (v).

See 'Ocean.'

Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Owner of Buildings, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Williamsville Post Office Revenue, Pet. *re* Removal, &c. (Ans.) 7288 (iv).

Windygate Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ans). 2930 (ii).

——— Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 3168 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8118 (v).

——— (remarks) 8364 (v).

Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays (remarks) 3135, 3673 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 3484 (ii).

See 'Sunday,' &c.

LENNOX, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7202 (iv).

Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* (Ques.) 169 (i).

Barrie Post Office Square (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c. (remarks) 6177 (iv).

Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c. (Ques.) 3166, 3676 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7301 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Flood Damages, on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

——— Instructions, Payments, &c., as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands (Ques.) 6391 (iv).

——— Payments to *re* Trent Canal Damages (Ques.) 7516 (v).

——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6806 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 5885 (iii).

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Criminal Code (copyright) Amt. (B. 41) 1° m., 430; 2° m., 805; on Order for Com., 1209 (i).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6632 (iv).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3482, 3872 (ii).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8696 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth)in Com., 6184 (iv).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 176 (i).

Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve (Ques.) 3294 (ii).

G. T. P., Construction Contracts, Provisions *re* Forfeits, &c. (Ques.) 387 (i).

——— Eastern Div., Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1687 (i).

——— Engineers' Complaint against Arbitrators (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

——— and N. T. Ry. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

See 'Natl. Transcl..'

——— Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract (Ques.) 2140 (ii).

Hodgins Investigation *re* N. T. Ry., Payments *re* Legal Services, &c. (Ques.) 7064 (iv).

Holland River, Channel from Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 170, 626 (i).

See 'Trent.'

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5534, 5819, 5840 (iii).

Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7865 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2799 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1112 (i).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5723, 5763 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2889 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Marieville Post Office, Que. of Order in Com. of Sup., 686 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Adjustment of disputed Item in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c. (M. for copies*) 3495 (ii).

——— Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of, &c. (Ques.) 2137 (ii).

——— Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2335; Amt. Neg. (Y. 65; N. 109) 2629 (ii).

——— Changes in Rep. of Com., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

——— Changes in Rep., on M. for Sup., 5585 (iii).

——— Classification submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909 (Ques.) 261 (i).

——— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 643 (i).

——— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

——— Letter of Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion, &c. (Ques.) 839 (i).

——— Meeting of Com. (remarks) 3480 (ii).

——— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister (Ques.) 2139 (ii).

——— Objections *re* Classification, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3169 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2297 (ii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to consider, 5820 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6015 (iv).

N.T.Ry., Lumsden Charges, Appmt. of Counsel, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (amt.) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).

——— Royal Commission (prop. res.) on M. for Sup., 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).

N. T. Ry. Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificates, Cor. (M. for copies*) 1686 (i).

——— Promotion of, (Ques.) 839 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

——— Names of Contracts, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2297 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2715 (ii).

——— Estimate of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Excavations, &c. (Ques.) 3291 (ii).

N.T.Ry., Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F' (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907 (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

——— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Rep., Distribution of (remarks) 622 (i).

—— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 2283 (ii).

—— and Quebec Bridge, Expenditures *re* Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 6392 (iv).

—— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

—— Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 2284 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4752, 4814, 4819, 5235, 5281 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5723 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commisison B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt., in Com., 1365 (i).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Quebec Bridge Co., Payments to Directors at time of Collapse (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

—— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 628 (i).

—— Tenders for New Piers, &c. (Ques.) 840 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c. (M. for ret.*), 277 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6171 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 7868 (v).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5785 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s B. 115, in Com., 5841 (iii), 6138, 6672, 6721; (amt.) 6725; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv).

SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of by Officials (remarks) 7976 (iv).

—— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 8477 (v).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5531 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1348 (i).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl., new) 7169 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 929; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 954 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4755 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Lawrence River Channel) 3834 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3887; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3893; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Vallée) 3904; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Matane) 3907; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3911 (ii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 2881; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (drawbars) 2882; (Halifax) 2884; (highways) 2882; (Lac au Saumon) 2884; (side ladders) 2945 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. (construction, &c.) 5232 (iii), 5249 (iv), 8360 (v).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3078 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Ques. of Priv., 5759 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Intermediate Tariff, &c.(remarks) 5892 (iii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Survey, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

—— Damages by Floods, Charges *re* L. F. Clarry, &c., on M. for Sup., 5209 (iii).

Trent Canal, Clarry, Mr. L. F., Charges *re* (remarks) 4714 (iii), 6096 (iv).

See 'Clarry.'

—— Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

—— Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Zinc Ores Smelting Investigation B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5797 (iii).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Address, The, 82 (i).

Barr, Dr., Decease of (remarks) 380 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2013 (ii).

Capital Offences and Offensive Weapons (B. 14) 1°*, 204 (i).

Canadian Attache at Washington (prop. res.) 1582 (i).

Canadian Business Agent at Washington (remarks) 4708 (iii).

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6861 (iv).

Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public (Ques.) 5104 (iii).

Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada (remarks) 853 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (assaults, &c.) Amt. (B. 71) 1°*, 1360 (i).
Criminal Code (automobiles) Amt. (B. 13) 1° m., 201 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii); in Com., 8729 (v).
Currency, Govt. Assistance to Clean Circulation (Ques.) 8238 (v).
——— Distribution of Clean Bills (remarks) 7188 (iv).
Daylight Saving (B. 72) 1°*, 1361 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 3133 (ii).
Immigrants from Europe. Number for 1908, 1910 (Ques.) 7872 (v).
Inspection of Vessels (B. 47) 1° m., 515 (i).
Load Lines on Ships (B. 10) 1° m., 162 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 2nd Rep. 3133 (ii).
Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).
Motor Vehicles Injuries (B. 13) 2° m., 2035 (ii).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4403 (iii).
Oaths, Administration of (B. 100) 1° m., 1878 (i).
Offences against the Person (B. 71) 2° m., 2040 (ii).
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to (remarks) 4712-3 (iii).
Ry. Act (sanitary conditions) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1297 (i).
Rules of the House, Amt. to (prop. res.) 1536, 1545 (i).
——— Progress of Committee (remarks) 4307, 5893 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 5891 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes (remarks) 3135 (ii).
——— on Ships (B. 11) 1° m., 163 (i); 2° m., 2035 (ii).

LOGGIE, W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The, 2178, 2215, 2222 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6972 (iv).
Selkirk Dock, Collections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Dredging (new plant) 4767 (iii).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5069 (iii).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *South Renfrew.*

Budget, The, 1864 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. Cs., &c., 3531 (ii).
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6917 (iv), 7882 (v).
Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1140 (i).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2854 (ii).
——— Board of Management, Additional Powers (Ques.) 627 (i).
——— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1117 (i); on M. for 3°, 2209 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8769 (v).
N. T. Ry., Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2414 (ii).
——— Lumsden Charges, Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse (remarks) 5197 (iii); Ques. of Order, 5199 (iii).
——— on Ques of Priv. (remarks) 5570 (iii).
——— Changes in Report, on M. for Sup., 5572 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Prop. Res. *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 8302 (v).
——— Lumsden Charges, Payment of Counsel Fees (M.) 8832 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3386, 3575 (ii); in Com., 7474 (v).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., *re* Change of Route, on M. (Mr. Warburton for Copies, 3191 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7357 (iv).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6384 (iv); in Com., 8084 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8011 (v).
Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8718 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 271 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5941, 6004 (iv).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Wreck on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (M.) to adjn House, 1597 (i).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 5617 (iii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Dominion Bank (B. 171) 1°*, 5617 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 256 (i).
Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., &c., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ques.) 2925 (ii).
Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 22) 2° m., 1268, 1270 (i).
Extension, B. C. Mining Disaster, Medals awarded, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 270 (i).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6739 (iv).
Immigrants Treatment *re* Deportations, &c. (remarks) 6945 (iv).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 257; 2° m., 1296 (i).
—— Consideration of (remarks) 6941 (iv).
—— (personal explanation) 8116 (v).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1213 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2899 (ii).
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).
Ottawa Buildings Design, Competition, &c. (Ques.) 6180 (iv).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ques.) 2924 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 515 (i).
Ry. Act (cheap rates) Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 257 (i).
Ry. Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, Positions, &c. (Ques.) 6390 (iv).
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment by Govt. (Ques.) 3935 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5485 (iii).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Quantity imported into Can., Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 6506 (iv).
S. A. Veterans Association, Military Reserve, (M. for cor.*) 2149 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4223 ; (Three Rivers) 4247 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1048 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ques.) 3167 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6771 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4998 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*

Address, The, 52 (i).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Fred. Borden) in Com., 5941, 6003 (iv).
Budget, The, 1626 (i).
Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 7998 (v).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).
French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173 (i).
Imperial Conference Secretariat, Formation of, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 403 (i).
Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8032 (v).
I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2810 (ii).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1102; in Com., 1133 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8766 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6283 (iv).
Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 5687 (iii); on M. for 2°, 6335 (iv).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5142 (iii); in Com., 7397 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Special Rep. of Com., 6399 (iv).
—— on M. for Com., 6468 (iv).
—— on order for Com., 6509; in Com., 6501, 6510 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8736 (v).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c., Ques. of Priv., 378 (i).
Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048 (v).
Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1442 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5457 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5951, 5977 (iv), 8755 (v).

—— (remarks) 5690 (iii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 234 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8777 (v).

'Toronto World', Ownership by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5998 (iv).

MACNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*

Hudson Bay Ry., Survey, Obstructions, &c. (remarks) 7187 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5091 (iii).

McALLISTER, Mr. D. H., *King's and Albert*

I.C.R. Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2308 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4879 (iii).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*

Budget, The, 1655 (i).

Port Dover Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3464 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5489 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (creosoted timber) 3453 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3461 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 6160; (Ottawa, water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c. (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland Relief (B. 134) 1°*, 3133 (ii).

Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Office Revenue per month, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1590 (i).

Grain Shipment from the West (M. for papers*) 1687 (i).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2675 (ii).

Petroleum Locations on Athabaska River, Reports *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3493 (ii).

R.N.W. M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Applications *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ques.) 1206 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreements with Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1686 (i).

Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of duty, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3492 (ii).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *West Kent.*

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6990 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6318 (iv).

Rondeau Park Forest, Removal of by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6944 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1174 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 875 (i); on M. for Com., 6431; in Com., 6500, (amt.) 6501; in Com., 6524; 6578, (amt.) 6580, agreed to (Y. 78; N. 77) 6587; in Com., 7265 (iv).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal (B. 136) 1°*, 3296 (ii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*

Committee on Standing Orders, 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 6605 (iv).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2756 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (M.) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7149 (iv).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Pardee) on M. for 2°, 7868 (v).

Mond Nickel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 92) 1°*, 1731 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1099 (i); in Com., 2258 (ii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 380; in Com., 1364 (i).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 380 (i); in Com., 2098 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton, North.*

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8775 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1245 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5925 (iii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2317 (ii).
Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2773 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M for 2°, 4343 (iii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 5679 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps. *re* Libel Suits (M. for copy) 656 (i).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Burk's Head) 979; (Pictou Island) 1000 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury and Queens.*
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3798 (ii); in Com., 7443 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *South Huron.*
Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6872 (iv); in Com., 7905 (v).
Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4413 (iii).
—— (remarks) 4928 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare, *re* Speech on Naval Bill, 5200 (iii).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7269 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *South Cape Breton.*
Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 882 (i); in Com., 6495, 6573 (iv).
Fisherman's Bait Association, Amounts paid per ton, &c. (Ques.) 1015 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c., (Ques.) 6799 (iv).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer (Ques.) 6798 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5844 (iii).
I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2864 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1237 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).
Ottawa and Quebec East Representation in the House of Commons, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1314 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, &c., Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3193 (ii).
Sydney Free Mail Delivery, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 1014 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3137 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*
Alberta Coal Areas, Estimated Total Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).
Blackfoot Indian Reserve, Proposed Lease (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).
—— Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7853 (v).
Budget, The, 1920 (i).
Canadian Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 227 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8487 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (licenses) Amt. (B. 143) 1° m., 3670 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).
Homestead pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c. (Ques.) 6935 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 2135 (ii); on M. for 2°, 5516 (iii).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2908 (ii).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representation re (Ques.) 641 (i).
Lethbridge Post Office Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
—— Cor. Reps, &c., with Depts. (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
—— Improved Facilities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7781 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).
—— (personal explanation) 8855 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 941 (i).
—— Total Revenue for ten months, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).
N.T. Ry., prop, Res., *re* Royal Commission (Mr. Lennox) on M. for Sup., 8285 (v).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurer) on M. for 2°, 4328 (iii).
Population, Method of estimating (Ques.) 4846 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5443 (iii).
Section 29, Tp. 9, Range 22, Application *re* Right of Way (M. for reps.*) 643 (i).
SUPPLY—
Indians—Man. (general expenses) 7853 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 582 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Rock Island) 947; (St. Roch) 829 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4276 (iii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4245 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4273 (iii).

Waterways Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U. S. (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Labelle Settlers Grievances (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).

Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *East Elgin.*

Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation (remarks) 1600 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4910 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ques.) 264 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Port Stanley Life Saving Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).

SUPPLY.

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 8518 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 695 (i).

Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *North Wellington.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3921 (ii).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 2100 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5661 (iii).

Ry Act (labourer's pay) Amt. (B. 39) 1° m., 386 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5463 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina*

Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus Relief (B 162) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

Brockville, Ottawa and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 160) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Budget, The, 1662 (i).

Edmonton, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 219) 1°*, 7975 (v).

Forster, James Alexander Hurst Relief (B. 221) 1°*, 8361 (v).

Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re* (Ques.) 2427 (ii).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1529 (i); in Com., 3139 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95, Rep. in Toronto 'World' *re* 'Round Robin,' Ques. of Priv., 4305 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertising in (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6147 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 885 (i); in Com., 6460 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8432 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1543 (i).

Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 4753 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6386 (iv).

MAYRAND, Mr. H., *Maskinonge.*

Saint Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s (B.59) 1°*, 1099 (i).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie*

Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1282 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7807 (v).

Homestead Patent for S.W. ¼ 18-19-20, 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against (Ques.) 8109 (v).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2049 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1231; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1266 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Sel. Com., 2908 (ii).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2548 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep of Com., 6087 (iv).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5087 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6970 (iv).

Norris, T. C., Payments to for 1908-9 (Ques.) 2718 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Negatived (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).

——— Disposal of Protest, &c. (ques. of priv.) 802 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6552 (iv).

Ry. Act (liability) Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).

Railways, Adjudication of Claims B. 151 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 6600 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7722 (v).

——— Ques. asked Min. of Public Works, 7695 (v).

Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7369 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427, 537 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 6104 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Pink Rock) 3400 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5966 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8081 (v.)

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup. 8343 (iv).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2039 (ii); 3°*, 8731 (v).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Cabano) 3879 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *North Grey.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) 5352 (iii)

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

B. C. Judges, Delay in Apptmts., on M. to adjn., 19 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 535 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ques.) 7514 (v).

Civil Service, Outside Service, Legislation *re* Reorganization (remarks) 6947 (iv).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7001 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7798 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 733 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1123 (i).

International Waterways Canal Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2679 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i).

N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 2495 (ii).

——— Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5593 (iii).

——— on M. to adjn. debate, 5597 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3210 (ii); on M. for 3°, 7545 (v).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5291 (iii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5333 (iii), 6138, 6242, 6351 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7107 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 574 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 543; (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (museum) 567 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging (new plant) 4769 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5954 (iv).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Budget, The, 1507 (i).

Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c. (Ques.) 1378 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111, (M.) to ref. back to Committee of the Whole, 4025 (iii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7805 (v).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, Ques. of Priv., 3937 (ii).
See "Race Track."

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Insect Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5639 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8460 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 126; 2° m., 499; (M.) to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

——— (B. 73) 1° m., 1362 (i); 2° m., 2040; in Com., 2153 (ii).

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Militia Stores, Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (M.) 8361 (v).

Race Track Gambling (B. 6) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 856, 914(i); on M. for Com., 6400, 6514, 6572, 7258; 3° m., 7270 (iv).

Race Track—Gambling Bill: Ques. of Priv. *re* Letter of Min. of Justice, 6715 (iv).

Senate, Abolition, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster) 1992 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7755 (v).
House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7779 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1416 (i).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c. (M. for copy*) 4315 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4913 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7126 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8094 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, The, (remarks) 47 (i).

All-Red Route, Rep. re Negotiations, Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).

Artillery Horses to Petawawa Camp, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent (M. for copy) 2298 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).

——— Lease to Messrs McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

Business of the Hse., Delay, &c. (remarks) 118 (i).

Canadian Navy. Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

——— Purchase of Vessels by Govt. (Ques.) 2930 (ii).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation of, Pension, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of (prop. res.) 142 (i).

Co-Operative Credit Societies Act (B. 26) 1° m., 340 (i); order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

——— Consideration of (remarks) 2710, 3205 (ii).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 870 (i).

Dom. Lands (licenses) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Magrath) on M. for 1°, 3671 (ii).

Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.(Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies (remarks) 3207 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 173; on M. for 2°, 757 (i).

French Treaty, Provision *re* Termination, (Ques.) 276 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3941 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., &c., 3555 (ii).

German Tariff, Agreement *re* Hay, &c. (remarks) 3832 (ii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 1363 (i).

'Hestia' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy (Ques.) 130 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5505 (iii).

Immigration Agents in France, Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Paul Wiallard (Ques.) 790 (i).

Imperial Defence Conference, Expenditure by Can. Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1022 (i).

——— Statement of Cost, Conversion into Canadian Currency (remarks) 856 (i).

——— Total Expenditure (Ques.) 639, 783 (i).

Insurance Bill, Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt. (Ques.) 786 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 506 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Japan Trade Commission, Cor., Rep., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston (M. for copies) 328 (i).

Judicial Business, Montreal District (M.) for Ret., 1792 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Additions to Board of Engineers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Quebec Water Lots, Sale to Private Individuals, &c. (Ques.) 430 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 640 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions, incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3142 (ii).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 641 (i).

Mails between G.B| and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1587 (i); in Com., 2714 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, and Postal Stations, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 1581 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for ret.) 1580 (i).

National Battlefields Commission, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).

N.T.Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

—— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 164 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1769 (i); on M. for 2°, 2991, Amt., 3022 (ii); Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095 (iii).

Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1546 (i).

Naval Defence Bill, on Inquiry for, 1100 (i).

Naval Ships, Purchase of by Govt., Details of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).
See 'Can. Navy.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, Cor. &c. (M. for copies) 1547 (i).

Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c. (Ques.) 1376 (i).

—— Disposal of by Govt. (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons (M. for sel. com.) 136 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 605 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Public Works in the Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets. Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 114 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Ques. of Order *re* Answer, 1534 (i).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1541 (i).

St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

—— Sale of to Private Individuals (Ques.) 625 (i).

St. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets. &c., *re* Repairs (M. for copy) 110 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c. (Ques.) 629 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Speaker Blanchet (M. for copies*) 2298 (ii).

Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal (remarks) 332 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 832 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Becancour) 3865, 3875 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3085 (ii).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES (Secretary of State) *Russell.*

Analytical Index to Hansard, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2138 (ii).

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. *re* Naturalization Commissioner (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c. (Ans.) 7515 (v).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 209) 1° m., 7181 (iv); in Com., 8381 (v).

Civil Service (census) Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7302 (iv).

Civil Service Apptmts., Number passing Examinations, &c. (Ans.) 2287 (ii).

Civil Service List (presented) 1730 (i).

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887, 910 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ans.) 2286 (ii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re* (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction (Ans.) 6938 (iv).

International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 381 (i).

MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES—*Con.*

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ans.) 849 (i).

Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ans.) 7516 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7287 (iv).,

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to (remarks) 3486 (ii).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ans.) 7514 (v).

Reynolds, Conductor, Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award (read) 4208 (iii).

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 337; Marine and Fisheries (printing) 252; Sec. of State (salaries) 337 (i).

Treaties with U.S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c. (Ans.) 269 (i).

Voters' Lists, Total Cost of Revision for Thunder Bay, &c. (Ans.) 629 (i).

Winding-up Act, Amt. B. 65 (Mr. Meighen) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 732 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4535 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1577 (i).

Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).

Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of (Ques.) 787 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Maisonneuve) 678; (Marieville) 679; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 953 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

National Park, Sask., Establishment of, Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4931 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4821, 5292 (iii).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1360 (i); in Com., 4753, 4840 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8047, 8427, 8588 (v).

St. Lawrence Power B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5412 (iii).

Sunday Postal Service at Winnipeg, Closing of P.O. (remarks) 2931 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *North Oxford.*

Budget, The, 2246 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts, 8657, (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6916 (iv), 7892 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3873, 3919 (ii).

Green, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7946, 8465 (v).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1124 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2052 (ii).

Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to ref, back to Sel. Com., 5235 (iii).

Naval Defence Bill, Ques. of Order *re* quoting King's Speech, 5100 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4832, 5309 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7268 (iv).

Reid, Ada Ann Relief (B. 158) 2° m, 5490 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8053 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5355 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 380 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Dredging (new plant) 4768 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv); in Com., 8095 (v).

Western Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 380 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy *re* (Ques.) 102 (i).

See 'Ry. B. 5.'

Bow River Coal Lands, &c. (M. for cor.*), 3170 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 180 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8625 (v).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2154 (ii).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2916 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 6055 (iv).

Ministers of the Crown and Public Gifts (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2° (amt.), 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191 (iii); in Com., 7396 (v).

—— Notice of Amt., 5102 (iii).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 615 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6595 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 96; 2° m., 480; Neg. (Y. 107; N. 60) 494 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii); 6236 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5963 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Alberta Coal Areas, Total Tonnage of, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).

Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c. (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Becher, Chas. D. T., Homestead Patent, &c. (Ans.) 7290 (iv).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Brandon Agency, Number of Persons employed, Absence, &c. (Ans.) 2950 (ii).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ans.) 6182 (iv).

B. C. Ry. Belt, Govt. Title to Beds of Streams, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

See 'Water Power.'

Buffaloes: *See* 'National.'

Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents (remarks) 1101 (i).

Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instruction to Capt. Jemmett (Ans.) 5499 (iii).

Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage (Ans.) 5000, 5561 (iii).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund of Money *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Dom. Lands, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenue (Ans.) 3291 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Man., Sask., Total Area of Arable Lands (Ans.) 2925 (ii).

See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,'

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3875, 3916 (ii).

Doukhobors, Comparison with h. m. for Dauphin (remarks) 5532 (iii).

Emigration to U. S. from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston (Ans.) 432 (i).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ans.) 268 (i).

See Immigration, &c.

Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Construction of Roads (Ans.) 636 (i).

Gervais, Mrs. C. Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4617 (iii).

Grain Trade: *See* "Western."

G. T. R. Ry. and Land Sales along the Line (Ans.) 1966 (ii).

Half-Breed Scrip, Commission *re* (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

—— Location since Jan. 1910 (Ans.) 6937 (iv).

Half Sections in Man., N. ½, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amounts collected (Ans.) 3678 (ii).

See "Wood."

Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c. (Ans.) 1784 (i).

Homestead Fees, Amount collected in Alberta and Sask. (Ans.) 848 (i).

Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).

Homestead Patent for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20 W. 4th Meridian, Issue of (Ans.) 6936 (iv).

Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

—— Total Acreage sold since 1908 (Ans.) 275 (i).

—— Total Acreage, Moneys received, &c. (Ans.) 2951 (ii).

Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties (Ans.) 4080 (iii).

Homesteads for Women (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8489 (v).

Hudson Bay Ry., Land Sales, Number of Acres (Ans.) 2144 (ii).

Hydrographic Survey, Irrigation Rep. (presented) 5103 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 2133 (ii); 2° m., 5502; in Com., 5532, 5802, 5822 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8400 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amt.—*Con.*
——— in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5540 (iii).
Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 102 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Wiallard (Ans.) 790 (i).
Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number (Ans.) 128 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number of (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910 (Ans.) 7872 (v).
Immigrants and S.S. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).
——— Letter from Supt. (read) 8579 (v).
Immigrants located on Bay of Quinté Ry., Number, &c. (Ans.) 7872 (v).
Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations (remarks) 6946 (iv).
——— Treatment of at Halifax (remarks) 7977, 8477 (v).
Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 638 (i).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing (Ans.) 2294 (ii).
Immigration Official Dr. Lavoie, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8109 (v).
Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials (remarks) 6610 (iv).
Indian Act Amt. (B. 141) 1° m., 3390 (ii); 2° m., 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).
Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ans.) 6179 (iv).
See 'School,' &c.
Indian Lands Sale in Alberta, Disposal of by Govt., on M. (Mr. Herron) to adjn., 120 (i).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Terms, &c., of Sale (Ans.) 635 (i).
Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c. (Ans.) 784 (i).
Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re* (Ans.) 6390 (iv).
Interior and Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 186) 1° m., 5886 (iii); in Com., 6201 (iv).
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
La Butte Indian School, Payments to (Ans.) 6179 (iv).
Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 125) 1° m., 2485 (ii); 2° m., 5921 (iii); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).
Leech, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*
Lilly, Wm., Homestead Preemption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ans.) 6936 (iv).
McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 443 (i).
McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ans.) 5890 (iii).
McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office, &c. (Ans.) 4081 (iii).
Manitoba Federal Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ans.) 4310 (iii).
Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ans.) 4309 (iii).
National Park, Sask., Disposition of Buffalo Herd (Ans.) 790 (i).
Naval Defence, Lands available for defraying Cost (Ans.) 1367 (i).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4835, 5294 (iii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations (Ans.) 3169 (ii).
Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 851 (i), 2718 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Damages, Fiat, &c. (Ans.) 640 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1563 (i).
Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53, 54, Terms of Sale (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
Oka River Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8582 (v).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Land Grant (Ans.) 1376 (i).
——— Disposal of Lands by Govt. (Ans.) 1535 (i).
Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement (Ans.) 4313 (iii).
——— Total Acreage of Arable Land, &c. (Ans.) 2925 (ii).
Peigan Indian Agency, Winding up Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Peigan Reserve, Sale of Lands (Ans.) 6936 (iv).
Petroleum Fields in N.W., Royalty Charges, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).
Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re* (Ans.) 3493 (ii).
Pincher Creek sub-Land Agency (remarks) 8840 (v).
Pitt Meadows, Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c. (Ans.) 274 (i).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest (Ans.) 432 (i).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ans.) 1369 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations, prop. Res., 3057 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6194, 6372 (iv).

R.N.W.M. Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Corporations (Ans.) 1206 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5447 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation *re* Charges, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7071 (iv).

—— Claims *re* Speculators, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

—— Inquiry for Report (Mr. Bradbury) 5762 (iii).

—— Investigation *re* Surrender, &c. (Ans.) 2296 (ii).

—— Instruction to Chief Justice Howell, on Inquiry for Ret., 2636 (ii).

—— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor (explanation) 1963 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Mr. W. Frank (Ans.) 7065 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7527 (v).

—— Surrender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 433 (i).

School Lands, Sale of, Conditions, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 5930 (iii).

See 'Indians.'

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price paid, Additional Cost (Ans.) 1003 (i).

—— Distribution to Homestead Holders in Quarter Section 24 (Ans.) 1196 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ans.) 3732 (ii).

—— Amt. *re* Issue of (Ans.) 133 (i).

—— Issue of to Relatives (remarks) 8581 (v).

—— Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 107 (i), 2144 (ii).

See 'Volunteers.'

SS. Passengers: *See* 'Immigrants.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 344, 415 (i); Interior (contingencies) 8194; (salaries) 8194 (v).

Dom. Lands (printing, &c.) 8493; (salaries) 8489; (timber protection) 8492 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207; (salaries) 8494 (v).

Indians—Alta. (Peigan reserve) 7856 (v).

Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7858 (v).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7837; (schools) 7861 (v).

Indians—Man. (annuities, &c.) 7848; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (general expenses) 7853; (grist mills) 7853; (live stock) 7848;

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(medical attendance) 7849; (Sioux) 7853; (supplies) 7849 (v).

Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys)) 7837 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox island wharf) 7847; (relief, &c.) 7847 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 427 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii); (adminstration salaries) 8487 (v).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms, &c. (Ans.) 2291 (ii).

Surveys in Township Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ans.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3391 (ii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, Expenditure re (Ans.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

U.S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens (remarks) 6943 (iv).

Veteran Land Grants, Number taken up, Assignments, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

See 'S. A.'

Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 4996 (iii) 2°., 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072 8389 (v).

Wakefield, A. G., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 5890 (iii).

Walton, Geo., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3734 (ii).

Warwick, Thos. G., Value of Improvements on Entry (Ans.) 275 (i).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C. (B. 187) 1° m., 5887 (iii); in Com., 6373 (iv); 8135, 8706 (v).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber Lands, &s. (Ans.) 844 (i).

Watson, R. J., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2488 (ii).

Western Grain Trade, Deputations *re* (remarks) 8584 (v).

Western Grain Trade, Over-classification of Grades (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8344 (v).

—— Over-classification of Grades (remarks) 8363 (v).

Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mill and Trading Co. (Ans.) 2292 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. FRANK—*Con.*

Whitford, James, Issue of Scrip, Location, &c. (Ans.) 6935 (iv).

Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel in Twp. 50, &c. (Ans.) 4079 (iii).

See 'Hay.'

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 888 (i).

I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2901 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 1571 (i).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Budget, The (remarks) 2246 (ii).

Campbellford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).

Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908 (Ques.) 2285 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5079 (iii).

Parcel Post Delivery, Signing for, &c. (remarks) 3682 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6588 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Discussion, in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 930 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3850 (ii).

Trent Canal, Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

U.S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada (remarks) 4712 (iii).

PAPINEAU, Mr. L. J., *Beauharnois.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Request *re* Indemnity (Ques.) 5560 (iii).

Ry. Act (fires) Amt. (B. 48) 1° m., 621 (i); 2° m., 2032 (ii).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Agricultural Bulletins, Number distributed, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7282 (iv).

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ques.) 1019 (i).

Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1193 (i).

Budget, The, 1929 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 742 (i).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Can.*

Historial Manuscripts Commission, Members, Results, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5823 (iii).

Immigration Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re* (M. for papers*) 1022 (i).

Immigration Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 101 (i).

Immigration Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan. 1908 (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).

Imperial Naval Conference, Distribution of French Edition (Ques.) 276 (i).

I. C. R. Board of Commissioners, Names, Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

——— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 128, 164 (i).

——— Employees, Number in 1907-8-9 (Ques.) 835 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4678 (iii).

Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4315 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6529 (iv).

St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3936 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1425 (i).

Year Book, Expenditure *re*, French Distribution (Ques.) 1020 (i).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) 2° m., 7868 (v).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6877 (iv); in Com., 7912 (v).

Criminal Code (ore thefts) Amt. B. 85 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 2167 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Haggart) *re* Vote of Sol. Gen., 8168 (v).

Mond Nickel Patent Relief B. 92 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., 3090 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 7263 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 2221 (ii); in Com., 5317' 5334 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251; on Senate Amts., 8653 (v).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 8000 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. Wm., (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*

Budget, The, 2061 (ii).

Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6953 (iv).

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ans.) 812 (i).

Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10 &c. (Ans.) 8109 (v).

Dunnville, Postal and Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 1009 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7828 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 190; on M. for 2°, 776 (i).

German Trade Relations, Value of Exports, &c. (Ans.) 261, 633 (i).

Grain Exports from Montreal for past Ten Years, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).

Herring Fish transported to U.S., &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i.

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ans.) 169 (i).

LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 641 (i).

Machinery, Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ans.) 1015 (i).

Mahone, Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).

Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c., (Ans.) 836 (i).

School Slates and Lead Pencils imported into Canada, Quantity, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 6506 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 243; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8803 (v); (salaries) 1359 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 826 (i).

Trade Relations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 8753 (v).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8100 (v).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1378 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil*

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6643 (iv).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Grenville Station to Grenville Village Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for (Ques.) 131 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7959 (v).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3151 (ii).

Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 3183 (ii); (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5689 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4863 (iii).

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for (Ques.) 4128 (iii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

——— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens, &c. (read) 5625 (iii).

Ottawa, Govt. Buildings (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ques.) 1009 (i).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. (B. 178) 1°*, 5759 (iii); in Com., 8599 (v).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4842 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4233; Ste. Croix) 4237; (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, &c. (prop. res.) 1380 (i).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

I.C.R., Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2313 (ii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 5773 (iii).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8387 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5841 (iii).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4639 (iii).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5771 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7375; (cold storage) 7363, 7384 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*

Apples grown in Prov. of Quebec (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 5651 (iii).

Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief (B. 157) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

PRICE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co's. incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1285 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5082 (iii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6532 (iv).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Green, James Albert Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5103 (iii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3195 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Public Works) St. John City and County, N.B.

Archives, Protection *re* Fire (Ans.) 1019 (i).

Arctic Expedition Tablet, re Authority for placing in H. of C. (Ans.) 1596 (i).

——(corrected answer) 1730 (i).

Armouries in Can., on Inquiry (Mr. Edwards) for Ret., 8742 (v).

Armouries and Drill Halls in Man., Purchase and Locations, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, &c. (Ans.) 1017 (i).

Bathurst Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).

See 'Dredging.'

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to Date (Ans.) 1179 (i), 3676 (ii).

Boivin, Elzéar, Payment re Telegraph Construction (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Brandon Drill Hall, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 1777 (i).

Budget, The, Ques. of Order re Kensington Wharf, 2109 (ii).

See 'Kensington.'

Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments re (Ans.) 7870 (iv).

Burlington Beach Protection Piers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3856 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co's. incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger (Ans.) 1969 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease *re* Lands and Timber, &c. (Ans.) 2717 (ii).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Columbia River Banks, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Dalhousie Port Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ans.) 631 (i).

Digby Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).

Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3873, 3925 (ii).

Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie (Ans.) 6508 (iv).

See 'Bathurst.'

Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4253 (iii).

See 'Govt. Dredges.'

Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 105 (i).

Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy (Ans.) 106 (i).

Dry Dock Subsidies B. 229 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 8695 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments by P. W. Dept. (Ans.) 2718 (ii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Papers, 2029 (ii).

Fighting Island Channel Improvement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).

Forty-ninth Regiment, Appmt. of Commanding Officer, &c. (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Fraser River Channel, Depth of Dredging, &c (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Protection *re* Inundations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4213 (iii).

Gasperaux River Dredging, Payments to Mar. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2487 (ii).

—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (remarks) 2490 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3569 (ii).

—— Papers laid on Table, 8734 (v).

Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, &c., Reply to Mr. German, 3986 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1536 (i).

Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of struction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2185 (ii).

Grand Bend Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contracts *re* Kaministiquia River (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

Grimsby Post Office Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 929 (i), 8816 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3672 (ii).

Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction of (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6139 (iv).

Heating and Lighting Contracts *re* Public Buildings (Ans.) 1203 (i).

Hecla Island Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).

'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work (Ans.) 1967 (ii).

I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1132 (i); on M. for 3°, 2210 (ii).

Interest Act Amt. B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2672; in Com., 3151 (ii).

Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 4514 (iii).

'J. G Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

Kensington Wharf, Negotiations *re* Purchase of (Ans.) 1783, 1970 (i).

—— Recommendations re (Ans.) 3469, 3737 (ii).

King, Mr., Astronomer's Residence: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works—Buildings—Ottawa.'

Labour Dept., Rent of Y.M.C.A. Building (Ans.) 627 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

Lachute Public Building, Completion of, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— (remarks) 3137 (ii), 5690 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Lake Nipissing flooded Lands, Compensation *re*, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c. (Ans.) 850 (i).

Lambton Barracks, Appropriations *re* (Ans.) 271 (i).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3165 (ii).

Lemieux, Ed., Payments to for Wood (Ans.) 8838 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 641 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 583 (i).

L'Institut de Notre Dame des Missions incorp. B. 80 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3148 (ii).

Loggie, Messrs. A. & R., Total Payments to (Ans.) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).
See 'Dredging.'

Long Sault Rapids, Deputation *re* Building of Dams (remarks) 2060 (ii).

McLean, A., Payments for Sale of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2690 (ii).

Maritime Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

—— Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 849 (i).
See 'Gaspereaux.'

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2768 (ii).

Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of (Ans.) 99 (i).

Mayes Contract, Charges *re* Graft (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 589 (i).

Michipicoten Dock, Preparation of Plans, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 783 (i).

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ans.) 386 (i).

—— Fire Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Montreal River Improvements, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 1014 (i).

Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Mud Lake Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 3294 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1156 (i).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 103) 1° m., 2135 (ii); in Com., 5674 (iii), 6202, 6963 (iv).

Nechaco River, &c., Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4753, 4820, 5279, 5291 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., &c., Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6141 (iv).

—— List *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 8825 (v).

New Westminster Dom. Land, Expiration of Lease, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 789 (i).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting (Ans.) 4078 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

—— Names of Employees, &c., Total Expenses (Ans.) 4079 (iii).

Oakville Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4810 (iii), 6149 (iv).

Okanagan Lake Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* speaking in Committee, 4798 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Design Competition (Ans.) 6180 (iv).

—— Canadian Stone *re* Construction (Ans.) 5107 (iii).

—— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes and Rent, &c. (Ans.) 1010 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Militia,' 'Rideau Hall.'

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8614 (iv).

Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarac Wood (Ans.) 7871, 8834 (v).

Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

Pender Island Canal, Depth, Length, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2427 (ii).

Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 3489 (ii).

Pink Rock Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i), 3397 (ii), 4734 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).

—— Par. in 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 3739 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order, 3743 (ii).

Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6507 (iv).

Port Arthur Dry Dock, Subsidy Grant, &c. (remarks) 5003 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3136 (ii).

See 'Dry Docks.'

Port Bruce Harbour, Total Expenditure from 1904-9 (Ans.) 264 (i).

Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c. (Ans.) 1968 (ii).

Port Credit Harbour, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6127 (iv).

Port Dover Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3465 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, N.S., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 4082 (iii).

Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4513 (iii).

Port Stanley Life Saving Station(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).

Potvin, P. A., Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).

Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Public Works Advertising, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8118 (v).

See 'Newspapers.'

Public Works, Deptl. Rep (presented) 7 (i).

Public Works Employees, and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).

Public Works Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 2293 (ii).

Pulp Co., Payment of Tolls *re* passing through Booms (Ans.) 7871 (v).

See 'Oyamel.'

Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ans.) 4309, 4846 (iii).

Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7872, 8238 (v).

Residents in H. of C and Senate., on Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).

Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Committee (M.) 376 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8428, 8588 (v).

Return, on Inquiry for (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

—— on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7692 (v).

See 'Pink Rock,' &c.

Rideau Hall Furniture, on Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).

Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputations *re* Claims of McLaren Co. (Ans.) 1777 (i).

River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cors., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 117 (i).

Rondeau Harbour, Removal of Forest by Provl. Govt. (remarks) 6945 (iv).

Ross Rifles Mark II**, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

R.M.C. Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 381 (i).

—— Servants' Quarters, Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 263 (i).

Royal Mint, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 103 (i).

Rural Free Mail Delivery Boxes, Changes in Design (Ans.) 1783 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4263 (iii).

St. Andrews Rapids Construction, Division of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 8239 (v).

St. Clair River Sand, Lease to Detroit Co. by Ont. Govt. (remarks) 5821 (iii).

Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 112 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

St. John Harbour, N.B., Wharfs and Buildings (B. 204) 1° m., 6934 (iv); in Com., 8120 (v).

——— Courtenay Bay and G. T. P. Terminals, Contract, &c. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 3156 (ii).

St. John River Channel Survey, on Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv); 8118, 8580, 8737 (v).

St. John Valley Ry., Construction by Govt. (remarks) 123 (i).

St. Johns, Que. Govt. Land occupied by Militia (Ans.) 3494 (ii).

St. Lawrence Channel, Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan (Ans.) 841 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5377 (iii); 6231, 6342, 6665; on M. for 3°, 7252 (iv).

——— Compliance with Act of Incorporation (Ans.) 7869, 8108, 8659 (v).

——— Rep. of Engineers laid on Table, 5557, 5617 (iii).

St. Maurice Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c. (Ans.) 5931 (iv).

Ste Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of Property, &c. (Ans.) 787 (i).

Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).

Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Decision *re* Subsidy (remarks) 3833 (ii), 5278 (iii). *See* " Dry Docks."

Sawdust Wharf: *See* ' Richibucto.'

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 106 (i).

Selkirk Wharf, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt. Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5698 (iii).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Macleod) 8189; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Fernie) 8190; (Chilliwack) 8190; (Greenwood); 8191; (Vancouver) 8191; (Williamshead) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 8193; (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182; (Winnipeg) 8184 (v).

Public Works—Buildings Mar. Provs. (renewals) 596 (i).

Public Works — Buildings — N.B. (Bathurst) 580; (Fairville) 580; (Fredericton) 581; (Grand Falls) 582; (Hartland) 583; (Hillsborough) 587; (Moncton) 591; (Partridge Island) 595; (Tracadie) 596 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Halifax) 574; (Lawlor's Island) 576; (Lunenburg) 576; (North Sydney) 577; (Parrsboro) 577; (Wolfville) 579 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Dresden) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174; (Fergus) 7178 (iv); (Gananoque) 7495; (Goderich) 7496; (Guelph) 7496; (Guelph armouries) 8169; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Kingston) 7505; (Leamington) 7506; (Listowel) 7506; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8169; (Parkhill) 8177; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177; (Toronto) 8178; (Uxbridge) 8178, 8185 (Wallaceburg) 8178; (Waterloo) 8178; (Whitby) 8179 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 416, 536 (i); (deptl. buildings, new) 548 (i), 7166 (iv); (Eastern Block) 571 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (military stores) 597; (museum) 566 (i); (National Art Gallery) 6158 (iv); (Parliament Driveway) 8173; (peat testing) 8177; (Printing Bureau) 8170; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8193 (v); (Royal Mint) 557 (i); (Senate re-decorating) 8176 (v); (standardizing room) 572 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 580 (Summerside) 580 (i).

Public Works—Quebec— (Arthabaska) 661; (Aylmer) 661; (Chicoutimi) 662; (Fraserville) 662; (generally, repairs) 662; (Grosse Isle) 662, 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Lévis) 668; (Maisonneuve) 670; (Marieville) 679; (Mégantic) 700; (Montreal P.O.) 700; (Montreal, postal station) 704; (Plessisville) 704; (Quebec customs) 824; (Quebec hospital) 823; (Quebec immigration sheds) 823, 926, 959; (Quebec observatory) 823; (Quebec, ordnance stores) 967; (Quebec P. O.) 823 (i); (Rigaud) 8814 (v); (Roberval) 927; (Rock Island) 946; (St. Henri) 952; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 952; (St. Lambert) 955; (St. Roch) 828; (Shawenegan Falls) 948; (Three Rivers) 959; (Westmount) 963 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (rents, &c.) 8193 (v).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (generally) 6138 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4738, 4755; (vessel repairs) 4731 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Man. (generally) 6137 (iv); (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (generally) 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Ont. (generally) 4809 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6124 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Sask. (new plant) 4771 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta — (Athabaska channel) 4272; (North Saskatchewan River channel) 4273 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Athalmer) 4276; (Bamfield) 4276; (Campbell) 4276; (Chilliwack) 4299; (Columbia river) 4277; (Coquitlam)

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

4291; (Fort George Canyon) 4727; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Lockport) 4715; (Masset) 4715; (Nitinat lake) 4715; (Nootka) 4716; (Porcher island) 4716; (Port Moody) 4728; (Queen Charlotte) 4716; (Serpentine river) 4305; (Skeena river) 5608; (Spallumcheen river) 4718; (Stewart wharf) 4726 (iii); (Vancouver) 6122; (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Yakoun river) 4728 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (bridge work) 4731; (surveys) 5719 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4254; (Gimli) 4263; (Lake Winnipeg wharfs) 4262; (Red River) 4266 (iii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 6103 (iv); (St. Andrew's Rapid Lock) 8819 (v); (St. Laurent) 5255; (Winnipeg beach) 4267 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5608 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v); (Bayside) 2697; (Buctouche) 2697; (Campbellton) 2703; (Cape Bald) 2704; (Cape Tormentine) 2706; (Chance Harbour) 2706; (creosoted timber) 3452; (Cummings Cove) 2706; (Dalhousie) 2707; (Dipper harbour) 3391; (Dorchester) 3391; (generally) 3392; (Kouchibouguac) 3392; (Lameque) 3393; (Leonardville) 3393; (Lorneville) 3393; (Mace's bay) 3394; (Moncton) 3394; (Neguac) 3395; (New Mills) 3395; (Partridge Island) 3450; (Petit Rocher) 3396; (Pink Rock) 3397; (Pointe du Chene) 3427; (Quaco) 3427; (Richibucto) 3428, 3438; (St. Andrews) 3450 (ii); (St. John) 6106 (iv); (St. John harbour) 3450; (St. John tributaries) 3446; (St. John wharf property) 3451; (Sackville) 3448; (Seal Cove) 3449; (Shediac) 3449; (Shippigan) 3450; (Sibley) 3475; (Tracadie) 3452; (Traynor's Cove) 3452 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W. Ters. (generally) 4276 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 976; (Arichat) 977; (Black Point) 977; (Blue Rocks Island) 977; (Bluff Head) 977; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Broad Cove) 995; (Brooklyn) 978; (Brule) 979; (Burk's Head) 979 (i); (Centreville) 8817 (v); (Chapel Cove) 985; (David's Cove) 985; (Deep Brook) 986; (Delap's Cove) 986; (Delorey's Beach) 986; (Devil's Island) 986; (Digby) 986; (Diligent) 986; (Dover) 989; (Dublin) 990; (Duncan Cove) 990; (Eastern passage) 990; (Economy) 985; (Fox Island) 990; (generally, repairs, &c.) 992; (Gulf shore) 991; (Habitant River) 992; (Hampton) 992; (Joggin's Mines) 995; (Judique) 995; (Kingsport) 995; (LaHave) 995; (Lake Ainslie) 995; (Leitche's Creek) 995; (Liscombe) 995; (Litchfield) 995; (Little Anse) 995; (Little River) 996; (Little Tancook) 996; (Lower Argyle) 996; (McNair's Cove) 996; (Meteghan) 996; (Middle Island) 999; (Mira River) 999; (New Harbour) 999; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 999; (Owl's Head) 1000; (Parker's Cove) 1000; (Pictou Island) 1000; (Pinckney) 1158 (i); (Pine Brook) 8816 (v); (Piper's Cove) 1158; (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Porter's Lake) 1161; (Port Hood) 1161; (Port Joli) 1164; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1164; (Saw Pit) 1176; (Shelburne) 1176; (South Cove) 1177; (South Ingonish) 1177; (Spanish Bay) 1177; (Swim's Point) 1178; (Sydney Mines) 1178; (Tenecape) 1178; (The Wharfs) 1179; (Three-Fathom) 1179; (Toney River) 1179; (Tusket Wedge) 1179; (Upper Prospect) 1179; (Upper Washabuck) 1179; (West Advocate) 1179; (West Baccaro) 1180; (West Dublin) 1180; (Yarmouth) 1191 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont.—(Blanche river) 3458; (Brockville) 3455; (Burlington) 3456; (Byng inlet) 3459; (Christian island) 3467; (Collingwood) 3467; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835; (Goderich) 3468; (Grand Bend) 3468; Gravenhurst) 3468; (Haileybury) 3468; (Juniper island) 3469; (Kensington wharf) 3469; (Latchford) 3471; (Lion's Head) 3470; (McGregor's creek) 3470; (Martin island) 3474; (Michipicoten) 3471; (Picnic islands) 3457 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 6101 (iv); (Port Burwel) 3471; (Port Hope) 3472; (Port Stanley) 3472; (Providence bay) 3457; (Rainy river dam) 3472; (Rondeau harbour 3474; (St. Lawrence river channel) 3833; (Sault Ste. Marie) 3474 (ii), 5608 (iii); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv); (Toronto improvements) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii); (Victoria) 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v); (Wiarton) 3475 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Belfast pier) 2693; (Belle river) 2693; (Brudenell) 2693; (China Point) 2694; (Cove Head) 2694; (generally) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Lennox Island) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (New London) 2695; (Port Selkirk) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2696; (Summerside) 2697; (Tignish) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3862; (Becancour) 3865, 3875; (Bic) 3871; (Cabano) 3879; (Cap a l'Aigle) 3881; (Cap de Chatte) 3889; (Carleton) 3885; (Chateauguay) 3886; (Chicoutimi) 3886; (Contrecoeur) 3889; (Doucet's Landing) 3890; (Father Point) 3891; (Fort William) 3891; (Gaspé) 3892; (Godfroy) 3898; (Grand Mechin) 3900; (Grand Riviere) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3904; Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Isle Verte) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Lake Aylmer) 3907; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii); (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Le l'etit Debarquement) 3907; (Les Eboulements) 3907 (ii); (Lévis) 6102 (iv); (Malbaie) 3907; (Matane) 3907; (Montebello) 3908; (Murray Bay) 3908; (Natashquan) 3909; (New Carlisle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3912; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3913 (ii); (Pointe aux Trembles) 4210; (Richelieu river) 4212; (Rimouski) 4210; (Rivière du

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Loup) 4227; (Riviére Ouelle) 4211; (Rivière aux Vases) 4210; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (St. André de Kamouraska) 4228; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232 (iii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234; (Ste. Croix) 4235; (St. Denis) 4235; (St. Joseph de Sorel) 4246; (Saguenay) 4221; (Shigawake) 4227; (Sorel wharf) 4246; (Tadousac) 4246; (Three Rivers) 4247; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5720, 5724 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain lake) 4272 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Yukon (Lewes and Yukon rivers) 4730 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monument) 6158; (Dale, Sydney J.) 6167; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6163; (engineering branch) 6163 (iv); (engineering branch, salaries) 5720 (iii); (International Commission, N.B.) 6163; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6159; (Ottawa, water-storage dams) 6162; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6161 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—(Dom., generally) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N. B. (Courtenay Bay Marsh road) 6151; (St. John-St. Leonard) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. (Chapeau) 6150 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 6149; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; (Limerick Gravelburg) 6154 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B. C. (Arrow Lakes) 5614 (iii); (Kamloops-Okanagan) 6156 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alberta (generally) 5614 (iii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Chatham diversion) 2881 (ii).

Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8836 (iv).

Toney River: *See* 'Boat,' &c.

Toronto Barracks, Site on Humber River, Disposal of (Ans.) 3167 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ans.) 3735 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4251 (iii).

Toronto Harbour Extension, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2929 (ii).

Tremblay, Payments *re* Purchase of Wood (Ans.) 8836 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Trent Canal: *See* 'Couchiching.' 'Lakefield.'

Veilleue, Charles, Payments to (Ans.) 8837 (v).

Victoria Immigration Building, Total Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1369 (i).

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B. C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8446 (v).

Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment *re* Purifying (Ans.) 131 (i).

Weymouth Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4789, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).

Wharfs transferred to P. W. Dept., Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).

Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Building, &c. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4239 (iii).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Winnipeg Beach Pier, Contract *re* (Ans.) 7239 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).

Winnipeg Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3865 (ii).

Wolfe Island Wharf, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 3462 (ii), 6164 (iv).

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *North Perth.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5428 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, &c., 3542 (ii).

Grain Exports from Montreal, for ten years, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8641 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i).
See 'Labour.'

Immigration Act Amt. B 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537, 5826 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 5541 (iii).

Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers (remarks) 209 (i).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 519 (i).

——— (potatoes) Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 807 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., on Annual Stmnt., 2814 (ii).
——— Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 205 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8765 (v).
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5764 (iii).
Kemptville Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).
See 'Hours.'
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 4517 (iii).
Long Sault Rapids Dam, Application *re* (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— Deputation *re* Building a Dam (remarks) 2060 (ii).
——— Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 5933 (iv).
See 'St. Lawrence B. 115.'
Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, &c., on M. for Sup., 5589 (iii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6281 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Resignation of Mr. Lumsden, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint Com., 2950 (ii).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4947 (iii); in Com., 7442 (v).
Naval Defence Bill (remarks) 855 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Pet. of Right, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copy, 1577 (i).
Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7675 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5329 (iii); 6230, 6354 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).
——— Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529, (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7373; (farm bulletins) 7377 (iv).
Customs—Outside Ports (Contingencies) 8804 (v).
Justice—Administration of (N.W. stipendiary magistrate) 8799 (v).
Labour (Industrial Disputes Act) 8799; (technical education) 8800 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 7496 (v); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 428; Que. (Grosse Isle) 666; (Maisonneuve) 674 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provinces (dredging) 5608 (iii).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Sask. and Alta. (generally) 5614 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton shops) 2938 (ii).
R.N.W.M. Police (rifle ranges) 8802 (v).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).
Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5956, 6000 (iv).
Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1079 (i).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell (Ques.) 3735 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 2929 (ii).

REID, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*

Restigouche Boom Co. (B. 150) 1°*, 4402 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*

Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4310 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 6929 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt (motors) Amt. B. 75 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 8732 (v).
Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6627 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8774 (v).
I.C.R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1125; in Com. (amt.) 1130 (i).
I.C. Ry., Dismissals by Board of Management, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).
——— Passes alleged to be Stolen, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3292 (ii).
——— Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, Date of leaving and arrival (M. for ret.*) 3171 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2907 (ii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1223 (i).
Machinery Steel, Quantity imported for 1907-8 (Ques.) 1015 (i).
N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names and Payments, &c. (Ques.) 4516 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Names of Employees, Total Expenses in operating, &c. (Ques.) 4078 (iii).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4513 (iii).
Public Accounts Com. and N.T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 1380 (i).

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3292 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Naval Service (maintenance) 8503 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3397 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Broad Cove) 995; (Breen's Pond) 977; (Burk's Head) 983; (Diligent) 986; (generally, repairs, &c.) 993; (Gulf shore) 991; (Northport) 999; (Nyanza) 1000 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 2877; (highways) 2882; (Moncton shops) 2936; (new machinery) 2942; (Pintsch gas) 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c. (Ques.) 1370 (i).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2767 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., West Shore, Memorials, &c., *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5501 (iii).

P.E.I. Tunnel Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 285 (i).

——— Winter Communication, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Copies, 3199 (ii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Budget, The, 1842 (i).

Civil Servants in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 845 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. White) for O.Cs., 3563 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4036 (iii).

Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 183) 1°*, 5886 (iii).

Royal Guardians Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 2329 (ii); in Com., 7256 (iv).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*

Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 172 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8465 (v).

N. T. Ry., Accidents *re* Explosives, Circular *re* Caution, &c. (Ques.) 4512 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5362 (iii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, Prices paid for Sites, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7297; 7308 (iv).

Clear Lake, Application to raise the Water Level (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874 (ii).

Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands (M. for cor.*) 3170 (ii).

Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c. (M. for cor.) 5502 (iii).

G. T. P. Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re* (Ques.) 3159 (ii).

Homesteads for Women, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5548 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Man. Govt. (M. for copies) 644 (i).

——— Legislation *re* (Ques.) 131 (i).

Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3619 (ii).

Railway Commission Board, Vacancy *re* Mr. Greenway's Death, Filling of (Ques.) 131 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 226 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8478 (v).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 216 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8043; in Com., 8424 (v).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).

——— Reserve, Removal of Squatters (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6198 (iv).

Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Number of Warrants issued, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Interior (salaries) 7767 (v).

Dom. Lands (salaries) 8488; (timber protection) 8491 (v).

Indians, Man., (annuities, &c.) 7848; (hospitals) 7850; (live stock) 7848; (supplies, &c.) 7849 (v).

Militia (arms, &c.) 8558; (properties) 8571 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3069 (ii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry commission) 3128 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res (Mr. Perley) 1400 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6382 (iv); in Com., 8073 (v).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).
Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3437 (ii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny*
Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 51) 1°*, 782 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4570 (iii).
Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6580 (iv).

ROY. Mr. E., *Dorchester.*
Budget, The, 1678 (i).
Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates, and French Language (remarks) 8240 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1260 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 507 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4667 (iii).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Croix) 4237 (iii).

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *East Toronto.*
Railway Act Amt. B. 145 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8419 (v).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. on Civil Service Bill, 6958 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (experimental farms) 7350 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6678 (iv).
Immigration (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7177 (iv); (Guelph) 7500; (Mitchell) 7507 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert*
Naval Defence B., Ques. of Priv., 5502 (iii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 782 (i); in Com., 4752, 4814, 4818, 4834, 5235, 5279 (iii).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4753 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Alien Labourers on Rys. (remarks) 8577 (v).
Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 6004 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Canadians entering U.S., Action of U.S. Immigration Agents, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 1101 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7299 (iv).
Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7917; on M. for 3°, 7980 (v).
Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3917 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William and Port Arthur, Charges *re* (remarks) 5933 (iv).
Grain Trade, Terminal Elevator Co., Tel. (read) 8240 (v).
See 'Western.'
Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5547, 5838 (iii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5924; in Com., 5926 (iii).
Insects, Pests, Diseases B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5652 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7952, 8465 (v).
Jones, Hon. L. M. and Hon. F. T. Frost, Apptmts, *re* Senate (Ques.) 2189 (ii).
Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep .of Com., 2906 (ii).
Manitoba Subsidy *re* School Lands (Ques.) 4310 (iii).
N.T.Ry. Commisison, Number of Members, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 630 (i).
N.T.Ry., Wheat Shipments, &c. (Ques.) 1206 (i).
Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4012 (iii).
Naval Defence, Lands available for Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7320 (iv).
Souris Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
S. A. War, Expenditures for Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 632 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7756 (v); (Dom. exhibitions) 7387; (experimental farms) 7341 (iv), 7765 (v).
Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (experimental farms) 227; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 (i).
Dom. Lands (timber protection) 8492 (v).
Indians—Man. (Sioux) 7853 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 541 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 935 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1169 (i).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 3068 (ii).

Railways—I C. R. (Pintsch gas) 2944 (ii).

Railways (Quebec bridge) 3072 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Grain Act) 5715 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5967 (iv).

Trachoma in Regina Schools (remarks) 3390 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop Res. (Mr. Perley) 1409 (i).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).

—— Timber Reserve, Tree Planting, &c. (Ques.) 5932, 6181 (iv).

Walton, Mr. Geo., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

Western Grain Trade, Letter from Mr. R. McKenzie (read) 8577 (v).

See 'Grain.'

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7274 (iv).

Budget, The, 1804 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 767 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5658 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6302 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*

Combines Investigation Act B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7890 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6285 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3619 (ii).

Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 178 (Mr. Perley) in Com., 8599 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5408 (iii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6383 (iv).

SEGUIN, Mr. P. A., *L'Assomption.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6394 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4991 (iii).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *East Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1868 (i).

Insects, Pests, Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Lakefield Wharf Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3463 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6305 (iv).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2615 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (analysis) 1354 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (cold storage) 7383; (experimental branch farms) 7392; (experimental farms) 7333 (iv), 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v); (seeds) 7389 (iv).

Canals—Galops (concrete piers) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Quebec (protection walls) 3123 (ii).

Canals—Sault Ste Marie (iron mooring posts) 3124 (ii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7770 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 568 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 693; (Plessisville) 704 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Byng Inlet) 3460 (ii); (Victoria) 5747 (iii).

Railways—Miscellaneous (ry. commission) 3130 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 1355 (i).

Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1376 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *North Ontario.*

Bank Act (stock) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 205 (i).

—— M. to withdraw Bill, 1209 (i).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 57) 1° m., 923 (i).

Cement Merger, Complaints *re* illegal combination, &c. (Ques.) 2296 (ii).

Central Experimental Farm, Number of Horses, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Couchiching and Simcoe Lakes, Lowering of Water, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 7000 (iv); in Com., 8129 (v).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii); 5772 (iii).

Dredging Inspection on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199 (i).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1154 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5837 (iii).

I. C. R. Dismissals for each month from Oct. 1908 to March, 1909 (Ques.) 1776 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3929 (ii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

N. T. Ry., Board of Arbitrators, Names Contractors Claims *re* Over-classification (Ques.) 836 (i).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) 6370 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4475 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5245, 5307 (iii).

Pork Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report *re* (Ques.) 5782 (iii).

Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., Number of Persons accommodated, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).

Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure (Ques.) 4309, 4846 (iii).

Rules of House, in Com. on Rep., 8377 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5317 (iii); 6270, 6664; 6723 (amt.) 6724; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7251, neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 7254 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8656 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with the Act. of Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).

School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 432 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons, &c. (Ques.) 3732 (ii).
See "Volunteers," &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v).

Civil Govt.—Public Works—(salaries) 334 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 8564; (armoury grants) 8570; (civil employees) 8573; (engineers' services) 8569; (pay, &c.) 8559 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax) 575 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7174; (Dundas) 7174; (Elora) 7174 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (deptl. new) 7167 (iv); (Langevin Block) 8176 (v); (Museum) 567; (Royal Mint) 557 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (immigration sheds) 960; (Westmount) 964 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Estevan) 8185 (v).

Public Works — Dredging — Generally (plant) 4777; (new plant) 4763 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3458; (Byng Inlet) 3461; (Christian Island) 3467; (Juniper Island) 3469 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Alphonse de Bagotville) 4227; (Ste Anne des Monts) 4232; (St. Croix) 4241; (Riviere Ouelle) 4211 (iii).

Tourists Post Offices, Number temporarily established (Ques.) 170 (i).

Uxbridge Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).

Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to (Ques.) 2188 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 8077 (v).

Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7213, 7244, 7270 (iv).

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4618 (iii).

Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

Budget, The, 1952 (i).

Combines Investigation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7903 (v).

Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands (Ques.) 4616 (iii).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8034 (v).

Half-Sections in Man., N. half, &c., Sale of (Ques.) 5889 (iii).

Hay Permits, from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected for Wood Cutting, &c. (Ques.) 3678 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5544 (iii).

McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 443 (i).

McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon Trip (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of (Ques.) 4309

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6367 (iv).

N.E. Quarter Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5502 (iii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).

Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4519 (iii).

Quarantine Frontier Inspectors, Duties, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

—— Cor. *re* Apptmts. (Ques.) 5561 (iii).

—— Apptmts. of (M. for cor., &c.*) 4315 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8054, 8422 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7086 (iv).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5532 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7757; (experimental farms) 7766; (live stock industry) 7749 (v).

Indians—Man. (clothing, &c.) 7851; (live stock) 7848 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258 (iii).

Quarantine (steamers) 7767 (v).

Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 626 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8398 (v).

Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909 (Ques.) 5777 (iii).

Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change (Ques.) 2930, 3168 (ii).

—— (M. for cor.*) 4315 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. (B. 213) 1°*, 7650 (v).

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6333; in Com., 6340, 6363 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6485 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough*

Budget, The, 1690 (i).

Canada Shiping Act (inspection) Amt. (B. 15) 1° m., 204; 2° m., 512 (i).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7897 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5908 (iii); in Com., 8034 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1536 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 1976 (ii).

Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c. (Ques.) 259 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Com., Report (presented) 7867 (v).

—— (M.) to conc. in Report of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2691 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Com., 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 3133 (ii).

—— M. to conc. in 5th Rep., 3986 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries Sel. Com. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7324 (iv).

Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S. (Ques.) 625 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6518; on Amt. (Mr. McColl) in Com., 6581 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Method, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c. (Ques.) 3168 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c. (Ques.) 444 (i).

SUPPLY.

Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 6701 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 8519 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1046 (i).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8004 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *North Middlesex.*

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6317 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Annuities, Can. Govt., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 385 (i).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 384 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 643 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Control of other Rys., Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

—— Subsidies *re* main and branch lines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Cirkle, Mr. F., Unprofessional Conduct, Charge, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5502 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7908 (v).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1192 (i).

Great Lakes Dredging Co.'s Contract *re* Kaministiqua River (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1251 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2902 (ii).

Mines and Minerals Committee (M.) *re* Sittings, 6276 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3982 (ii), 3987 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8048, 8423, 8593 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1040 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 1731 (i).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 2792 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1°*, 1587 (i).

SMITH, Mr. ROBT., *Stormont.*

Budget, The, 2269 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5323, 5348 (iii); on M. for 3°, 7253 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *East Algoma.*

Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Trent Canal Floods, &c. (remarks) 5226 (iii).

Dom. Police, Number sent to Thunder Bay, &c. *re* Election of 1909 (Ques.) 1007 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3430 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4975 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5424 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Picnic Islands) 3457; (Providence Bay) 3457 (ii); Que (Roberval) 940 (i).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Lake Nipissing floods) 6164 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges, N.B. (St. John) 6151 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. (Maurice) 6150; (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. Charles Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7194 (iv).

Bellechasse Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re* (notification) 3476 (ii).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s sec. (read) 922 (i), 6606 (iv).
See 'Senate.'

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs Members remarks checked, 6396 (iv).

Budget, The, Interruptions, &c. (ruling) 2084 (ii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 2109 (ii).

Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Ins. Co.'s B. 123, on Senate Amts., 8657 (v).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Controverted Elections Petitions, Certificate of Judges (presented) 1, 21 (i).

—— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges (presented) 256 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Dauphin Post Office, Opening of, Members' remarks checked, 3136 (ii).

Distribution Office, Recommendation *re* Salary Increases, 620 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).

Dom. Lands Act (homesteads) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce (remarks) 1688 (i).

Drill Halls, and Armouries, &c. (remarks) 1535 (i).

Dufferin, Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1731 (i).

—— Vacancy (notification) 620 (i).

Escheats to the Crown, B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for Com. on Res., 6508 (iv).

Essex Electoral District Certificate (presented) 620 (i).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7822 (v).

Garrison Artillery Guns, Ques. (Mr. Barnard) ruling *re* Question asked by another Member, 1791, 1799 (i).

Gaspereau Dredging, demand for Papers (remarks) 2490 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Crocket) for papers to be laid on Table (ruling) 2632 (ii).

Glover, Robert, Pet. ruled out of Order, 1586 (i).

Govt. Railway Bill, Conference with Senate, Mess. from the Senate, 8834 (v).

Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Members remarks checked, 8241 (v).

House of Commons Staff, Re-organization of, withdrawn, 7977 (v).

Indian Lands, Sale in Alberta, Irregularity of Discussion (remarks) 119 (i).

Industrial Disputes Bill, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8117 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie to introduce (ruling) 518 (i).

—— on Ques. of Order (ruling) 620 (i).

I. C. R. Branch Lines B. 17, Members remarks checked, 1126 (i).

—— on Order for 2°, 1803 (i).

—— Res. from Senate re Amendments, 8828, 8855 (v).

I.C.R., Safety of Travel (remarks) 2278 (ii)

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on Ques. of Order re laying Letters on Table (ruling) 502 (i).

International Waterways Canal, &c. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, Members' Remarks checked, 2679 (ii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. to con. in 2nd Rep. of Com., Members remarks checked, 2893 (ii).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 5 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104 (v).

Lumsden Charges, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 5199 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv., Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 5570 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Committee, 6016 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, Vote of Sol. Gen., on Amt. (Mr. A. Haggart) 8168 (v).

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, Reading Documents (remarks) 2685 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex., Assent to Bills (read) 5557, 5628 (iii).

——— Estimates for 1909-10 (read) 154, 377 (i).

——— Estimates, Suppl, 1910 (read) 377 (i); 2949 (ii); 5277 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 7519 (v).

——— Internal Economy Com. (read) 97 (i).

——— Opening (read) 1 (i).

N. T. Ry., Counsel before Public Accounts Committee (remarks) 4517 (iii).

Naval Service Appointments, Members remarks checked, 8839 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) re King's speech (ruling) 5100 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 3983 (ii).

Naval Defence, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) (remarks) 5003 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ruling *re* interrupting h. m. (Mr. Clare) 4929, 4937 (iii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7563 (v).

Nickel Mines in Canada, Members remarks checked, 2191 (ii).

Nickel Mines in Can., Control by Govt., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2493 (ii).

Ottawa City and Quebec City Representation in H. of C., Ques. (Mr. Meighen) *re* Disposal of Protests, 802 (i).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted in ref. to Ruling, 833 (i).

——— Vacancy (notification) 1729 (i).

——— Certificate of Election (notice) 3476 (ii).

Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) 3477 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 3744 (ii).

Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy to, Members remarks checked, 4712 (iii).

Private Bills: *See* 'Senate.'

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 8833 (v).

——— Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).

Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re* (ruling) 1799 (i).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller), on Ques. of Order (Mr. Wilson) *re* Translation of Evidence (ruling) 6404 (iv).

——— Members Remarks checked, 6720 (iv).

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, remarks checked, 462 (i).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* (remarks) 8833 (v).

Railway Passenger Service, Ques. of Order, 379 (i).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6172 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Interruptions of Members (remarks) 7600 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 7676 (v).

——— (ruling) *re* Question of Mr. Meighen, 7695 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 7691 (v).

Ross Rifles, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Answer of Minister of Militia (ruling) 1586 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co.'s Incorporation, Rep. *re* Application (remarks) 1529 (i).

——— Members remarks checked, 8108 (v).

——— on Senate Amts. (ruling) 8655 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, 7256 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 7072 (iv), 7522 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) 7148 (iv).

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Members remarks checked, 1445 (i).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule, &c. (read) 5776 (iii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Sunday Postal Service, Closing of P. O. at Winnipeg, Members Remarks checked, 2931 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Charles de Caplan) 4234 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S. (Mr. Lewis) Members Remarks checked, 5892 (iii).

Technical Education (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2663 (ii).

Toronto 'World,' Ownership, Member asked to withdraw stmnt., 5998 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

West Middlesex Electoral District, Certificate of Election of Mr. D. C. Ross (notification) 413 (i).

Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes, Members remarks checked, 3135 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) *South Perth.*

B. C. Public Works, Govt. Expenditures, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4290 (iii)

Budget, The, Members Remarks checked, 2229 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 2267 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) Members Remarks checked, 7895 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order *re* Customs Laws, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Conservation Bill, Members Remarks checked, 6141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Crosby) 5539 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 5535 (iii).

Manufacturers Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 2279 (ii).

Mayes Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Members Remarks checked, 589 (i).

N.T. Ry., on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission (ruling) *re* Points of Order, 8310 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ref. to Governor General or Sovereign not permissible (ruling) 4204 (iii).

Newspapers in Ont., Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6143 (iv).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 152 (Mr. Turcotte) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com. (ruling) 4798 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin), Amt. (read) 1364 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 4736 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 7316 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., Procedure *re* Discussion (ruling) 6558 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. McColl) 6579 (iv).

Restigouche Log Driving, &c., B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6171 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Charges against Ministers (ruling) 7630 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Owen) *re* Discussion (ruling) 3845 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. DEPUTY—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., Members asked to withdraw offensive language, 5399 (iii).

—— Members Remarks checked, 6231 (iv).

—— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6723 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Neely) 5412 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 6352 (iv).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Tobin) 5434 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, &c. (cold storage) on Ques. of Order, 7365 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Richibucto) Members remarks checked, 3439 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Meteghan) on Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) 997 (i).

Pubic Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 7509 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) Denials must be accepted (ruling) 546 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 665; (Marieville) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox)—(ruling) 686 (i).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonell) 6778 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) 8077 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Address, The 73 (i).

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7193 (iv).

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir F. Borden) in Com., 6003 (iv).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sen-Sentence (remarks) 2712 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2012 (ii).

Budget, The, 1601 (i).

—— (remarks) 2065 (ii).

Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. Cowan) in Com., 2671 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 6950 (iv).

Clarry, L. F., Charges re Trent Canal, Damages, &c. (remarks) 5225 (iii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6845, 6887 (iv); in Com., 7895; on M. for 3°, 7977 (v).

—— Ques. of Order re Customs Law, on M. for 3°, 8002 (v).

Combinations in Restraint of Trade, Legislation *re* (remarks) 1363 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Committee on Standing Orders, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6606 (iv).

Conservation: *See* 'Natural.'

'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage (remarks) 5896 (iii).

——— Answers of P.M.G. (remarks) 8818 (v).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6988 (v).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6629 (iv).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 3053 (ii).

Dominion Millers' Association B. 111 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3874, 3916 (ii), 5772 (iii).

Dufferin Election, Date of (remarks) 623 (i).

——— Representation of: (notice) 521 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272, 1284 (i).

Escheats to the Crown B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv); in Com., 8385 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. negligence) Amt. B. 159 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6183 (iv).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5910 (iii).

French Floods Relief Fund (remarks) *re* Grant, 3061 (ii).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 199; on M. for 2°, 747; on M. for 3°, 817 (i).

Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).

See 'Race Track.'

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O. C.'s, 3574 (ii).

Govt. Annuities Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6330 (iv).

Govt. Measures for Session (remarks) on Easter Adjournment, 5893 (iii).

Guelph Junction Ry. Co.'s B. 218 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. for 2°, 8056, 8380; in Com., 8625 (v).

Halifax Roundhouse Property, Valuation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).

Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 6760 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5803, 5841 (iii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 141 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5923 (iii); in Com., 5934 (iv).

Industrial Disputes Act Amt. B. 198 (Mr. King) in Com., 8030 (v).

Inspection and Sales Act (bread) Amt. Bill, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce, 517 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 7949, 8460, 8461 (v).

I. C. R., Sale of, on prop, Res. (Mr. Black) 2302 (ii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 1104 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 508; on laying letters on Table, 502 (i).

——— B. 73 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 2054 (ii).

International Waterways Canal and Construction Co.'s incorp. B. 119 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 2°, 2674 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Guthrie) to refund fees, 7512 (v).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 231 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8764 (v).

James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 128 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 5764 (iii).

Labour, Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 2°, 1226 (i).

Labour, Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2911 (ii).

Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8106, 8229 (v).

London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Harris) in Com., 3930 (ii).

Lumsden Charges, on M. to conc. in 4th Report of Com., 6016 (iv).

See 'N. T. Ry.'

Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup., 2688 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 657 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry Co.'s B. 113 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3431 (ii).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2785 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6280; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

Merchants and General Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2714 (ii).

Militia Clothing, Insurance *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6015; in Com., 6192 (iv).

Militia Stores Building, Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

Milk Testing, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Mines and Minerals Committee, on M. (Mr. R. Smith) *re* sittings, 6276 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2281 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commission Subsidy B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 5902; in Com. on B., 5904 (iii).

Motor Vehicle Injuries B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 2°, 2035 (ii).

National Battlefields Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 5889 (iii), in Com., 6599 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Classification of Material, Lumsden Charges, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
See 'Lumsden.'

Natural Resources Conservation B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 6336; in Com., 6364 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3281 (ii); in Com., 7396, 7485 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95, Ques. of Order, 3983 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Ref. to Gov. Gen., 4205 (iii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5285 (iii).

Newspapers in Ontario, Patronage *re* Advertising (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6142 (iv).

Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill.'

Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* (remarks) 8583 (v).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Ottawa and Montreal Power Transmission Co.'s Bill (Mr. Perley) on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 6504 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com. on Amt., 1365 (i).

Ottawa and Quebec East Representation, on Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1323 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto 'World,' 521 (i).

——— Disposal of Protests (remarks) 803 (i).

Pink Rock Wharf Ownership (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3747 (ii).

Protection Piers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3857 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., on M. to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 610 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 260 (i).

Quebec Judges, Superior Court Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 6984 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Questions standing as Notices of Motions (remarks) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., on Procedure *re* discussion, 6558 (iv).
See 'Gambling.'

Ry. Act (appeals) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 456; on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 463 (i).

Ry. Act (cable rates) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6010 (iv).

Ry. Act (contracts) Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Northrup) on M. for 2°, 493 (i).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).

Ry. Committee Report, Delay in presenting (remarks) 7190 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars (Ques.) 5106 (iii).

Railway Passenger Service, Delays, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 379 (i).

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5766 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Reid) in Com., 6176 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Carvell) 3847 (ii).

——— on Ques of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7632 (v).

Rocky Mountains Park Regulations (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 6373 (iv).

Rules of the House, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1443 (i).

——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 7867 (v).

——— in Com., on Rep. of Com., 8366 (v).

St. Andrew's Dam Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. John Harbour, Wharfs B. 204 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 8123 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5340 (iii), 6235, 6347, 6663, 6724; on M. for 3°, 6886 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8654 (v).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7093 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Priv (Mr. Bradbury) 7523 (v).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2647 (ii).

——— B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) on M. to dschg. order for 2°, 656 (i).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Address (Mr. Lancaster 2000 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces, on prop. Res. (Mr. Taylor) 2007 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Skill and King, Release of, &c. (remarks) 7070 (iv).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sunday Postal Service, Closing at Winnipeg, &c. (remarks) 2932 (ii).

SUPPLY

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 5728; (experimental farms) 5725 (iii).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 8821 (v).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194; Naval Service (salaries) 8514 (v); Post Office (salaries) 6696 (iv).

Customs—Outside Ports (contingencies) 8807 (v).

Fisheries (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5748; (hatcheries) 5750 (iii); (protection service) 8509 (v).

House of Commons (Library) 8802 (v).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii); (agents, &c.) 8195; (contingent expenses) 8207 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 8808 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 5703 (iii), 8810 (v); (Can. and G. B.) 8808 (v); (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809 (v); (Rivière du Loup) 5712 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523 (v).

Naval Service (maintenance) 8496 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (hydrographic surveys) 8511; (patrol vessels) 8521; (salaries) 8510; (schools of navigation) 8518; (wireless stations) 8513 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (R. G. Mercer) 5755; (rural delivery) 5753 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John) 593 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Digby) 574; (Lunenburg) 576 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chesley) 7173; (Elora) 7176 (iv); (Guelph) 7498; (Harriston) 7500; (Kincardine) 7504; (Listowel) 7507; (Mitchell) 7507; (Mount Forest) 7510; (Niagara Falls) 7511, 8170; (Port Arthur) 8177; (Sarnia) 8177 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 418, 537 (i); (deptl., new) 7167 (iv); (military stores) 597; (museum) 569 (i); (Parliament driveway) 8173; (Printing Bureau) 8170 (v); (Royal Mint) 557; (standardizing room) 573 (i); (ventilation) 8170 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (Grosse Isle) 663; (immigration sheds) 962; (Joliette) 663; (Marieville) 693; (Montreal P. O.) 700; Montreal postal station) 703; (Quebec barracks) 976; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968; (St. Lambert) 956 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—Generally (new plant) 4740; (vessel repairs) 4732 (iii).

Public Works—Dredging—Que. and Ont. (generally) 6130 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 4290 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (generally) 4258; (Winnipeg beach) 4270 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Pink Rock) 3422; (Shediac) 3450 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 3457; (Brockville) 3455; (Byng Inlet) 3459; (Fiddler's Elbow) 3851; (Goderich) 3468; (Lion's Head) 3470; (Michipicoten) 3471 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv); (Thornbury) 3475 (ii); (Tiffin) 5746 (iii), 6122 (iv); (Toronto) 3852 (ii); (Victoria) 5747, 6123 (iv); (Whitby) 8818 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I., (Brudenell) 2694; (Haggerty's) 2694; (Miminegash) 2695; (Naufrage) 2695; (Red Point) 2696; (Rustico) 2696; (Souris) 2697 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Gaspé) 3894; (Grand Mechin) 3902; (Grand Riviére) 3903; (Grand Vallee) 3905; (Grosse Isle) 3905; (Harrington wharf) 3906; (Kamouraska) 3907; (Le Petit Debarquement) 3907 (ii); (Levis) 6102 (iv); (Matane) 3907; (Natashquan) 3910; (New Carlisle) 3912; (Norway Bay) 3912; (Paspebiac) 3913; (Petit Saguenay) 3913; (Piche Point) 3914 (ii); (St. Charles) 6102 (iv); (Three Rivers) 4247; (Yamaska and Richelieu) 5724 (iii).

Public Works — Miscellaneous (International Commission, N.B.) 6164; (Lake Nipissing floods) 6165; (McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, monument) 6160; (Ottawa water-storage dams) 6163; (telephone memorial) 6161; (Tilley, Sir Leonard, memorial) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.B. (St. John) 6151; Ont. (Chapeau) 6150; Ont. and Que. (Hawkesbury) 6151; Que. (Restigouche) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay) 6149 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Edmonton-Athabaska) 6154; Que. (St. Lawrence shore) 6153 (iv).

Railways—Hudson Bay (construction) 8820 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Beresford subway) 2872 (ii).

Railways—N.T. Ry. Quebec Bridge (construction) 8821 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira) 3063 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 5946, 5974 (iv).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 5278, 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1092 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Supply, 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6011 (iv).

Toronto Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 116 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 6792 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1429 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6376 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8007 (v).

Water Powers in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6374 (iv); 8458 (v).

Western Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Taylor) in Com., 3438 (ii).

Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).

Zinc Ores Smelting B. 182 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5795 (iii); in Com., 5938; on M. for 3°, 6618 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2426 (ii).

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N.S., Expenditure to date, &c. (Ques.) 3676 (ii).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re* (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Number, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5501 (iii).

——— Dismissals by Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 164 (i).

——— Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

——— Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 276 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 4812 (iii).

——— Purchasing Agent, Names, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

——— Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Bill, 8483 (v).

——— Sleeping Cars, Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co. (Ques.) 5105 (iii).

——— Standard Pay for Machinists (Ques.) 259 (i).

Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re* (Ques.) 1198 (i).

McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3733 (ii).

Magdalen Islands and Pictou SS. Services, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7065 (iv).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Leave of Absence to Crew to vote (Ques.) 4077 (iii).

Pictou Post Office Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 3489 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c. (M. for papers*) 3495 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Miscellaneous (Mrs. J. Gordon, allowance) 5616 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (contingencies) 248 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Dufferin) 1161; (Port Maitland) 1166; (Port Malcolm) 1165 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (air-brakes) 2882; (Beresford subway) 2872; (Chatham diversion) 2874; (highways) 2882; (Loggieville) 2886; (original construction) 2943; (Pintsch gas 2944; (Robinson's crossing) 2945 (ii).

Weights and Measures (gas inspection) 1355; (inspection) 1355 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Agriculture, Dept. of, Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7204 (iv).

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).

Baie St. Paul, Title to Lot 73, Applications *re* Purchase (Ques.) 1017 (i).

Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c. (Ques.) 6182 (iv).

Budget, The (remarks) 1616 (i).

Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing (M. for copies*) 2150 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7902 (v).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature, &c. (remarks) 7804 (v).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables Tariff, Pet. against Removal of Duties (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Holland Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

——— Boxes (remarks) 7881 (v).

Homesteading on Section 34, Tp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4080 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 5539 (iii).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 122) 1° m., 2329 (ii).

Kilmant and Shackleton, Application for Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).

Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4081 (iii).

Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 7290 (iv).

Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. ¼, 32-7-5, &c. (Ques.) 6936 (iv).

Lumsden Charges, Change in Report, on M for Sup., 5573 (iii).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 658 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6304 (iv).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5133 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4306 (iii).

Port Colborne Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 7325 (iv).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 477 (i).

Ross Rifles, Distribution of, Ques. of Priv., 339 (i).

St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4264 (iii).

St. Laurent, Man., Wharf Piers, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1195 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2648 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 7759 (v); (archives) 7284; (cold storage) 7364; (Dom. exhibitions) 7384; (experimental farms) 7336 (iv), 7765 (v).

Canals—Welland (elevators) 3121 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 362 (i); Post Office (salaries) 6650 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Laurent wharf) 4254 (iii).

Indians—Alberta (agricultural implements) 7857; (clothing, &c.) 7851; (medical attendance) 7849 (v).

Post Office—Miscellaneous (Holland) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 8182 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 600; (museum) 570 (i).

Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c. (Ques.) 272 (i).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Welland Canal run through Lot 50, Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 8660 (v).

STEWART, Mr. T. J., *West Hamilton.*

Criminal Code (race track) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 909 (i).

Gas Inspection Act (tests) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 5680 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt—Post Office (salaries) 6693 (iv).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6381 (iv).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, 1636 (i).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1731 (i)

STRATTON, Mr. J. R.—*Con.*

Cirkle, Fritz., Emplymt. by Dept of Mines (Ques.) 5497 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5806 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6319 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500, 6519 (iv).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8052 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—N.S. (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E. *Bellechasse.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 3389 (ii).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 5907 (iii); in Com., 8042 (v).

Govt. Railways Pension Act Amt. B. 19 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 1151 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., Ques. of Order, 5535 (iii).

I. C. R. Branch Lines Lease B. 17 (Mr. (Graham) on M. for 2°, 1109 (i).

I. C. R. Derailments during 1909 (Ques.) 2141 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2298 (ii).

Laurentian Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 5687 (iii).

Montmagny Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Lavergne) on M. for 3°, 2282 (ii).

Naval B. 95, on M. for 2° (remarks) 4108 (iii)

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6500 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. of Sup., 7689 (v).

Ross Rifles, Weight of, &c. (Ques.) 8678 (v).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rules *re* (remarks) 5777 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (translation) 1343 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Roberval) 937 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 99 (Mr. Burrell) on M. for 2°, 2101 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7221 (iv).

Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 8856 (v).

——— Vol. II., on Inquiry for, 1445 (i).

Budget, The, (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. (Ques.) 1969 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846; in Com., 6904 (iv).

Co-operative Societies B. 26 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 2156 (ii).

Currency Act Amt. B. 195 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6631 (iv).

Customs and Excise Revenues for 1909-10, &c. (Ques.) 8109 (v).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 514 (i).

Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of (Ques.) 631 (i).

Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to (Ques.) 849 (i).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7289 (iv).

Franking Privilege and Political Literature (remarks) 7832 (v).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 184; on M. for 2°, 779 (i).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders re (Ques.) 4617 (iii).

G.T.P. Bonds, Total Amount guaranteed to 31st March, 1910 (Ques.) 8237 (v).

House of Commons, Steps and Walks to, Matting Coverings (remarks) 448 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5537 (iii).

Indian Industrial School, Regina, Closing of (Ques.) 6179 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (warehouse) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 152 (i).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).

'J. G. Witherbee,' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

Johnson, Mr. Arthur, Engineer on 'Reliever,' Certificate, &c. (Ques.) 3734 (ii).

Labour Dept., Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2901 (ii).

La Butte Indian School, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 6179 (iv).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep. on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8105 (v).

Lumsden Charges, &c. (M.) to adjn. debate, 5599 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries Vote, on Amt., Ques. of Order re Sol. Gen.'s Vote, 8167 (v).

Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 849 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., on Res., 6098 (iv).

Milk Tests, Glass Inspection B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6006 (iv).

Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c. (Ques.) 3294 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 7441 (v).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6965 (iv).

Paul, Mr. William, Purchase by Govt. of Gasolene Boat (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).

Public Works Employees and Election Campaign (remarks) 2489 (ii).

Questions standing as Notices of Motion (remarks) 6941 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6501 (iv).

Retail Merchants Association incorp. B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 2°, 7287 (iv).

Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3844 (ii).

St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c. (Ques.) 8239 (v).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5320 5396 (iii), 6670 (iv); Reps. of Engineers (remarks) 5560 (iii).

Saturday Sitting of Hse (remarks) 8110 (v).

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 4518 (iii).

Supply B. 173 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5530 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors) 1346 (i).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals' health) 7755 (v); (archives) 7284; (Can. exhibit, London) 7380; (census) 7373; (cold storage) 7362; (dairy and fruit) 7362 (iv); (experimental farms) 5724 (iii); (experimental farms) 7764 (v); (farm bulletins) 7377; (Patent Record) 7371; (tobacco) 7380 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 7769 (v).

Customs Outside service (salaries) 1358 (i).

Excise (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).

Fisheries—Miscellaneous (fish transportation) 5748 (iii).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7774 (v).

Immigration (agencies) 5729 (iii).

Indians—Generally (land management fund) 7838 (v).

Indians—Man. (live stock) 7848; (Sioux) 7853 (v).

Indians—N.B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. GEO.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7836 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (Lennox Island wharf) 7847 (v).

Indians—Sask. (Elkhorn schools) 7861 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Atlantic ports to Australia) 8811; (Can. and Mexico) 8809; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound) 8809; (Riviere du Loup) 8810 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Can. Handicrafts guild) 7866; (Naturalization Act) 7865 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa(astronomical observatory) 421, 541 (i); (grounds) 8192; (Parliament driveway) 8174 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec customs) 825 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5614 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Malcolm) 1164 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Fiddler's Elbow) 3835 (ii); (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Aylmer) 3863; (L'Ange Gardien) 3862 (ii);

Quarantine (Public Health Act) 7392; (steamers) 7392 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 8810; (old age annuities) 8811 (v).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356 (i).

Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c. (Ques.) 8237 (v).

U S., Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Counsel at Kingston (Ques.) 431

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8090, 8389 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 25 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8008 (v).

Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts (M. for cor.) 644 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Barge, W. R., Application *re* License, Extension of Time, &c. (Ques.) 5002 (iii).

Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts. (Ques.) 2716 (ii).

B. C. Lt.-Governorship, Appmt. of Mr. F. C. Wade, Charges *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 523 (i).

——— Recommendations from Political Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C. (Ques.) 382 (i).

B. C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

Central Park, New Westminster, B.C., Post Office, Pet. *re* Closing (Ques.) 2188, 2293 (ii).

——— (M. for cor.*) 3169 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7883 (v).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 633 (i).

Experimental Farm at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 192 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8035, 8059 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 3933 (ii).

Franking Privilege, Justice Dept. (Ques.) 1207 (i).

——— Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen. on M. for Sup., 7784; (amt.) 7792; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).

Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c. (Ques.) 2487 (ii).

——— Inundations, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4212 (iii).

International Fisheries Commission, Regulations *re*, Legislation by Parlt., &c. (Ques.) 3490 (ii).

Japanese Immigration from U.S. entering B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 21 (Mr. Verville) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1264 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2894 (ii).

Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address (Ques.) 7869 (v).

——— (remarks) 8118 (v).

N.T.Ry. Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7563 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4307 (iii).

New Westminster, Dom. Land, Lease, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i), 3160 (ii).

——— Penitentiary, Contract *re* Fish Supply (Ques.) 7516 (v).

——— Post Office Apptmts., Application to, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Lands on special Terms, &c. (Ques.) 274 (i).

Port Moody Wharf Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii.)

Postal Violations, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 2292 (ii).

Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to question 4 (Ques.) 2290 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensation, &c. (Ques.) 2294 (ii).

Senate Representation by Provinces (prop. res.) 2003 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 369, Labour (salaries) 239 (i).

House of Commons (sessional indemnities) 7773 (v).

Public Works — Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 8190 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Chilliwack) 4298; (Columbia river) 4280; (Coquitlam) 4291; (Fraser river) 4295; (Lillooet river) 4298; (Port Moody) 4728; (Serpentine river) 4304 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bic) 3871; (Carleton) 3885 (ii), (Laprairie) 4221 (Richelieu river) 4212; (Ste. Croix) 4244; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1093 (i).

Veterinary Service, B.C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Water Power in Ry. Belt, B.C., B. 187 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 8445 (v).

—— Govt. Title to beds of Streams, &c. (Ques.) 2951 (ii).

Westminster District, Land Leased to B. C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co., (Ques.) 2291 (ii).

Western Power Co.'s (B. 86) in Com., 3432 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Comox-Atlin.*

Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost (Ans.) 4310 (iii).

Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints re (Ans.) 4311 (iii).

Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount collected for 1907-9 (Ans.) 7872 (v).

B.C. Public Works, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment (Ans.) 5002 (iii).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 4515 (iii).

Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported (Ans.) 631 (i).
See 'Inland.'

Cirkle, Mr. Fritz., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 205 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7310 (iv).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers (remarks) 8585 (v).

—— (stmnt. read) 8831 (v).

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) in Com., 7886 (v).

Conservation Commission, Regulation *re* Fisheries (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Electrical Measure Units (B. 7) 1°*, 96 (i); on Order for 2°, 5673 (iii).

Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

Estimates, Delay in bringing down (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8520 (v).

Fisheries Act (regulations) Amt. B. 192 (prop. res.) 4708 (iii); in Com. on Res., 5906, 1°*, 5921 (iii); in Com., 8032, 8058 (v).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Compensation Claims *re* Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations *re* Manitoba, on Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5894 (iii).
See 'Man.' 'Lobsters.'

Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6798 (iv).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 3056 (ii); in Com., 5680 (iii).

Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c. (Ans.) 3933 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance agent, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

'Hudson,' Str., Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 4518 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 9) prop. Res., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; in Com., 522; 3° m., 811 (i).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Dept., Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3935 (ii).

Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer (Ans.) 4844 (iii).

Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman Roy, Charges re (Ans.) 4517 (iii).

Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).

Liquor Compounding, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).

Lobster Canning Plant, Connection of Fishery Officers *re* (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Report, on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8104, 8234 (v).

McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada (Ans.) 3491 (ii).

McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. in Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto (Ans.) 5678) (ii).

Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmnt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7289 (iv).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

Manitoba Fisheries Regulations, Amts. *re* (remarks) 4308 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'

Military Articles for Uniforms, Free Importation of (Ans.) 2927 (ii).

Milk Standards, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).

Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c. (Ans.) 5498 (iii).

Naval Service, Names of Cruisers, Purchase, Description, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Nickel Mines, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson (remarks) 2190 (ii).

Pembina River Fishing Regulations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8530 (v).

'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge (Ans.) 8239 (v).

Pure Food Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. J. A. Currie) on M. for 1°, 2796 (ii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 6178 (iv).

Rescue Stations in Coal Mining Districts, Establishment of (Ans.) 3936 (ii).

Sailing Directions to Capts. of Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 5891 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (inspectors, &c.) 1345; (prosecutions) 1349 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 231; (salaries) 229; Mines (salaries) 336 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 1331; (extra hours) 1336; (inspectors salaries) 1331; (methylated spirits) 1344; (provisional allowances) 1344; (tobacco stamps) 1342; (translation) 1343; (travelling expenses) 1341 (i).

Fisheries (B. C. claims) 8552; (Canadian exhibit) 8544; (cold storage) 8545; (customs bureau) 8551; (dog fish) 8546; (fish breeding) 8540 (v); (fish transportation) 5747 (iii); (fishways) 8534 (v); (hatcheries) 5751 (iii); (legal expenses) 8543; (oyster culture) 8545 (v); (protection service) 5752 (iii); (provincial jurisdiction) 8546; (salaries) 8536 (v).

Geological Survey (assay office, Vancouver) 7769; (books, &c.) 8556; (maps, &c.) 8556; (specimens) 8556; (surveys) 8555 (v).

Inland Revenue (minor revenues) 1358 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 8525; (buoy steamer) 8528; (ice breaker, Thunder Bay) 8526; (pensions) 8528; (salaries) 8523; (signal service) 8527 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5709; (Victoria and San Francisco) 5711 (iii).

Marine (dredging plant) 8523; (piers, Lake St. Peter) 8523; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 8521; (Sorel yard property) 8523 (v).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. WM.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mines, &c. (explosives) 8556; (ore deposits) 8553; (peat bogs) 8553 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 8519; (icebreakers) 8514; (patrol vessels) 8521; (schools of navigation) 8518 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Chilliwack) 4303; (Columbia river) 4281; (Queen Charlotte) 4717 (iii).

Weights and Measures (electric inspection) 1356; (gas inspection) 1355; (inspectors) 1355; (travelling expenses) 1356 (i).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (administrator) 5615 (iii).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe, Imports, Duties collected, &c. (Ans.) 3931 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Reps. of Messrs. Costello and Clarke (Ans.) 3737 (ii).

Yukon Territory, Goods imported free, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3492 (ii).

Zinc Ores, &c., Smelting (B. 182) Prop. Res., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°*, 5801 (iii); in Com., 5935; 3° m., 6617 (iv).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *North Lanark.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7234 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Infraction *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding (remarks) 4813 (iii).

Budget, The, (remarks) 1621 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1293 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Recognition of Services (remarks) 7068 (iv).

Insurance Act B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7947 (v).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5097 (iii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6223 (iv).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 5310 (iii).

Party Patronage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2462 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6562 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (contingent expenses) 8212 (v).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1088 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Agriculture Dept., Administration of, on M. for Sup., 7278 (iv).

Budget, The, 1817, 1949 (i).

Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1372 (i).

Elections Act (deposits) Amt. B. 22 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 1272 (i).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2658 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7363 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5422 (ii).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Reps. Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance of Light, on M. (Mr. Daniel) for Papers, 321 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John) 6120 (iv).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

H. of C., Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to (Ques.) 8677 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2221; in Com., 3430 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1878 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kincardine) 7504 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4622 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que (Godfroy) 3893 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Budget, The, 1935 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry., Claims *re* Right of Way (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).

Chambers of Commerce incorp. (B. 220) 1°*, 8213 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 740 (i).

Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction, &c (Ques.) 6937 (iv).

Interest Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 504 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works B. 21 (Mr Verville) on M. for 2°, 1221 (i).

Labour Hours on Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2913 (ii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P.—*Con.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4893 (iii).

Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) in Com., 5722 (iii).

Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 6178 (iv).

Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Protection *re* Invasion, &c. (Ques.) 7513 (v).

Richibucto Wharf, Ques. of Order, 7691 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1512 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5478 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Roch) 833 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging) 5613 (iii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4161 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bathurst) 8817 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

Budget, The, 2127 (ii).

Conservation of Natural Resources B. 185 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6372 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 94) 1° m., 1731 (i).

——— M. to Introduce, 1688 (i).

French Treaty B. 12 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 186 (i).

G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 127) 1°*, 2631 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5545 (iii).

I. C. R., Low Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies B., 8482 (v).

——— Sale of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2325 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 659 (i).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2730 (ii).

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4830 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) on Amt. in Com., 1365 (i).

Pioneers Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 211) 1°*, 7512 (v).

Protectorate Life Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 5929 (iv).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 6593 (iv).

Railway Committee, Rules *re* Bills (remarks) 8833 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Rainy River Radial Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 103 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 5768 (iii).

Retail Merchants' Association B. 210 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 8434, 8598 (v).

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1540 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5352 (iii), 6259 (iv).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Bounty Act Amt. (B. 87) 1° m., 1687 (i); 2° m., 2056 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Elora) 7178 (iv); Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 417, 538; (Royal Mint) 563 (i).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4999 (iii); in Com., 8073 (v).

Weyburn Security Bank incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 4922 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Evers, T., Total Payments to *re* Lachine Canal Expenses (Ques.) 2428, 2927 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works (B. 21) 1° m., 256; 2° m., 1209; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1263 (i).

Independent Order of Rechabites incorp., (B. 112) 1°*, 2221 (ii).

Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i).

Labour, Hours of Public Works, on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2897 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs, &c. under Denis O'Brien (Ques.) 1964 (ii).

——— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 627 (i).

——— Carpenter Shop, Number of Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 1006 (i).

——— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c., (M. for copy*) 1547 (i).

——— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c. (Ques.) 1367 (i).

——— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to (Ques.) 5103 (iii).

——— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100 (Ques.) 2428 (ii).

——— Supply of Douglas Fir, Quantity on hand, &c. (Ques.) 1368 (i).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4383 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 671 (i).

Technical Education, Commission *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1052 (i).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *Centre York, Ont.*

Baby Farm Sale B. 181 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5792 (iii).

Blythe, Walter, Postponed Execution of, (M. for papers) 2009 (ii).

Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures, acting as Insurance Agent, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).

Horse-Racing Regulation (B. 81) 1° m., 1529 (i).

——— (remarks) 6617 (iv).

Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island (remarks) 8586 (v).

McArthur, F. J. Gustin Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 3390 (ii).

Markham Post Office Site, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 99 (i).

——— Completion and Opening (remarks) 3137 (ii).

Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State (Ques.) 849 (i).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 194 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6014; in Com., 6193 (iv).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5149 (iii).

Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost in 1909 Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

North Toronto, Free Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).

Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1373 (i).

Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 5890 (iii).

S. A. Patriotic Fund, Control of, Complaints *re* &c. (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

Stanley Barracks, Sale of Baby Farm, &c (Ques.) 2952 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (Newmarket) 3107 (ii)

Post Office—Outside Service (salaries) 7864 (v).

Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duty collected &c. (Ques.) 3931 (ii).

Volunteer Bounty Act Amt. B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 6388 (iv).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c. (M. for memorials, &c.) 2019 (ii).

Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B. N. A. Act, on prop. Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2735 (ii).

See 'Representation.'

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 3946 (ii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London. Memorials, &c. *re* Surveys (M. for copies*) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, Surveys *re* Construction (M. for copies) 277 (i)

P. E. I. Winter Communication, Changes in Routes, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies) 3171 (ii).

Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602 (i).

Representation in H. of C. of Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c. (M. for copy)—(amt.) 644 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *North Renfrew.*

Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909 (Ques.) 842 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal, O.C.'s &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3495 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6616 (iv).

Incubators, Total Number imported from U. S., 1909 (Ques.) 169 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 414 (i).

I.C.R., on Annual Stmnt., 2815 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 103 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 6216 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. McGiverin) in Com., on Amt., 1365 (i).

Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 4129; (remarks) 5279 (iii).

Petawawa Wharf, Protection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6216 (iv).

Return, Inquiry for, 8585 (v).

St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 841 (i).

Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases (remarks) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6060 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 7750 (v).

Waterways Committee, Meeting, &c. (remarks) 3390 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alberta.*

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s (B. 154) 1°*, 5277 (iii).

Pine Pass Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 515 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7366 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Saskatchewan river channel) 4275 (iii).

WILCOX, Mr. O. J., *North Essex.*

Budget, The, 2168 (ii).

Crude Petroleum Bounty B. 208 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 6999 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).

I.C.R. Wire Fencing, Tenders, Prices quoted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2150 (ii).

——— Tenders for 1909, &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for Com., 6448 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Outside ports (contingencies) 8806 (v).

Walkerville, Post Office, Appropriation for (Ques.) 1373 (i).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to (remarks) 6396 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, on M. (Mr. White) for O.C.'s, 3544 (ii).

Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

Mail Privileges *re* Postal Regulations, Members Privileges, &c. (Ques.) 2146 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4457 (iii).

Postal Regulations, Duration of Recess of Parlt. (Ques.) 2486 (ii).

Race Track Gambling B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 880 (i); on M. for Com., Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence before Special Com., Appeal from Speaker's Decision, Neg. (Y. 55; N. 99) 6406 (iv).

Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).

SUPPLY—

Adulteration of Food (prosecutions) 1352 (i).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Combines Investigation B. 101 (Mr. King) on M. for Com. on Res., 6846 (iv).

Emigration from Canada, System of Record-keeping (Ques.) 268 (i).

Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c. (Ques.) 7872 (v).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5519; in Com., 5545 (iii); 5802, 5830, 5880 (iv); on Senate Amts., 8401 (v).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 171 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2222, 2797 (ii).

Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Lobster Fisheries Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc., 8107, 8230 (v).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 109 (i).

Napanee River Dredging (M. for cor.*) 1022 (i).

Napanee River, Dredging, on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1194 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co. Claims for Moneys, Fiat granted, &c. (Ques.) 640 (i).

——— Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies*) 644 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission B. 230 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8770 (v).

Rideau Hall Furniture, Inquiry for Ret., 8742 (v).

Royal Guardians B. 120 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 7257 (iv).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5783 (iii).

Rules of the House, in Com. on Rep., 8371 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 8194 (v); Post Office (Salaries) 6696 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 8195 (v): (contingent expenses) 8210 (v).

Indians — Generally (land management fund) 7838; Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 ; Ont. and Que. (surveys) 7837 (v).

Public Works — Buildings — Alta. (Lethbridge) 8188; (Strathcona) 8189 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (tobacco stations) 8191 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 542 (i); (grounds) 8191; (Rideau Hall grounds) 8192 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Quebec P. O.) 824 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (immigration) 5607 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Brown, Hon. Geo., monuments) 6158; (Ottawa river water storage dams) 6162 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (city bridges) 6152 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Alberta (Limerick-Gravelburg) 6155 (iv).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c. (Ques.) 2288 (ii).
See 'de la Ronde.'

Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c. (Ques.) 5498 (iii).

Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c. (M. for cor*.) 5501 (iii).

De la Rondes, Major and Capt., Charges *re* Malfeasance in Army Service Corps (M. for cor.*) 414 (i).

——— (Ques.) 135 (i).

——— Rep. of Justice Dept. (Ques.) 5500 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Drill Halls and Armouries, &c., Contribution to Cost of (Ques.) 1534 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Contract to C. A. Barnett, &c. (Ques.) 4312 (iii).

Eastern Cavalry Bridage, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 636 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants, &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Garrison and Artillery Regiments, Supply of 12-pounder B. L. Guns (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Halifax and Esquimalt Docks, Protection *re* Deterioration, &c. (Ques.) 1010 (i).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Import of Military Clothing (M. for cor.*) 3495 (ii).

Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes (Ques). 843 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c. (Ques.) 637 (i).

Improved Paper Machinery Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1360; in Com., 3137 (ii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7944 (v).

Militia Active Service, Requirements *re* Standard Rifle Shooting, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Military Articles for Uniforms, &c., Free Importation of (Ques.) 2927 (ii).

Militia Clerks, Apptmts. without Examination, &c. (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Militia Clothing, Amounts deducted from Allowances for Deficiencies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— Life of, Purchases of New Articles (Ques.) 1018 (i).

Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 275 (i).

Militia Expenditure re Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition (Ques.) 1778 (i).

Militia Field Allowance, Expenses of Staff Officers (Ques.) 1201 (i).

Militia, Govt. Policy *re* Armouries, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Militia Harness and Saddlery Tenders, &c for 1909 (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1780 (i).

Militia Inspection Pay, Rates to Inspectors (Ques.) 1535 (i).

Militia Medical Attendance, Money Allowance for married Officers (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Militia Officers, Provisional School Allowance (Ques.) 1019 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Ordnance Stores, Damage by Fire, Value, &c. (Ques.) 386 (i).

Militia Pay and Allowance Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 1377 (i).

Militia Provisions re Arms, &c. for active War Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 842 (i).

Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c. (Ques.) 639 (i).

Militia Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1779 (i).

—— (M. for ret.*) 2149 (ii).

Military Topographical Surveys, Expenditure re (Ques.) 1375 (i).

Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re* (Ques.) 1200 (i).

Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate, &c. (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Ordnance Militia Stores Buildings, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling (Ques.) 837 (i).

Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c. (Ques.) 2289 (ii).

See 'de la Ronde.'

Permanent Militia Corps, Increase of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

—— Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1781 (i).

—— Officers, Entertaining Allowance (Ques.) 1530 (i).

—— Requirements re Instructions, &c. (Ques.) 1011 (i).

—— Schools of Instruction, Number, Certificates issued, &c. (Ques.) 1531 (i).

—— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 266 (i).

Permanent Officers, Annual Cost per man (Ques.) 1013 (i).

—— Payments re Scale, &c. (Ques.) 1012 (i).

Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts (Ques.) 1203 (i).

Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c. (Ques.) 265 (i).

Rifle Practice, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

—— Schools of Instruction at St. John (Ques.) 1776 (i).

Ross Rifles, Answer of Minister to Question: Ques. of Order, 1597 (i).

—— Dates of Issue of Special Marks (M. for ret.*) 154 (i).

Ross Rifles, Marks I and Marks II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re (Ques.) 1532; on Ques. of Order, 1534 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle Mark II**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c. (Ques.) 273 (i).

—— Contract *re* (Ques.) 4311 (iii).

—— Number received and contracted for, &c. (Ques.) 5499 (iii).

Ross Rifle, Regulations *re* National Rifle Association, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4529 (iii).

—— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c. (Ques.) 134 (i).

—— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn *re* Bisley Meet (Ques.) 4082 (iii).

Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que. &c. (Ques.) 3491 (ii).

R. N. W. M. Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Sask., Arrangements *re* (Ques.) 843; (i).

St. Johns Que., Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 3738 (ii).

Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1780 (i).

See 'Militia.'

Sub-target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1799 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c .(Ques.) 1535 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Fraserville) 662; (generally, renewals, &c.) 662; (Grosse Isle) 665; (Joliette) 662; (Lachine, clock) 667; (Lachine, heating) 667; (Levis) 668; (Quebec ordnance stores) 968 (i).

U. S. Training Vessels on Great Lakes, Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c. (Ques.) 103 (i).

Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1777 (i).

Woollen Industry, Rep. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke (Ques.) 3737 (ii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Beaumarais Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).

Combines Investigation (B. 101) on M. for Com. on Res., 6892 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 102 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 5526; in Com., 5832 (iii).

Insects, Pests Diseases Prevention B. 20 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5667 (iii).

Latchford Dam, Montreal River, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3165 (ii).

Naval Defence B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 2°, 5152 (iii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Nelson River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 4839 (iii).

Oka Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).

Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Neely) in Com., 4841 (iii).

Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 4843 (iii).

St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co.'s incorp. B. 115 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Seed Control Act Amt. B. 55 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2653 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (improvements) 3126; (Newmarket) 3118 (ii).

Indians — Generally (land management (fund) 7837 (v).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 7846 (v).

Indians—N.S. (roads, &c.) 7845 (v).

Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 7835 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 7843; (surveys) 7337 (v).

Indians—P. E. I. (Lennox Island Wharf) 7847 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 5763; (Canada and Mexico) 5691 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Wolfville) 579 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings, new) 552; (Royal Mint) 564 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 580 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 683; (Rock Island) 947; (Roberval) 931; (St. Henri) 952 (i).

Public Works — Dredging — Mar. Provs. (generally) 4784 (iii); Que. and Ont. (generally) 6132 (iv); Dredging (new plant) 4760 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Port Hood) 1162; (Port Maitland) 1175 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur and Fort William) 5732 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Laprairie) 4221 (iii); (Paspebiac) 3912 (ii); (Riviere Ouelle) 4212; (Ste. Anne des Monts) 4232; (Ste Croix) 4236; (Three Rivers) 4250; (Vaudreuil Cove) 4211 (iii);

Railways—Miscellaneous (statistical officers) 3131 (ii).

Telegraphs Act Amt. B. 105 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 6012 (iv).

Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Wharfs transferred to Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3883 (ii).

Wharfs under P. W. Dept, Collection of Dues (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Accidents on Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. Ecrement) 22; Seconded (Mr. Kyte) 27.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 33; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Monk) 47; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 52; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. A. Haggart) 67; (Mr. Sproule) 73; (Mr. Lewis) 82; (Mr. Graham) Denial *re* reported Speech, 81 (i).

——— M. *re* Precedence (Sir Wilfrid Lauricr) 5 (i).

——— M. to Present (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).

——— Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1586 (i).

Address to Earl Grey on close of Term of Office: Moved (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8737; Seconded (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8740 (v).

Adjudication of Claims Treaty, Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).

Administration of Oaths of Office: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Adulteration of Food, Inspectors, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).

Aid to C. N. Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Air-Brakes to Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).

'Air-Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations re: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).

Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1369 (i).

——— Assistance to Messrs. McCurdy and Baldwin: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture Bulletins, Number distributed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 789 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Administration: Statement (Mr. Fisher) on M. for Sup., 7351, 7191, 7270 (iv).

——— Criticism of Methods: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Campbell) 1364 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 5724 (iii), 7764 (v).

Agriculture and Experimental Farms, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Agricultural Products exported from 1906-9, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4618 (iii).

Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).

Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).

Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) &c., in Com. on Bill, 5635 (iii).

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373 (iv).

Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).

Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products: in Co. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).

Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

——— Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).

Experimental Farms, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).

——— Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).

Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).

Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).

'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).

Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).

Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Swine Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).
Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Swine Industry in Ireland, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Alberta Coal Areas, Total Estimated Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 1010 (i).
Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Albert Medal: *See* 'Reynolds.'
Alcoholism International Conference, Canadian Representation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 521 (i).
Alfalfa Seed: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Abolition of, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
—— Violation of *re* Mechanics in Shipbuilding: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 4813 (iii).
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Allan SS. Co., Calling at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3057, 3209 (ii).
Allard and Prevost, Govt. Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crothers) 2488 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crothers) 2635 (ii).
All-Red Route, Rep. *re* Negotiations, Legislation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 269 (i).
Analytical Index to Hansard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Angus, Wm., Apptmt. as Naturalization Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3165 (ii).
Animal Breeding, Examination of Inspecting Vet. Surgeons: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) *re* Question, 6941 (iv).
Animals' Health: in Com. of Sup., 7755 (v).
Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).
—— Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 385 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Apples grown in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 5635 (iii).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (iv).
—— Protection *re* Fire: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1019 (i).
Arctic Expedition Tablet, Authority for placing in H. of C.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1596 (i).
——Corrected Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 1730 (i).
'Arctic' Str., Official Rep. *re* Cruise: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1014 (i).
Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Armouries, Drill Halls, Construction, Conribution *re* Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii), 8742 (v)
See 'Militia,' 'Drill Halls.'
Armouries and Drill Halls, Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Armstrong, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
Army Service Corps, Charges *re* two Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2288 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
Arrow Lake Telephone System: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Arthabaska 'Gazette' Declarations, &c., *re* Franking Privileges: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lavergne) 2149 (ii).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Assault: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Assay Office, Vancouver, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7769 (v).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).
Associated Press Despatches rrom England Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'

Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
——— Additional Buildings, Dr. King's Residence: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Atlantic Ports to Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Auctil, J. Napoleon, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1193 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Report, Delay in bringing down: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8856 (v).
——— Vols. I. and III: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).
——— Vol. II: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1445 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (v).
Automobiles injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Automobiles, Use of: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Aylmer Post Office, Addition: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Baby Farm, Sale by Militia Dept.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
See 'Militia.'
Baie St. Paul, Loss of Title of Lot 73: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1017 (i).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 18, 56, 57.'
Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3479 (ii), 4307 (iii).
Banking Act, Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Bank Bills: *See* 'Currency.'
Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).
Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).
Barge, W. R., Application *re* Licenses, Extension of Time, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5002 (iii).
Barr, Dr., M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 201 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 380 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Barthelmes, Alexander Augustus, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).
Bathurst Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux,' 'Loggie,' &c.
Bathurst Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
Bathurst Pubic Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).
Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal Leases, Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).
——— Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Roberts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).
Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
Becancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Behring Sea Sealing Arbitration, Expenditure by British and Can. Govts.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2716 (ii).
Belfast Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievance *re* Operation by G. T. Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 102 (i).
See 'B. No. 5.'
Beresford Subway, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
'Bessemer No. 2,' Str., Wreck of on Lake Erie, Negligence re Signals (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
——— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
See 'Marine.'

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).

Bills of Lading on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 25.'

Bills, Royal Assent. Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 922 (i); 5628 (iii); 6606 (iv).

Bills from Senate, Numbering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6177 (iv).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 3 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act,—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 93; 2°, 413, 448 (i).

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 94; 2°, 452 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 95; 2°, 467 (i).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Northrup).
1°, 96; 2°, 480 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 96; 2°, 856 (i); M. for Com., 6398; in Com., 6500, 6510, 7258; 3°, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Units of Electrical Measure.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°*, 96 (i); wthdn., 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 126; 2°, 499; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 98; in Com. on Res., 151; 1°* of B., 154; 2° and in Com., 522; 3°, 811 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 162 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 163 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting a certain Supplementary Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 172; in Com. on Res., 173; 1°* of B., 199; 2°, 705, 744; in Com., 781; 3°, 812 (i).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting Injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 201 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii), 8729; in Com., 8729; 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Criminal Code respecting offensive Weapons and Capital Offences.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 204 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Sinclair)
1°, 204; 2°, 512 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 204; wthdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, lines of Railway connected with the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 205; 2°, 1102; in Com., 1130 (i); 3°, 2191 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8402, 8828, 8854, 8855 (v).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 205; wthdn., 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 206; 2°, 1136; in Com., 1138 (i); 3°, 2637 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) To prevent the introduction or spreading of Insects, Pests and Diseases destructive to Vegetation.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 200; in Com. on Res., 209; 1°* of B., 212 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5627, 5630; 3°*, 5673 (iii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°, 256; 2°, 1209 (i).

Bill (No. 22) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 256; 2°, 1268 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°, 1296 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 257; 2°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Water Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 258; 2°, 1299 (i); in Com., 8004; 3°*, 8027 (v).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 340 (i); 2° m., 2156; 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the British North American Mining Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 556; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Eastern Townships Railway Company.—(Mr. Lavergne).
1°*, 379; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 1920 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1332 (i).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Northern Mortgage Company of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); 3°, 2279, 2373 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., 1364; 3°*, 1366 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Union Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557 (i); in Com., 2098; in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 557; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 380 (i); 2°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 429; withdn., 656 (i).

Bill (No. 41) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Lennox).
1°*, 430; 2°, 805; in Com., 807 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743; in Com., and 3°*, 1333 (i).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Hudson Bay Insurance Company.—(Mr. Knowles.)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3181 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Montreal Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Ethier)
1°*, 515; 2°*, 743 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 46) To incorporate the Pine Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. White, Victoria, Alberta).
1°*, 515; 2°*, 744; in Com., and 3°*, 1366 (i)

Bill (No. 47) To provide for Inspection of Vessels not now inspected.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 515 (i).

Bill (No. 48) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Papineau).
1°, 621 (i); 2°, 2032 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 520; in Com. on Res., 657; 1°* of B., 661 (i); withdn., 5674 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 705 (i); 2°*, 3206 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Roy, Montmagny).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 2279; 3°, 2280 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Nelson River Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).
1°*, 782; 2°*, 956 (i); in Com., 4752, 4814, 5235 5279; 3°*, 5317 (iii).

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1° 782 (i); 2° m., 2156 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 807; 1°* of B., 808 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To amend the Seed Control Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
In Com. on Res., 808; 1°* of B., 811 (i); 2°, 2637; in Com., 2638; 3°*, 2661 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 922 (i); 2°, 2035 (ii).

Bill (No. 57 To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 923 (i).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., 2258; 3°*, 2258 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Mayrand).
1°*, 1099; 2°*, 1333 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2258 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 60) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 1102 (i).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3151 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°*, 1192; 2°*, 1486 (i).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 1193 (i); 2°, 2039 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 8731 (v).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Improved Paper Machinery Company.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 3137; 3°*, 3138 (ii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Neely).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 4753, 4839; 3°*, 4922 (iii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Toronto Central Terminal Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1360; 2°*, 1729 (i).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting Assault and Offences against the Person.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1360 (i); 2°, 2040 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1361 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2040; in Com., 2054, 2153 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 1362 (i); 2°, 2158 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Harris).
1°, 1363 (i); 2°*, 2056 (ii); M. for Com., 8731; in Com., 8732; 3°*, 8733 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 76) To amend the Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1440 (i).

Bill (No. 77) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Boyer).
1°, 1441 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1528; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2259 (ii).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1729 (i); in Com., 6139, 6169, 6739; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate l'Institut de Notre Dames des Missions.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 1529; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3139; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) To regulate Horse Racing.—(Mr. Wallace).
1°, 1529 (i).

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Merchants and General Insurance Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2714; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1587; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Armstrong).
1°, 1587 (i).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).
1°, 1588 (i); 2°, 2162; in Com., 2166; 3°*, 2167 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Western Canada Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 1687; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3432; 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To amend an Act to authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Turriff).
1° m., 1688 (i); 2°, 2056 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 1689 (i).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Stratton).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3929; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting a Patent of the Mond Nickel Company, Limited.—(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1731; 2°*, 1920 (i); in Com., 3090 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 1731 (i); 2°*, 1964; in Com., and 3°*, 2671 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) To amend the Dominion Lands Act—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 1731 (i).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the Naval Service of Canada.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1732 (i); 2° m., 2952, 3210, 3296, 3575, 3683, 3747, 3945 (ii), 3987, 4025, 4083, 4129, 4316, 4403, 4535, 4618, 4848, 4922, 5003; Amt. (Mr. Monk) neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; Amt. (Mr. Borden) neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; on M. for 2°, 5107; Amt. (Mr. Northrup) neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5194; Res. prop., 5195 (iii), 6509; M. for Com., 6948; in Com. on Res., 7294 (iv); in Com. on B. 7393; 3° m., 7528, agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; Res. *re* withdn., 8742 (v).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., 3150; 3°*, 3150 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2101; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Trust and Loan Company of Canada.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°*, 2259 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Burrell).
1°*, 1878 (i); 2°, 2101 (ii); in Com., 4841; 3°*, 4842 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting Oaths.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1878 (i).

Bill (No. 101) To provide for the Investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers which may enhance prices or restrict competition to the detriment of consumers.—(Mr. King).
1°, 2056; Res. prop., 2489 (ii), 6802, 6886; in Com. on Res., 6904; 2°, 6904; in Com., 6904 (iv), 7881, 7977; 3°, 8003; Sen. Amts., 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2133 (ii); 2°, 5502; in Com., 5529, 5532, 5802, 5821, 5851 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8400 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 103) To amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act.— (Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 2135 (ii); 2°, 5674 (iii); M. for Com., 6202; in Com., 6209, 6963; 3°*, 7071 (iv).

Bill (No. 104) To control the rates and facilities of Ocean Cable Companies, and to amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2136 (ii); 2°, 6007; in Com., 6010; 3°*, 6011 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To amend the Telegraphs Act. —(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 2138 (ii); 2° and in Com., 6011; 3°*, 6012 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8389 (v).

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To incorporate the Ottawa Montreal and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Gladu).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Rainy River Radial Railway.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2283 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5765; 3°*, 5772 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 2184 (ii).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company. —(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3438 (ii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Dominion Millers' Association.—(Mr. Harris).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3481, 3872, 3915 (ii), 4025, 5772; 3°*, 5776 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To incorporate the Independent Order of Rechabites.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., and 3°*, 3876 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; in Com., 3430; 3°*, 3432 (ii).

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Forget).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373; 3°*, 3930 (ii).

Bill (No. 115) To incorporate the St. Lawrence Power Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 5317, 5722 (iii), 6138, 6169, 6226, 6341, 6663, 6721; 3° m., 6886, 7251 (iv); Sen. Amts., 8653 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 116) To incorporate the Toronto and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).
1°*, 2221; 2°*, 2373 (ii); in Com., 6768; 3°*, 6886 (iv).

Bill (No. 117) For the Relief of George Robert Buttonshaw.—(Mr. Campbell).
1°*, 2710; 2°*, 2840; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To incorporate the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Cowan).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2671 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate the International Waterways Canal and Construction Company.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°*, 2329; 2°, 2672, 3151 (ii); wthdn., 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 120) Respecting the Royal Guardians.—(Mr. Rivet).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 7256; 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 121) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., 4753; 3°*, 4754 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).
1°, 2329; 2°*, 2714 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Central Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8657 (v).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Eastern Canada Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).
1°*, 2426; 2°*, 2714 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 125) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 2485 (ii); 2°, 5921; in Com., and 3°*, 5922 (iii); Sen. Amts., 8401 (v).

Bill (No. 126) To correct a clerical Error in the French Convention Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 2486 (ii); 2°, 6620; in Com., and 3°*, 6620 (iv).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 2631; 2°*, 3030 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4755 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) To incorporate the James Bay and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., 5723, 5763; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) To incorporate the Ontario and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Low).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 130) Respecting the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 2792; 2°*, 3091 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 2792 (ii).

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
1°, 3056 (ii); 2°, 5680; 3°*, 5687 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate), To incorporate the Merchants Bank of Canada Pension Fund.—(Mr. Doherty).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), For the Relief of Hope Eileen Moreland Drinkle.—(Mr. McCarthy).
1°*, 3133; 2°*, 3254; in Com., and 3°*, 3481 (ii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 3133 (ii).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5496 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 3296; 2°*, 3438 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5723 (iii).

Bill (No. 138) To amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 3290 (ii); 2°, 6189; in Com., and 3°*, 6190 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 3389; 2°*, 3482 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Frederick Joseph Gustin McArthur.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3390; 2°*, 3875 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 141) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 3390 (ii); 2°, 5922; in Com., 5925 (iii), 5934; 3°*, 5934 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), To incorporate the Congregational Union of Canada.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 3481; 2°*, 3625 (ii); in Com., 4754; 3°*, 4844 (iii).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Magrath).
1°, 3670 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Jessie Maud Mary Maxwell.—(Mr. Boyce).
1°*, 3829; 2°*, 3931 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4308 (iii).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 3914 (ii); 2°, 8405; in Com., 8406; 3°*, 8422 (v).

Bill (No. 146, from the Senate), Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).
1°*, 4128; 2°*, 4246; ref. back to Ry. Com., 5235 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of Archibald Laurie.—(Mr. Congdon).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate) For the relief of Bernard Shea.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate) For the Relief of Clara Louise Holden.—(Mr. Rankin).
2°*, 4754; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to The Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Company.—(Mr. Reid, Restigouche).
1°*, 4402; 2°, 4842 (iii); in Com., 6139, 6169; 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 151) To provide for the adjudication of small claims arising in respect of the operation of the Government Railways.—(Mr. Graham).
1°, 4402 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6600; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) To incorporate the Northern Quebec Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, Quebec).
2°*, 4754; in Com., 5722; 3°*, 5850 (iii).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate), For the Relief of James Albert Green.—(Mr. Prowse).
1°*, 5103; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com.., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. W. H. White).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate), To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 4922 (iii); 2°, 6329; in Com., 6330; 3°*, 6332 (iv).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) To incorporate the Weyburn Security Bank.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°* 4922; 2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 157, from the Senate) For the Relief of Cecilia Marie Pringle.—(Mr. Price).
1°*, 4922; 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Ann Reed.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 5103; 2°, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 4996 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6182; 3°*, 6187 (iv).

Bill (No. 160, from the Senate) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°*, 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the Sovereign Trust Company, and to change its name to 'The Federal Trust Company.'—(Mr. Nesbitt).
2°*, 5496; in Com., and 3°*, 5724 (iii).

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) For the relief of Alexander Augustus Barthelmes.—(Mr. W. M. Martin).
1°* 5277; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Volunteer Bounty Act, 1908.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 4996 (iii); 2°, 6376 (iv); in Com., 8072, 8389; 3°*, 8400 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 5103, 2°*, 5496 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) For the relief of Elmore Walker Scott.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 5557; 2°*, 5777 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°*, 5617 (iii); 2°, 7940; in Com., 7942, 8459; 3°*, 8476 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve).
1°*, 5617, 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming.—Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5724 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6140 (iv).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Bank.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*,5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Co.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 5617; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6177 (iv).

Bill (No. 173) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Years ending respectively, the 31st March, 1910, and the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5529; in Com. on Ways and Means, 5606, 5626; 1° of B., 5626; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5627 (iii).

Bill (No. 174) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°, 5621 (iii).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).

1°, 5620 (iii).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) To incorporate the Laurentian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 5687 (iii); 2°* 6798; in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) To incorporate the Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Company.—(Mr. Broder).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa and Montreal Transmission Company, Limited.—(Mr. Perley).

1°*, 5759 (iii); 2°*, 6798 (iv); in Com., 8599; 3°*, 8618 (v).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) For the Relief of Helena Mellor Fleming.—(Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 5759; 2°*, 5850 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7258 (iv).

Bill (No. 180) To amend the Royal Military College Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2633; in Com. on Res., 5783; 1°*, of B., 5791 (iii); 2°, 6098; in Com., and 3°*, 6099 (iv).

Bill (No. 181) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Public Lands, and the acquisition of certain other Lands, in or in the vicinity of the Cities of Toronto and Winnipeg, respectively.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 2634; in Com. on Res., 5791; 1°* of B., 5793 (iii); 2° and in Com., 5941, 6003; 3°*, 6005 (iv)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 182) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada, and to promote the production in Canada of Zinc.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 4848; in Com. on Res., 5794; 1°* of B., 5801 (iii); 2e and in Com., 5935; 3°*, 6617 (iv).

Bill (No. 83, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin).

1°*, 5886 (iii); 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 184) To provide for the Testing of Glassware used in connection with Milk Tests.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5884 (iii); 2°, 6005; in Com., 6006; 3°*, 6007 (iv).

Bill (No. 185) Respecting the Commission for the Conservation of Natural Resources.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 5687; in Com. on Res., 5884; 1°* of B., 5885 (iii); 2°, 6332; in Com., 6338, 6359; 3°, 6619 (iv).

Bill (No. 186) To amend the Irrigation Act —(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5886 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6200; 3°*, 6202 (iv).

Bill (No. 187) To confirm and declare the rights of the Crown with respect to Water and Water Power, and relating to the diversion, acquisition and use of Water in the Railway Belt in British Columbia.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5887 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6375; in Com., 8435, 8706 (iv).

Bill (No. 188) To amend the Act respecting the National Battlefield at Québec.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 5888 (iii); 2° and in Com., 6598; 3°*, 6600 (iv).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate) To incorporate the Protectorate Life Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 5929; 2°*, 6140; in Com., and 3°*, 6798 (iv).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) To incorporate the Gatineau and Ungava Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°*,5921; 2°* 6798 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 191) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 5623; in Com. on Res., 5898; 1°* of B., 5904; 2°, 5904 (iii); in Com., 6601; 3°*, 6601 (iv).

Bill (No. 192) To amend the Fisheries Act. —(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4708; in Com. on Res., 5906; 1°* of B., 5921 (iii); 2° and in Com., 8032, 8058; 3°*, 8072 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 5929; 2°, 6279; in Com., 6279; 3°, 6618 (iv).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Militia Pension Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden).
Res. prop., 2633 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6012, 6097; 1°* of B.. 6098; 2°, 6190; in Com., 6190; 3°*, 6194 (iv).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting the Currency Act. —(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 2632 (ii); in Com. on Res., 6188; 1°* of B., 6189; 2° and in Com,. 6620, 6641; 3°*, 6646 (iv).

Bill (No. 196) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1910.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 6397; in Com., 6397; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 6398 (iv).

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Post Office Act. —(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 6100; in Com. on Res., 6601; 1° of B., 6389; 2° and in Com., 7313; 3°*, 7330 (iv).

Bill (No. 198) To amend the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.—(Mr. King).
Res. prop., 4848 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6603; 1* of B., 6605 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8027; 3°*, 8032 (v).

Bill (No. 199) Respecting licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 200) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 6607 (iv).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate) For the Relief of John Green.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Thornton Brownlee.—(Mr. Blain).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 7846 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) Respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company. —(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 6802; 2°*, 7258 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 204) To authorize the Erection of certain Wharfs and Buildings in the Harbour of St. John.—(Mr. Pugsley).
1°, 6934 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8120; 3°*, 8129 (v).

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6948; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6962; in Com., 7295 (iv); 3°*, 7528; Sen. Amts., 8772 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 206) Respecting Escheats.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6508; in Com. on Res., 6974; 1°* of B., 6976 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8384; 3°*, 8388 (v).

Bill (No. 207) To amend the Judges Act.-(Mr. Aylesworth).
Res. prop., 6607; in Com. on Res., 6976; 1°* of B., 6985 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8383; 3°*, 8384 (v).

Bill (No. 208) To provide for the Payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 6608; in Com. on Res., 6985; 1°* of B., 7009 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8129; 3°*, 8131 (v).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Murphy).
1°, 7181 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8381; 3°*, 8382 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate) To incorporate the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°, 7286; 2°, 7287 (iv); in Com., 7868, 8043, 8422, 8587; 3°*, 8599 (v).

Bill (No. 211, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pioneers Loan Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 7512; 2°*, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Government Annuities Act, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7512 (v).

Bill (No. 213, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Sifton).
1°*, 7650; 2°, 7868; in Com. and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7868; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) To incorporate the Buctouche Railway and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 7650; 2°*, 7846; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 216, from the Senate) Respecting the British Northwestern Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg).
1°*, 7867; 2°*, 8043; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 7867; 2° and in Com., 8382; 3°*, 8383 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) Respecting the Guelph Junction Railway Company. —(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 7975; 2°, 8055, 8380, 8618; 3°, 8652 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 219, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta, Peace River and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 7975; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 220, from the Senate) To incorporate the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 8213; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 221, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Alexander Hurst Forster.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 222, from the Senate) For the Relief of Emily Maud Nicoll.—(Mr. Osler).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 223, from the Senate), For the Relief of Edna Shibley De Mar.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 224, from the Senate) for the Relief of Clifford Buell Lillie.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 225, from the Senate) for the Relief of Rowland James Botterill.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 8361; 2°*, 8381; in Com., and 3°*, 8653 (v).

Bill (No. 226) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in Aid of the construction of Lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 7873, 8239; in Com. on Res., 8477; 1°*, 2°* of B., 8480; in Com., 8480; 3°*, 8679 (v).

Bill (No. 227) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company, and to aid in the construction of its Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8110; in Com. on Res., 8483; 1° of B., 8487; 2°*, and in Com., 8487; 3°*, 8679 (iv).

Bill (No. 228) To assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian Press (Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8239; in Com. on Res., 8679; 1°* 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8687 (v).

Bill (No. 229) To encourage the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 6276 (iv); withdwn., 8003; res. prop., 8113; in Com. on Res., 8687; 1°* of B., 8697; 2°, and in Com., 8673; 3°* 8764 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 230) Respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 8697; 1°* of B., 8704; 2° and in Com., 8770; 3°*, 8771 (v).

Bill (No. 231) Respecting Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 8362; in Com. on Res., 8705; 1°* of B., 8705; 2° and in Com., 8764; 3°*, 8770 (v).

Bill (No. 232) To amend the Government Railway Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8733; 2° and in Com., 8772; 3°*, 8776 (v).

Bill (No. 233) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1907 (Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8705, 8742; in Com. on Ways and Means, 8757; 1°* of B., 8763; 2°, 8841; in Com., and 3°*, 8854 (v).

Bill (No. 234, from the Senate) To correct an error in the Telegraphs Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°, 8776; 2°*, 8777; in Com., 8777; 3°* 8777 (v).

Bill (No. 235) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. of Ways and Means, 8856; 1°*, 2°*, 8856; in Com.., 8856; 3°*, 8856 (v).

Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (iv).

——— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).

Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).

Blue Rocks Islands Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).

Blythe, Walter, Commutation of Death Sentence: Correction re Crown's Action (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Wallace) for Papers, 2009 (ii).

Board of Ry. Commissioners, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 104, 145.'

Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).

——— Pet. *re.*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii)

Boat Harbour, Toney River, N. S., Expenditure to date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).

See 'Toney.'

Boivin, Elzear, Payment *re* Telegraph Construction: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
Bookmaking and Pool Rooms: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Botterill, Rowland James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 225.'
Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Bounties on Iron and Steel: *See* 'B. No. 231.
Bounties on Lead and Zinc: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Bounty to S. A. Volunteers: *See* 'B. No. 87 and 163.'
Bourgeois, Mr. B., Emplymt. by N. T. Ry., Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).
Bout de L'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Seguin) 6394 (iv).
Bow River Coal Lands, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 3170 (ii).
Boy Scouts, Visit to Canada, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3057 (ii).
Branch Lines on I. C. R., Requirement of: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
Brandon City, Land purchased from Govt., Title, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6182 (iv).
—— Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Brandon Land Agencies, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 213.'
Brantford Telephone Memorial: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Bridges, Wharfs, &c., Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
B. C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
—— Expenditure by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
—— Judicial Appointments, Delays, &c., on M. to adjn: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5 (i).
—— Reply to Mr. Borden (Mr. Aylesworth) 11 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 531 (i).
See 'Judicial.'
B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).
B. C. Lt. Governorship, Recommendations from Liberal Organizations *re* F. C. Wade, K.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 382 (i).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 523 (i).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B.C. Ry. Belt, Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187'.
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
British North America Mining Co.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
British Northwestern Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Britton, Hon. Mr. Justice, and National Trust Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 6799 (iv).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brown, Hon. George, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Brownlee, James Thornton: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brule Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buctouche Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— Debate: (Mr. Fielding) 1446; (Mr. Foster) 1474; (Mr. Miller) 1507; (Mr. Sproule) 1601; (Mr. Fowke) 1613; (Mr. Staples) remarks, 1616; (Mr. Thoburn) remarks, 1621; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1626; (Mr. Stratton) 1636; (Mr. McCall) 1655; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 1662; (Mr. Barnard) 1673; (Mr. E. Roy) 1678; (Mr. Sinclair) 1690; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1701; (Mr. Schell) 1804; (Mr. Lake) 1828, (Mr. Rivet) 1842; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 1858; (Mr. Low) 1864; (Mr. Sexsmith) 1868; (Mr. M. Clark) 1880; (Mr. Crothers) 1894; (Mr. Congdon) 1903; (Mr. Magrath) 1920; (Mr. E. Paquet) 1929; (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 1935; (Mr. Arthurs) 1946; (Mr. Thornton) 1949; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1952 (i); (Mr. Paterson) 2061; (Mr. Sproule) 2065; (Mr. Burrell) 2067; (Mr. J. Haggart) 2067; (Mr. Wallace) 2069; (Mr. Hughes) 2069; A. Currie) 2076; (Mr. Lalor) 2079; (Mr. Armstrong) 2080; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2081; Ques of Order, 2085; (Mr. Speaker) Ruling, 2084; (Mr. Foster) 2082; (Mr. Boyce) 2093, 2102; (Mr. Turriff) 2127; (Mr. Wilcox) 2163; (Mr. Loggie) 2178, 2215, 2222; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2218; (Mr. Edwards) 2227; (Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2229; (Mr. Owen) 2246; (Mr. Nesbitt) 2246; (Mr. Campbell) 2259; (Mr. Speaker, Dep.) Ques. of Order, 2267; (Mr. Robert Smith) 2269 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1002 (i).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Buoys on Lake St. John, Annual Payments: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870 (v).
See 'Lake St. Peter.'

Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Burk's Falls Wharfage Dues, Amount for 1907-9: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7872 (v).
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Business of the Hse., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 118 (i).
Buttonshaw, George Robert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3878 (ii).
Cable Co.'s Rates: *See* 'B. No. 104 and 234.'
Cable Cos. and Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Camborne Postmaster, B.C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii), 8810 (v).
Canada Gazette, French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 8585 (v).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
See 'Germany.'
Canada and G. B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8808 (v).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8809 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Commissions, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Can. Handicrafts Guild: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Can. Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Canadian Attache at Washington: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1582 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4708 (iii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount of U. S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).
See 'Currency.'
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Canadian Exhibit in London: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Canadian Flag: *See* 'Flags.'
Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (iv).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
See 'de la Ronde.'
Canadian Navy, Number of Applications *re* Positions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2717 (ii).
——— Pets. to Govt. and Parliament *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5782 (iii).
——— Purchase, by Govt. of Vessels, O.C's. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2930 (ii).
——— Names of Cruisers, &c., purchased, description, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3931 (ii).
See 'Naval,' &c.
Canadian Navy Shipbuilding, Tenders *re* Great Lake Shipyards and Rush-Bagot Treaty: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 844 (i).
Can. Northern Alberta Ry. Co., Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
——— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
——— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
C.P.R., Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 15, 74, 77.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
CANALS.
Beauharnois Canal Bridges, Cor. with Celestin Pregent: M. for copy (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Messrs. McIntyre & Robert, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2141 (ii).

—— Arrears of Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3732 (ii).

Canals, Arbitrations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Canal Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 5759 (iii).

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

—— Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment *re* Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

—— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s, &c. *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).

Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).

—— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).

—— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c. Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).

—— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).

—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).

—— Dismissals, &c. by Denis O'Brien, Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).

—— Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).

—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).

—— Evers, T., Emplymt. as Electrician: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).

—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).

Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).

CANALS—*Con*

New York Canals, Use by Canadian Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).

—— Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).

Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

—— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).

—— Slope Trimming, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3105 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).

Trent Canal, Clarry, L. F., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).

—— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii).

—— Instructions, Payments, &c. as Agent *re* Trent Canal Lands: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6391 (iv).

—— Payments to re Trent Canal Floods: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7516 (v).

Trent Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

—— Damages to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

—— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

—— Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).

—— Floods in twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).

—— Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re* Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).

—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (ii).

Trent Canal, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).

Trent Canal—Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).

—— Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).

—— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).

Trent Canal, Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).

——— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).

Welland Canal, Expenditure re Surveys, &c. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).

——— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Elevators, Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).

——— Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).

———Right of Way. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).

Welland Canal, Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Welland Canal, Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).

——— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).

Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).

Cape de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3888 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Capital Cases, Action of Crown: Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 2712 (ii).

Capital Offences: *See* 'B. Nos. 14, 71.'

Cargo Inspections, Names of Ports, Results, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 642 (i).

Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Cariboo-Chilcoten Telegraph Construction: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 6157 (iv).

Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).

Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).

See 'Frontenac.'

Catholic Episcopal Corporation of Temiskaming: *See* 'B. No. 170.'

Cattle Guards on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'

Cattle Inspection on Ships: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).

Chambers of Commerce, P.Q., Federation: *See* 'B. No. 220.'

Chambly Canal, Canton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).

See 'Canals.'

Chambly River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).

Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).

Champlain Monument: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).

Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).

Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).

Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

Charleston or Kelmont P. O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3682 (ii).

Charlottetown, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).

——— Increased Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).

Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: Motion for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).

——— Shareholders: Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).

See 'Finance.'

Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii)

Chatham, Diversion of I.C.R. Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).

Chaudiere Junction, I. C. R. Signals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).

Chevalier, Dr. E. N., Resignation, Pension, &c. (Mr. Monk) 636 (i).

Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).

Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Chief Justices, Apptmt. of by Govt: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 7293 (iv).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).

Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).

Chinamen, Number paying Capitation Tax. Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 7870 (v).

China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).

Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

'Christine,' Str., Purchase of, Rate of Speed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1201 (i).

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
——— Original Field Notes: M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Cement Merger: *See* 'Combines Bill 101.'
Cement Merger, Complaints *re* Illegal Combination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2296 (ii).
——— Protection *re* Combine: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 106 (i).
Cement Trust: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Census: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Census, Decennial, Date of taking: Ques. (Mr Boyer) 1371 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7373, 7763 (v).
Central Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 123.'
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Central Park Post Office, Action *re* Pet.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Change of Location, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
——— Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Cigarettes, Number manufactured and imported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 631 (i).
Cirkle, Mr. Fritz, Emplymt. in Dept. of Mines, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stratton) 5497 (iii).
——— Unprofessional Conduct, Charges *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. Smith) 5502 (iii).
Civil Employees, Salaries *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Civil Engineers: *See* 'Engineers,' &c.
Civil Govt. Expenditures, Increases of: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 212 (i).
See 'Supply.'
Civil Servants, in Outside Service, Increase of Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Rivet) 845 (i).
Civil Service Act (garnisheeing of wages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Civil Service Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Civil Service Amt Amt. Bill: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beauparlant) 7066 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmts., Number of passing Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2256 (ii).
——— Apptmts. under C. S. Act, Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 3170 (ii).
Civil Service Employees, Number in 1909, Total Cost: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 4315 (iii).
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 1730 (i).
Civil Service, Outside, Legislation *re* Reorganization: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 6947 (iv).
Claims Adjudication Treaty Ratification: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5278 (iii).
Claims against Govt. Rys., Adjudication: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Clarry, L. F., Charges *re* Claims for Damages on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5209 (iii), 6391 (iv), 7516 (v).
——— Total Amount of Account with Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5781 (iii).
See 'Canals—Trent.'
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).
Coal Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5000 (iii).
Coal Oil Lands, Acres sold, Leased, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 277 (i).
Coal Oil: *See* 'Petroleum.'
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v).
See 'Lightkeepers.'
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Coins, Minting of: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Coins, Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from Circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
See 'Can. Coins.'
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Cold Storage for Fruit: in Com. of Sup., 7383 (iv).
Cold Storage Plant, Barrington, N.S., Application *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1972 (ii).
Cold Storage Warehouses for Food Products, in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).

Columbia and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 29.'
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade: Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1363 (i).
Combines, Investigation: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Combines Bill: Personal Explanation (Mr. King) *re* Speech, 7188 (iv).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 8810 (v).
Commissions appointed by Govt. since 1896, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
Committee, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5, 22 (i).
—— Lists: Presented(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 155 (i).
—— M. to add Names, 1001 (i).
Committee on Standing Orders: M. (Mr. McCraney) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 6605 (iv).
Company Promoters, Legislation *re* Protection to Public: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 5104 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Congregational Union of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Conservation of Natural Resources: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.'
Conservation Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
—— Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1590 (i).
—— Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4845 (iii).
—— Regulations re Fisheries: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3486 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Consideration of Bill: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6140 (iv).
Consuls of Foreign Countries, Official Status in Canada: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 853 (i).
See 'Can. Attache.'
Contagious Diseases, Expenditure *re* Prevention, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Miller) 1378 (i).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
Controverted Elections, P.E.I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Convicts in Penitentiaries, Segregation of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 142 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Co-operative Societies B. 26, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3205 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Bank Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Extension of Concrete Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Lock 17, Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
—— Removing High Spots: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
—— Discrimination *re* Postage: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
—— Postal Regulations, P.M.G.'s Answers, Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Courtenay Bay—Marsh Road: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Criminal Code Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 14, 41, 71, 75, 81, 85.'
Crosbie, Mr. W. F., Refund to *re* Purchase of School Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4616 (iii).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 4, 145.'
Crown, Escheats to: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Cullum, Wm., Apptmt. as Boiler Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1529 (i).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Currency Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation. Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).
Customs Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Customs Act (reporting of vessels) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Customs Tariff Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'
CUSTOMS.
Burlington Customs Collector, Outside Employment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5001 (iii).
Canada and Germany, Total Value of Exports, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 633 (i).
Chambord Customs Office, Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Coal Importations from U. S. from 1905 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 842 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Customs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Customs and Excise Revenue for 1909-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8109 (v).
Customs Outside Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i), 8803 (iv).
Incubators, Total Number imported from U.S., 1909: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 169 (i).
——— M. for Ret.*: (Mr. G. V. White) 414 (i).
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industries, Transportation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7362 (iv).
Dale, Sydney J., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 4790 (iii).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 985 (i).
Daylight Saving: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 514 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 2424; M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 3052 (ii).
——— Translators, Apptmt. of: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3914 (ii).
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
Deep Water Weirs in Charlotte, Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delaucette, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecution: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
de la Ronde, Major and Capt., Charges of Malfeasance in Army Service Corps: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
——— Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i).
——— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Delisle Postmaster Alfred Gagné, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
De Mar, Edna Shibley, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 223.'
Deptl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Deschenes Lake Dredging Plant, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 631 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour, Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Disallowance of Ontario Legislation: Inquiry for Reps. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv), 7650 (v).
Distilleries, Extra Duty, Payments for: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
Distribution Office, H. of C., Salary Increases: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Divorce: *See* 'Bills, Nos. 117, 134, 140, 144, 147, 148, 149, 153, 157, 158, 162, 165, 179, 201, 202, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225.'
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
——— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).

Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dollar Bills: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
See 'Currency.'
Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Bank: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Dom. Coal Co. and Cumberland Coal Co.'s Strike, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dominion Elections, Total Cost for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 2285 (ii).
Dominion Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7384 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94 and 143.'
Dom. Lands Act B. 94, Ruling *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1730 (i).
Dom. Lands Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
See 'Half Sections,' 'Homesteads,' 'Interior,' 'N. E. Section.'
Dom. Millers' Association: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Dom. Police sent to Thunder Bay, Rainy River &c. during Election 1909: Ques. (Mr. Smyth) 1007 (i).
Dominion Traffic Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Douglas Island, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3165 (ii).
Doukhobors, Comparison *re* h. m. for Dauphin, Ques. of Order (Mr. Campbell) 5532 (iii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
See 'Bathurst' &c.
Dredging, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Fraudulent Charges *re* Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780, 5608 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs., Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
Dredging Plant, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
——— Ont and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii); 6124 (iv).
——— St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
See 'Govt. Dredges.'
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
See 'Armouries.'
Drinkle, Hope Eileen Moreland, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Dry Dock at Port Arthur, Application, &c. *re* Subsidy: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 104 (i).
See 'Port Arthur.'
Dry Dock at Sault Ste. Marie, Application *re* Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 105 (i).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Dry Docks, Subsidy to: *See* 'B. No. 229.'
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
See 'H. of C. Members,' 'Representation,' 'Ottawa City,' &c.
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dubuc, Chief Justice, Date of Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1975 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 2277 (ii).
See 'Judges, Man.,' &c.
Dufferin Electoral Division, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620, 1731* (i).
——— Date of: Remarks(Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).
——— Representation of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
Duncan Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunn, John A., Application for N. W. Lands: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3170 (ii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).

Du Tremblay, Mr. A., Instructions *re* Prosecutions: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8678 (v).
'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c., of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).
Easter Adjournment: M. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).
Eastern Deptl. Bldg., Ottawa, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
Eastern Canada Manufacturers' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Eastern Townships Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Edmonton-Athabaska Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.
Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 21, 109.'
Electric and Gas Exportation Licenses, Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 167 (i).
Electric Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Electrical Measuring: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Elevators at Terminal Points, Building, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i).
Elliott Bros. & R. Carson, Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
See 'Immigration.'
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Engineers' Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Engineers, Status in Civil Service, Pensions, &c.: M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. Warburton) 2019 (ii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Escheats to the Crown: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Fortificatons, Dismantling of, Imp-Conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
——— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Estimates, Delay in Bringing down: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).
——— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).
——— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).
Estimates, Suppl.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3987 (iii).
Evers, Mr. T., Emplymt. as Electrician on Lachine Canal: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428, 2927 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Excise Bonding Warehouses, Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Excise, French Translation: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
——— Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1331 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
——— Surveys, Special Pay for Extra Hours: in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Exhibition at Charlottetown: in Com. of Sup., 7766 (v).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 5728 (iii).
Exhibitions, Foreign, Canadian Participation *re*, Expenditure by Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1977 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farms at Agassiz, B.C., Dom. Contribution *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor 2294 (ii).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv.
——- Branch Stations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5724 (iii), 7392 (iv), 7764-5 (v).
Experimental Farms Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).

Experimental Farm, Lethbridge, Cor., &c., *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 2150 (ii).
Experimental Farm at Ottawa, Number of Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5002 (iii).
Explosives on Construction Works, Number of Accidents, Investigations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Robb) 172 (i).
Explosives, Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Extension, B.C., Mining Disaster, Medals Awarded, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
External Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i).
Factories Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
Farm and Dairy Produce, Amount exported: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1016 (i).
'Farm Weeds,' Expenditure *re* Preparation, Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1965 (ii).
Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Federation of Chambers of Commerce of P.Q.: *See* 'B. No. 220.'
Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction *re* Companies: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3207 (ii).
Federal Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Fences along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Fenelon Falls Dry Dock, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1207 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 789 (i).
—— Recognition of Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 7068 (iv).
—— Request *re* Indemnity: Ques. (Mr. Papineau) 5560 (iii).
See 'Volunteers Bills Nos. 87 and 163.'
Ferguson Balloting Device, Examination *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7289 (iv).
Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv), 8190 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
Fielding, Hon. W. S., Gift to: *See* 'Ministers of the Crown.'
Fighting Island Channel Improvement: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
FINANCE.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vols. 1. and III.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
FINANCE—*Con.*
—— Vol. II.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1730 (i).
Aud. General's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7768 (iv).
Banking Act, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6947 (iv).
—— Expiration of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 2950 (ii).
Bank Deposits in 1909: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5001 (iii).
Bank Shareholders List: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4846 (iii).
—— Report presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5759 (iii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount for ten years, Cost, Profit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Canadian Coinage, Amount of U.S. Silver, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2150 (ii).
Chartered Banks gone into Liquidation since 1888, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3170 (ii).
Coins Uncurrent and Foreign, Removal from circulation: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
Currency, Dom., Issue of Clean Circulation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 8238 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7188 (iv).
Estimates, The, 1909-10: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 154 (i).
—— Suppl., 1910: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 377 (i), 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).
—— (1911) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7519 (v).
Finance and Treasury Board Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).
Financial Statement—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).
Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).
Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
—— Annuities Act, Expenditure *re* Administration, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2142 (ii).
Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1st, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (iv).
Temporary Loans since beginning of present Session, Conditions re: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
—— since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).

Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Fires caused by Govt. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Fisheries Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fish Industry of Can. and Combines: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Fisheries Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Fish used as Fertilizers: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Fishing Vessels, Licenses to: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
FISHERIES.
Atlantic Fisheries, Amount of Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Bait Freezers, Date of Govt. Assistance, Number erected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1593 (i).
Bait Freezers at Inverness, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4310 (iii).
Bait Supply in Bay of Fundy, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
B.C., Claim *re* Fisheries Collections: in Com. of Sup., 8552 (v).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 8544 (v).
Chambly River Dam, and Fishing Right: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8538 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8515 (v).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
——— Cost of Maintenance, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Fish Contract for Penitentiary: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
Fish Drier at Souris, Operation, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6798 (iv).
Fish Fry, Application Forms: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 3058 (ii).
Fish Prices in B.C., 7884 (iv).
Fish Transportation and Conservation: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii).
Fish Tariff between U. S. and Canada: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Jameson) 4811 (iii).
——— Fisheries Commission, Number since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1198 (i).
Fisheries Regulations, Violation of, Names of Persons, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations and N. Essex Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
Fisheries Revenue, Alberta and Sask., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1021 (i).
Fishermen's Bait Associations, Amounts paid for Storage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1015 (i).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v).
Fishing Licenses in B. C., Compensation Claims, Disputes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3933 (ii).
Fishways Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques.* (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishment for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hatcheries at Berens River and Snake Island, Total Cost: (Mr. Bradbury) 632 (i).
Hatcheries in Man., Cost of Construction, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 384 (i).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
——— Number of Licenses issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
——— Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i), 2153 (ii).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
——— Letters from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 8540 (v).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Canning Plants, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Manitoba Fisheries Investigation, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).
—— Changes in Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).
—— Evidence and Rep., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 276 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell) 1302, 1801 (i), 1962 (ii).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).
—— Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).
—— Regulations in Man.: Inquiry for (Mr Bradbury) 3480 (ii), 5894 (iii).
—— Signing of Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2061 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries (lobster industry) Com.: M. to conc. in Rep. (Mr. Sinclair) 3986 (iii), 8101, 8214 (v).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at the Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii), 8509 (v).
Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
—— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Flag for Canada, Distinctive Ensign: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 133 (i).
Fleming, Helena Mellor, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Foreign Capital invested in Canada, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 631 (i).
Forests. Conservation of: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Forest and Timber Protection: in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Forster, James Alexander Hurst, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 221.'
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort Henry Reserve, Condition at Time of Lease to R. J. Dunlop: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Grain Supervisors, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Franking Privilege, Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1207 (i).
Franking Privilege, Political Literature and Sol. Gen.'s Frank: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784, (amt.) 7792, neg. (Y. 49; N. 79) 7834 (v).
Fraser River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Freight Rates, Guarantee against Loss: *See* 'B. No. 2.'
French Canadian Party in Parlt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blondin) 8115 (v).
French Floods Relief Fund: Grant to, 3059; Tel. from Sir Francis Bertie: Read (Mr. Fielding) 3295 (ii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
See 'Militia.'
French Treaty Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 12 and 126.'
French Treaty, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R .L. Borden) 6 (i).
—— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
—— Minimum Duties, Trade Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8664 (v).
—— Par. in Press *re* Consideration in France (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
—— Provisions *re* Termination: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 276 (i).
—— Similar Treatment to Germany: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
See 'German,' &c.
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).
—— Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).
Frontenac Mail Contracts, Payments, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).

Fumigating Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Galops Canals, Concrete Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Gambling Bill, Pamphlet *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) 3937 (ii).
Garden Fruits and Vegetables, Pet. *re* Removal of Duty: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 6646 (iv).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Gardiner, Wm. Reid, Cancellation of Entry, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 5502 (iii).
Garrison Artillery Guns, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799; Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).
Garrison Artillery Regiment, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
—— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Gas Inspection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Gas Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Gaspe Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments to Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487; Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
See 'Bathurst,' &c., 'Mar. Dredging Co.'
Gatineau and Ungava Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Geological Survey, Purchase of Books, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Georgetown Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Georgian Bay Canals, O.C.'s., &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. G. V. White) 3495 (ii.
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. G. V. White) 6616 (iv).
—— Ret.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8734 (v).
German Surtax, Error in Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4712 (iii).
—— Explanations *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3679 (ii).
German Tariff, Agreement wtih Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3829 (ii).
Germany and Canada Trade Relations, Similar Treatment as France: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 785, 1196 (i).
See 'Can. and Germany,' 'Customs,' &c.
German Trade Relations, Par. in New York 'Herald': Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 2635 (ii).
—— Value of Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 261 (i).
Gervais, Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6178 (iv).
Gervais, Mrs. C., Issue of Scrip, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6934 (iv).
Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Glassware used in Milk Tests, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Glover, Robert, Pet.: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1586 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Goderich Excise Collections, Name of Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 3933 (ii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Godin, Dr. Arsene, Payment of Indemnity *re* Damages on Chambly Canal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2486 (ii).
Gold Specie, Statutory Provision *re* Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3294 (ii).
Gordon, Mrs. John, Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 5616 (iii).
Govt. Annuities Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6099 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr Foster) 926 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays: M. (Mr. Fielding) 3829 (ii).
—— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2221 (ii).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 4315 (iii).
—— Remarks on Easter Adjournment (Mr. Sproule) 5893 (iii).
—— Unopposed Motions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4308 (iii).
Govt. Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
See 'Dredges.'
Govt. Employees, Garnisheeing Wages: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).

Govt. Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright: *See* 'Frontenac.'
Govt. Rys. Act (damages by fire) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
See 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).
Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).
Govt. Telegraph Lines, Mileage, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2184 (ii).
Govt. Weigher at Montreal, Apptmt. of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 1546 (i).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.
Grain Exports from Montreal for Ten Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 782 (i).
Grain Inspection Board: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Grain Mixing by Elevator Men at Fort William, &c., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 5933 (iv).
Grain Shipments from the West: M. for Papers (Mr. McCarthy) 1687 (i).
Grain shipped from and received at Lake Ports, Ont.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 445 (i).
Grain Supervisors at Fort William, &c., Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3482 (ii).
Grain Survey Board: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Grain Trade, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8534 (v).
—— Letter of Mr. R. McKenzie: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
—— Over-classification of Grades: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 8343; Reply (Mr. Oliver) 8363 (v).
—— Terminal Elevator Co., Tel., &c., Read (Mr. Schaffner) 8240 (iv).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Grand Bend Pier: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mere Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
G. T. R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. N. 164.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.
Arbitration Agreement of 14th May, 1909, Acceptance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2137 (ii).
Bonds guaranteed, Total Amount to 31st March, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
Branch Lines, Charters, Construction, Locations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1366 (i).
Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
—— Memorandum from Chairman to Prime Minister: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2139 (ii).
—— Classifications submitted to Mr. Lumsden on 16th March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 261 (i).
——Written Objections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
Construction Contracts, N.B., Provisions *re* Sub-letting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 383 (i).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 643 (i)
—— Provision *re* Forfeits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 387 (i).
—— Corrected Answer, 447 (i).
Courtenay Bay, G. T. P. Terminals, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3156 (ii).
Eastern Div. Survey, Location, &c., Names of Engineers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1687 (i).
Engineers' Complaints against Arbitrators: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2141 (ii).
Entrance into Brandon, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 3159 (ii).
Hodgins, Major, Name of Asst. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
—— Payments to Counsel, Total Cost.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
Land Sales along Lines: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1966 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
—— Adjustment of Disputed Item ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O. C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
—— Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
—— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors claims *re* over-classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
—— Bourgeois, Mr. B., Dismissal from N. T. Ry., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3166, 3676 (ii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
—— Classification, Letters of Aud. Gen.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lennox) 643 (i).
N.T. Ry. Commission: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682 (ii).
—— Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
—— Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
—— Rep.: M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
—— Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
National Transcontinental Ry. Construction, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii); 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
—— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup., 8242 (Amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
N.T. Ry., Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
—— Date of Contract for Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).
—— Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Lumsden, Hugh, Resignation, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).
——Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 97 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
—— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
—— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
—— Additional Letter to Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
—— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
—— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
—— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 5820 (iii), 6015 (iv).
—— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
—— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup. (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
—— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
N. T. Ry. Classification, Lumsden Charges, Apptmt. of Counsel: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
—— Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
—— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
——Payment of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
N.T.Ry. and G.T.P. Commission, Investigations *re* Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 260 (i).
—— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
—— McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).
—— McIntosh, Mr., Promotion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
——M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
N. T. Ry., Objections *re* Classification, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).
N. T. Ry., Contract to O'Brien & Fowler, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3291, 3490 (ii).
—— Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).
N. T. Ry. and Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shops: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (iv).
—— Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
—— Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).
N. T. Ry. from Winnipeg to Superior, Date of Opening for Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 165 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).
Opening of Winnipeg to Lake Superior Division, ref. to in Speech from Throne: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Prairie Section, Return *re* Cost, Verification of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1783 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Progress Estimates, Amounts claimed in District 'A' Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2140 (ii).
Remuneration to Govt. Directors: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N. T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Terminals, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Winnipeg to Edmonton Section, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 129, 623 (i).
Grande Vallée Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gratuitiies *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Gravel, Mr. A. J., Inspector of Weights and Measures acting as Insurance Agent: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 6505 (iv).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Great Northwestern Tel. Co., Night Letter Rates *re* French Language: Remarks (Mr. E. Roy) 8240 (v).
Green, James Albert, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Green, John, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grenfell Wheat Elevator Accident, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2427 (ii).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i), 8814 (v).
Grist Mills, &c., Indians in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
—— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496, 8169 (v).
Guelph Junction Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendation of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Gunn, Mr. Peter, Apptmt. as Fishery Inspector at Lac Ste. Anne: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 3737 (ii).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
—— Location since January, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir. Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).
—— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr Worthington) 1010 (i).
See 'Esquimalt,' 'Militia.'
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).
Halifax Harbour Master, Notification *re* Vacancy, Apptmt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2430 (ii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Halifax and Liverpool SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Hansard, Analytical Index, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Hansard Debates, Omission from: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7880 (v).
See 'Debates,'
Harbour Commissioners of Montreal: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Harbours and Rivers, Bridge Work, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers—B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276, 4715 (iii).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 2697, 3391 (ii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 976, 992 (i).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 3455, 3833 (ii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 4210 (iii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).

Harland and Wolff Shipbuilders, Rep. *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1363 (i).
Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 (ii).
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hatcheries and Breeding Establishments for Fish: in Com. of Sup., 5750 (iii).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hay and Wood Permits from Dom. Lands, Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
See 'Wood.'
Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa.'
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Herring Fisheries in Charlotte, Quantity Packed, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1782 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Herring Fisheries, Transportation to U. S. in Canadian or American Boats: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1777 (i).
'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).
See 'Life Saving,' 'Old Proprietor.'
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).
Highways Protection, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Historical Manuscripts Commission, Meetings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 790 (i).
Hodgins Investigations, Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7064 (iv).
See 'G. T. P.'
Holden, Clara Louise, Relief of: *See* 'B. 149.'
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865, 7881 (v).
Holland River Channel, Devil's Elbow to Bradford Station, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 170, 626 (i).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 1099 (i).
Holsteins and Jersey Cattle at Experimental Farms: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4309 (iii).
Homesteading Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homesteads Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S. W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, Total Acreage in Alta and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Homesteading on Sections 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4089 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Horses exported from Ont. into N. W. Ter., Disinfecting stockyards: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4812 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) on M. for Sup., 4209 (iii).
Horse Racing: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 81.'
Horse-racing Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 6617 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
See 'Labour.'
Hours of Ry. Men: *See* 'B. No. 66'
House of Commons Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS.
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3057 (ii).
Bellechasse Controverted Election, Petition: Announcement (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 923, 1298 (i).
Controverted Election Petitions, Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1, 21 (i).
——— P. E. I., Certificate of Judges: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 256 (i).
Dual Representation in H. of C., Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6802 (iv).
Dufferin, Electoral District, Representations of: Notice (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).
——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1731 (i).
——— Date of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 623 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5688 (iii).

Essex Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).

House of Commons and Senate Officials residing in Buildings, Estimate of Rents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain 1023 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3058, 3296 (ii).

House of Commons, Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).

Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).

Library: in Com, of Sup., 8802 (v).

Library of Parlt.: Rep. presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).

Mar. Provs. Representation in H. of C., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).

Mar. Provs., Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* B.N.A. Act.: Prop. Res., 2718 (ii).

Member introduced, 413, 1001 (i).

Members, Names of 221 *re* Dom. Statutes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell) 1547 (i).

Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).

N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B.N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).

Ottawa and Quebec East Electoral Districts, Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).

——— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).

——— Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation, Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (i).

——— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).

Ottawa Electoral District, Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).

Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).

Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536, 1545 (i).

——— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).

——— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 1441 (i), 8365 (v).

——— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).

Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).

Sessional Employees, H. of C., Number in Jan.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Best) 5502 (iii).

Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

Staff Reorganization: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6389 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7071 (iv), 7520 (v).

——— M. to disch. Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7872 (v).

——— Notice (Mr. Speaker) to withdraw, 7977 (v).

——— Staff Increases: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8830 (v).

Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).

Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (i).

Hudson Bay Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 43.

Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii), 8820 (v).

——— Estimates, &c.: Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).

——— Number of Acres of Land sold: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).

——— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).

'Hudson' Str., Purchase of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122, 3123 (ii).

Hunting and Homicide: *See* 'B. No. 71.'

Hydro-Electric Legislation, Disallowance: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv). *See* 'Disallowance.

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Hydrographic Surveys, Irrigation Report: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 5103 (iii).
Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
Icebreakers, Thunder Bay District: in Com. of Sup., 8526 (v).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 102, 135.'
IMMIGRATION.
Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii).
Agents, Names, Addresses, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 171 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2222, 2797 (ii).
Agents in Belgium, Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Paquet) 1022 (i).
Agents in Canada and G. B., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8195 (v).
Agents in France, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 101 (i).
—— Total Expenditure, Rep. of Mr. Wiallard: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 790 (i).
Canadians entering U. S., Action of U. S. Immigration Agents: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Schaffner) 1101 (i).
Emigration from Canada, System of Record Keeping: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 268 (i).
Goby, Mrs., Application by U. S. Immigration Dept. for Deportation: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
Immigration Buildings, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
Immigration Contingent Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
Immigrants contributed by Five Nationalities, Total Number: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 128 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Immigration into Eastern Townships, Total Number, Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 637 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, Number for 1908, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 7872 (v).
Immigrants located on Bay of Quinte Ry., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7872 (v).
Immigrants at Medicine Hat, Facilities for Housing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 2294 (ii).
Immigration Official, Dr. Lavoie, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 8109 (v).
Immigration O.C.'s and Regulations: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Immigrants at Quebec, Treatment by Officials: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 6609 (iv).
—— Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Immigration Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8494 (v).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants, Treatment *re* Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 6945 (iv).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B. C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Medical Inspection, Cor. since 1st Jan., 1908: M. for Copy* (Mr. Paquet) 1380 (i).
Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
SS. Passengers at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976 (iv).
—— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
U. S. Immigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Immigrants from, Remarks of Bruce Walker: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
—— Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, New Zealand and Australia Papers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 206 (i).
—— Instruction to Canada's Representative: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 923 (i).
Imperial Conference, Distribution of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Paquette) 276 (i).
—— Secretariat, Cor. *re* Formation, &c.: M. for Copy of Cor. (Mr. Foster) 388 (i).
—— Stmnt. of Cost, Conversion into Canadian Currency: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 856 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 639, 783 (i).
Imperial Export Co., Applications *re* Service between Can. and Australia: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1100 (i).
Improved Paper Machinery Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Incorporated Companies, Conference *re* Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6937 (iv).
Increased Facilities, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Incubators and Brooders, Total Number imported in Canada: M. for Ret.* (Mr. G. White) 414 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. G. White) 169 (i).
Independent Order of Rechabites: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Index to Hansard: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2138 (ii).
Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
INDIANS.
Agricultural Implements to Indians in Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 7857 (v).
Blackfoot Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
—— Proposed Lease: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Magrath) 3170 (ii).
B. C. Indians, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7858 (v).
Chu-chu-way-ha Reserve, Instructions to Capt. Jemmet: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 5499 (iii).
—— M. for Papers* (Mr. Burrell) 4315 (iii).
Garden River and Mississagua Indian Reserve, Construction of Trunk Road, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Issue, Commission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5931 (iv).
—— Location since Jan. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6937 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 345, 414 (i).
Indian Lands in Alberta, Disposal by Govt. on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 119 (i).
—— Irregularity of Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 119 (i).
Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale, Terms and Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 635 (i).
Indian Lands, Total Number of Acres sold, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 783 (i).
Indian Schools, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 7861 (v).
—— Industrial Schools, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
—— Industrial School, Regina, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
—— La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Indian Land Management Fund: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Indians, Man., Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
—— Clothing: in Com. of Sup., 7851 (v).
—— General Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
—— Grist Mills, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Indians, Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 7850 (v).
—— Live Stock: in Com. of Sup., 7848 (v).
—— Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
—— Supplies to Destitute Indians: in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
—— N. B., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7846 (v).
—— N. S., Roads, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7845 (v).
—— Oka, Settlement of: Remarks: (Mr Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
—— Ont. and Que., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7843 (v).
—— Ont. and Que., Medical Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 7835 (v).
—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7837 (v).
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Peigan Reserve, Open for Homesteading, Purposes, Disposal of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
P. E. I., Relief, Seed Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
See general heading.
Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Indiantown and Blackville Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Industrial Conditions, Increases in Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 168 (i).
Industrial Disputes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Industrial Disputes B. 23: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) *re* Discussion, 6941 (iv).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonell) 8116 (v).
Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
—— Legislation *re* Amt.: Ques. (Mr. Knowles) 1590 (i).

Industrial Schools for Indians, Govt. Policy *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6390 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 and 131.'
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
—— Minor Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Insects, Pests, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Inspection and Sale Act Amt: *See* 'B. Nos. 40 and 54.'
Inspection Act (pure food) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Inspection of Glassware in Milk Tests: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Inspection of Meat: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Inspection of Ships: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Inspection of Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Inspection and Sales Act, on M. (Mr. Currie) to introduce Bill: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 620 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act, Trade and Commerce: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Insurance Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5893 (iii).
—— Decision of Judge Leet, Appeal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Intelligence Bureau *re* Fisheries and Customs: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
I. C. R., Adjudication of Claims: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
I. C. R., Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
I. C. R., Damages by Fire: *See* 'B. No. 232.'
I. C. R.: Jurisdiction of Exchequer Court *re* Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
I. C. R. Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.
Accidents, Number, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 5501 (ii).
Air-Brakes to Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2881 (ii).
Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) on M. for Sup., 2798 (ii).
—— Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 2840 (ii).
Beresford Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Board of Commissioners, Names, Dates of Apptmt. Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 99 (i).
—— Additional Powers: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 627 (i).
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Board of Commissioners, Dismissals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3091 (ii).
—— Dismissals by Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 128, 164 (i)
—— Dismissals by Board of Management, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5501 (iii).
—— French Representation: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7519 (v).
—— Rep. to Hse: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2791 (ii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 2872 (ii).
Chatham, Diversion of Line to Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2874 (ii).
Chaudiere Junction, Signals, &c.: in Com. Sup., 2873 (ii).
Derailments, Number during 1909: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 2141 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Talbot) 2298 (ii).
Dismissals for each month from Oct., 1908, to March, 1909: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1776 (i).
Drawbars on Freight Cars: in Com .of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Employees, Number in 1907-8-9: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 835 (i).
Employees, Passes, Number issued for Sept., Oct. and Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2716 (ii).
Employees, Payments to: Names, Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1021 (i).
Excursion Train from Truro to Tatamagouche, Receipt, &c: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1367 (i).
Halifax Increased Accomodation: in Com. of Sup., 2883 (ii).
Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 2882 (ii).
Increased Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Line: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Management, Instructions *re* Alcoholic Goods: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 1208 (i).
I.C.R., Sale of to other Ry. Cos.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2299 (ii).
Lac au Salmon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Locomotive and Carshops Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
Low Rates: Inquiry for Information (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8481 (v).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
Moncton Cut-off: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Original Construction: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Passes, alleged to be stolen, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Passes, Sale and Distribution, Padded Pay Lists on Windsor Branch: M. for Papers* (Mr. Foster) 801 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2634 (ii).
Passes from 1908 to 1909, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 276 (i).
——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 4812 (iii).
Pintsch Gas, Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Purchasing Agent, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 272 (i).
Repairs to Car No. 37: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2286 (ii).
Riviere du Loup, Coal Shed, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4128 (iii).
—— Crossing Protection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
—— Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
—— Workshops, Electrical Development, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 6182 (iv).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Safety of Travel: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2278 (ii).
Side Ladders for Box Cars: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Sleeping Cars, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 4847 (iii).
—— Contract *re* Construction with Silliker Car Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5105 (iii).
—— Instructions to Sleeping Car Conductors *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 4512 (iii).
Standard Pay for Machinists: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 259 (i).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
Train Service between Pictou and Oxford Junction, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3171 (ii).
Water on Passenger Trains, Filtering, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 1303
Windsor Junction and Dartmouth, Change of Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 332, 343 (i).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 344 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Wire Fencing, Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilcox) 2150 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.' 'P.E.I.' 'Railways,' &c.
Interest Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 8, 73, 122.'
Interest by Banks: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
INTERIOR.
Becher, Chas. D. T., Issue of Homestead Patent: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 7290 (iv).
Brandon Agency, Number employed, Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2950 (ii).
Coal, Timber and Indian Lands in Alberta, &c., Revenue *re* Royalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 414 (i).
Coal and Timber Lands alienated from the Crown, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 5560 (iii).
Compensation to Alberta and Sask. *re* Public Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3291 (ii).
Dom. Lands Offices, Alberta and Sask., Aggregate Revenues: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3290 (ii).
Dom. Lands Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Dom. Lands, Total Acreage of Arable Lands: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2925 (ii).
Half-Sections in Man., N. ½, &c., Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5889 (iii).
Hay and Wood Permits in Man., Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3678 (ii).
Homestead Entries in Man., 1908-9, Original Entrants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1784 (i).
Homestead Fees, &c., in Alberta and Sask., Amount collected from 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 847 (i).
Homestead Lands open for Settlement, Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 270 (i).
Homestead Patents for S.W. ¼, 18-19-20, 2nd Meridian, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 6936 (iv).
Homestead Pre-emptions, available for Settlers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 6935 (iv).
Homesteads and Pre-emptions, Total Acreage sold since 1908: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
—— Total Acreage in Alta. and Sask., Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2951 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 34, Twp. 12, Settlement Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4080 (iii).
Homesteads for Women, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8488 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 8194 (v).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8194 (v).
Interior and Indian Affairs Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8490 (v).
—— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
Peace River District, Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
—— Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
Peace River Land Co., Disposal of Lands by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1535 (i).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Description of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (v).
—— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932 (iv), 6181 (iv).
Internal Economy Commission: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 96 (i).
International Commission, St. John River, Obstructions, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
International Fishery Commission, Regulations, &c., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3490 (ii).
International Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Jameson) 3059 (ii).
International Fisheries Regulations, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 381 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1880 (i), 2153 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
International Waterways, Canal and Construction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
See 'Waterways.'
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Iron Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4083 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'
James Bay and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128.'
Jams and Jellies, Analyses by Inland Rev. Dept., Prosecutions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 3935 (ii).
Japanese Immigration from U. S. entering B.C.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Japan Trade Commission, Cor. Reps., &c., of Mr. W. T. R. Preston: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 328 (i).
Japan-United States Treaty, Safeguarding Canadian Rights: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5761 (iii).
'J. G. Witherbee' Tug, Purchase by Govt. from J. B. Kaine: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Joggin's Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Johnson, Arthur, Certificate as Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4844 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3734 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Jones, Hon. L. M., and F. T. Frost, Apptmts. to Senate: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2189 (ii).
Judges' Act (Man. and Que.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
See 'Man. King's Bench.'
Judicial Apptmts. in N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 623 (i).
See 'B.C.'
Judicial Business, Montreal District: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1792 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Juniper Island, Stony Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Justice, Administraton of: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Juvenile Offenders, Number condemned in Can.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Kamloops to Fennels Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops to Okanagan Valley, Telephone Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kelly, Wm. J., Kidnapping by U. S., Action of Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) 851 (i).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
—— Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783, 1970 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
—— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Kilmant and Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
King, Chief Astronomer: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Kitsilano Indian Reserve Sale: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 7859 (v).
Kitchener, Lord, Cor. *re* Visit to Canada: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7519 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Krick, Mr. W. W., Govt. Inspector at Port Maitland, Date of Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 835 (i).
Labelle Settlers Grievances: Remarks (Mr. Major) on M. for Sup., 8778 (v).
Labour Dept., Industrial Disputes Act: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
—— Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Labour, Hours on Public Works, Com. on B. 21: 1st Report presented (Mr. King) 1586 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. King) to conc. in 2nd Rep. of Com., 2887; Agreed to (Y. 114; N. 36) 2923 (ii).
Labourers' on Rys., Pay: *See* 'B No. 39.'
La Butte Indian School, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6179 (iv).
Lac du Bonnet Fishing Leases, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
—— Letter from Mr. Wold: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 6720 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lachine Canal, Amount of Work *re* Repairs under Denis O'Brien: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1964 (ii).
—— Basins and Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Carpenter Shop, Estimated Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 627 (i).
—— Carpenter Shop, Number and Names of Employees, Dismissals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1006 (i).
—— Concrete Vertical Walls: in Com. of Sup., 3103 (ii).
—— Dismissals by Denis O'Brien, Promotion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1367 (i).
—— Pay Sheets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 1547 (i).
Lachine Canal, Douglas Fir, Quantity supplied, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1368 (i).
—— Electric Machinery at Mill St. Station, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5103 (iii).
—— Labourers, Names of those paid out of vote of $3,100: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2428 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137; 3483 (ii); 5689
Lac au Saumon Overhead Crossing: in Com. of Sup., 2884 (ii).
Lafontaine, Sir L. H., Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
La Have River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).
—— Stmnt. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Lake Nipissing Canal to Monetteville, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 1194 (i).
Lake Nipissing Flooded Lands Compensation, &c., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2295 (ii).

Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).
Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 6164 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).
——Piers: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lake St. Francis Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii)
Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
(Mr. Campbell) in Sup., 8540 (v).
Lake Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery: Remarks
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
See 'Baby Farm B.'
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Land Titles Act, Moneys received, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 1022 (i).
L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
'Lansdowne, Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Laplante, Mr., Salary Increase: Remarks Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 8827 (v).
Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
'La Revue Hebdomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Latchford Dam, Montreal river: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).
Laurentian Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Laurie, Archibald, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Lawlor's Island Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Leach, Mr., Duties *re* Dom. Lands: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
—— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4081 (iii).
Lead Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
LeBel, Wenceslas, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 640 (i).
'Leebro' Str., Emplymt. by Govt., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Cowan) 788 (i).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8543 (v).
Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lemieux, Ed., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
Le Petit Débarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lethbridge Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8188 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i), 7781 (v).
—— Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1380 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
Lethbridge Post Office, Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
Letellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Level Crossings Across Rys.: *See* 'B. Nos. 4, 145.'
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
Lévis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 6102 (iv).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Library, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Library of Parlt. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 5 (i).
Licenses to Fishing Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers in N. S., Coal Supply: Stmnt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).
See 'Coal.'
Lightkeepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
—— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).

Lillie, Clifford Buell, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 224.'
Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
Lilly, Wm., Homestead Pre-emption of S.W. quarter 32-7-5, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6936 (iv).
Limerick to Gravelburg, Wood Mountain Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iv).
L'Institut de Notre-Dame des Missions: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Linotype Machines, Removal of Duty; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6391 (iv).
Lion's Head Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
Liquor Compounding, Fraudulent Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 1336 (i).
Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Development of: in Com. of Sup., 7748 (v).
Lizotte, Luc, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques: (Mr Monk) 641 (i).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 10.'
Loans, Temporary, since June 1st, 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 169 (i).
See 'Temporary.'
Lobster Canning Factories, Failure to send Returns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 259 (i).
Lobster Cannery Licenses, Number issued: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
Lobster Canning Plant, Names of Officers connected with: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3936 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2149 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries Report: Presented (Mr. Sinclair) 7867 (v).
Lobster Fisheries Investigation: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8101, 8214 (v).
See 'Fisheries.'
Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Locomotive and Car Shops Machinery, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (ii).
Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2488 (ii), 5622 (iii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Loggieville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2885 (ii).
London and Lake Erie Ry. and Transportation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Long Sault Rapids Dam. Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1194 (i).
—— Deputation *re* Building of a Dam: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2060 (ii).
—— Par. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5933 (iv).
Long Sault Rapids Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
Lyons, Mr. Alex., Detention at Ellis Island: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 8586 (v).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
McArthur, Frederick Joseph Gustin, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
McConnell, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 443 (i).
McCormick Binders, Valuation *re* Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3491
McGee, Hon. D'Arcy, Monument: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iv).
McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
McKenzie, Mr. Calvin, Emplymt. on I.C.R., Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3733 (ii).
McKenzie, James H., Emplymt. by Inland Revenue Dept. at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
McLean, A., Payments for Purchase of Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
McLeod, Alex., Payments to *re* Yukon trip: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5890 (iii).
McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
McQuarrie, W. L., Apptmt. in Dom. Lands Office: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4081 (iii).
Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Machinery Steel, Quantities imported for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1015 (i).
Maganatawan Wharfinger, Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 7289 (iv).
Magdalen Island and Pictou SS. Service, Tenders, Susbidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7065 (iv).
Mahone Customs Collector, Dismissal of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6507 (iv).
Mails addressed to Street Numbers, Free Delivery, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).

Mails between G. B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).

Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c. Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).

Mail Contracts with Capt, Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).

Mail Delivery Free, Closing of Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).

Mail Delivery Free in Sydney: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).

See 'Sydney.'

Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).

See 'Franking.'

Mail Services, Supts. of Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii), 8808 (v).

Malbaie (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

Main-a-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).

Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Manitoba Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on M. for Sup., 8131; Amt. 8141, neg. (Y. 63; N. 102) 8166 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Man. Govts., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Molloy) 4315 (iii).

——— Cor., &c. with Man. Govt.: M. for Copies (Mr. Roche) 644 (i).

——— Extension, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).

Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 49, 88.'

Manitoba Fisheries Commission Report, Changes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 3391 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* 'up to date' (Mr. Campbell) 2151 (ii).

——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. Bradbury) 2667, 2683 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 3480 (ii).

——— Regulations, Amts re: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4308 (iii).

Manitoba King's Bench, Arrears of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 4846 (iii).

See 'Judges.'

——— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5624 (iii).

Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'

Manitoba School Lands, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4309 (iii).

——— Subsidy re School Lands: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4310 (iii).

Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

Manufacturers' Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).

MARINE.

Aids to Navigation, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 8525 (v).

Bass River and Little Dyke Lights, Supplies, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2426 (ii).

B. C. Lighthouses, Number, Reduction of Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 384 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 643 (i).

Canadian Inland Marine, Number of Vessels, Dry Dock Aid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 7514 (v).

Canning Wharf, Total Cost, Apptmt. of Wharfinger, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1969 (ii).

Coal Supply to Lighthouse Keepers in N. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8585 (v).

——— Stmt. (Mr. Templeman) 8831 (v).

Duncan Cove Life Boat Station: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

'Earl Grey,' Str., Names, &c. of Crew, Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3486 (ii).

Fiddle Reef Lighthouse Keeper, Salary Increase: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

Giant's Tomb Island, Estimate of Timber for Sale, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4617 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Names, Cost, Date of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1536 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1976 (ii).

Govt. Steamers purchased by Marine Dept. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3484 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1004 (i).

'Hestia,' Str., Wreck, Condition of Proprietor Light Buoy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 130 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Daniel) 290 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Daniel) 1880 (i).

See 'Life Saving.'

Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8511 (v).

Icebreakers and Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Lake Erie Signals, Pet. *re* Installation: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 1600 (i).

——— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).

'Lansdowne,' Wreck of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Life-Saving Station in Bay of Fundy, Equipment *re* Wreck of Str. 'Hestia': Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 107 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Lightkeepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
——— Increase in: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1589 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Sel. Com.: M. (Mr. Sinclair) to conc. in 6th Rep., 6606 (iv).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pintsch and Acetylene Gas, Accidents *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 802 (i).
Port Stanley Life-Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).
Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).
Seal Cove Life Boats, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).
Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).
Shipping Tonnage Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Wrecking Plants on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts, Tenders, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
——— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Mar. Dredging and Construction Co., Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
——— Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Mar. Provinces, Representation in H. of C., Pet. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop Res. (Mr. Kyte) 2718; (Mr. Turriff) 2730; (Mr. Warburton) 2735; (Mr. Daniel) 2746; (Mr. McCraney) 2756; (Mr. Crocket) 2761; (Mr. Richards) 2767; (Mr. Pugsley) 2768; (Mr. McKenzie) 2773; (Mr. Fraser) 2777; (Mr. Jameson) 2779; (Mr. Sproule) 2785; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2788 (ii).
Markham Post Office Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).
——— Completion, and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Maxwell, Jessie Maud Mary: *See* 'B. No. 144.'
Mayes Contract, Charges against Min. of Pub. Works: Ques of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 589 (i).
See 'Bathurst,' &c.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Meat, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Member introduced, 413, 1001, 1731 (i).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Merchants Bank of Canada, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Merchants and General Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Mergers, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates for 1909-10: Read (Mr. Speaker) 154 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1910; Read (Mr. Speaker) 377 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2949 (ii), 5277 (iii).

Mess. from His Ex.: Suppl. Estimates, 1911: Read (Mr. Speaker) 7519 (v).
—— Internal Economy Commission: Read (Mr. Speaker) 97 (i).
—— Prorogation (Mr. Speaker) 8833 (v).
—— Supply Bill Read (Mr. Speaker) 5557 (iii).
Messenger in Aud. Gen.'s Office: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 1344 (i).
Metropolitan Racing Association, Grant of Charter by Sec. of State: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 849 (i).
See 'Race Track,' &c.
Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Middlesex, W., Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 413 (i).
Military Lands, Purchase of: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Militia Pension Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
MILITIA.
Airships, Development of for Militia Purposes, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 446, 1369 (i).
Annual Drill, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8564 (v).
Arcand, T., Dismissal as Lightkeeper at Carousel: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 2288 (ii).
Armouries and Drill Halls, Contribution to Cost by Municipalities: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1534 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
See 'Drill Halls.'
—— Man., Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 788 (i).
Armoury Grants: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Arms, &c., for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Army Service, Ottawa Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Artillery Horses, Purchased for Petawawa Camp, Govt. Policy: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).
Artillery Re-armament, Reasons for: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1371 (i).
Barriefield Camp, Objections to Site, Removal of Ranges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. Currie) 3934 (ii).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Brandon Drill Hall, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Canadians appointed in Permanent Forces, Proportion &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5498 (iii).
Canadian Artillery, 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* Armouries at Esquimalt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
Canadian Militia Officers, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* Courts of Inquiry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5501 (iii).
Cartwright, Sir Richard, Terms of Lease of Land, Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2717 (ii).
See 'Frontenac.'
Charlottetown Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
De la Ronde, Major and Captain, Charges *re* Militia Frauds: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 135 (i), 2288 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 414 (i).
—— Rep. of Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5500 (iii).
Drill Halls and Armouries, Erection, Cost of Sites, Place for Construction, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 1546 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 5689 (iii).
See 'Armouries.'
Eastern Cavalry Brigade, Place of Training, Strength, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 636 (i).
Eighteenth Regiment, Refund of Moneys *re* False Names on Pay List: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Savard,' 'Scott,' &c.
Engineers Services *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8569 (v).
Esquimalt Armament, Cost of Transporting Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1017 (i).
Esquimalt Battery Guns, Cor. *re*, M. for Copy* (Mr. Barnard) 3170 (ii).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Continuous Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 633 (i).
—— Dismantling of, Imp. conc.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2292 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re* Transfer from Imp. Govt.: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Forty-ninth Regiment, Apptmt. of Commanding Officer: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4311 (iii).
French, Sir John, Inspection of Militia Camps: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Frontenac County, Lands held by Govt. for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1371 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Frontenac County, Property leased to Sir R. Cartwright, Rental, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 262 (i).
Garrison Artillery, Supply of Field Guns, &c.: Ques. dropped, 1790; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* asking by another Member, 1791; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1791, 1799 (i); Answered by Minister, 1800 (i).
Garrison Artillery Regiments, Number, Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2145 (ii).
—— Supply of 12-pounder Guns: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1593 (i).
Gratuities *re* Militia Services: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Guelph Armouries: in Com. of Sup., 8169 (v).
Halifax and Esquimalt Navy Yards, Observations of Sir Wm. White *re* Condition: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Sir Frederick Borden) 1961 (ii).
—— Protection *re* Deterioration: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1010 (i).
Halifax Harbour Gun Practice, Res. from Fishermen: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4714 (iii).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Free Imports of Military Clothing, &c.: M. for cor.* (Mr. Worthington) 3495 (ii).
Horse-Breeding for Military Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
See 'Artillery.'
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Kingston Battery Soldiers, Payment *re* Services for Moving Pictures: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1193 (i).
Kingston R. M. College: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
See 'R. M. C.'
Lambton Barracks, Appropriation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 270 (i).
Militia Camps, Instructions to: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Militia Clerks, Apptmt. without Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).
Militia Clothing, Fixed Life, Issue of New Material: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1018 (i), 2927 (ii).
Military Courts of Inquiry, Curtailment of Rights, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 275 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Militia and Defence: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
MILITIA—*Con.*
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7767, 8573 (v).
Militia Expenditures *re* Fortifications, &c., Submission to Leader of Opposition: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1778 (i).
Militia Field Allowances, Expenses of Staff Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1201 (i).
Militia Govt. Police *re* Armouries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Militia Harness and Saddlery, Tenders, &c., for 1909: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).
Militia Inspection, Pay, Rates of to Inspectors: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).
Militia Medical Attendance, Govt. Allowance for Married Officers: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).
Militia Pay and Aloowances, Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1377 (i).
Militia Properties: in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Militia Provisions *re* Arms for active War Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 842 (i).
Militia Regulations, Latest Edition, Date of Issue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 639 (i).
Militia Uniforms, Clothing, Free Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2927 (ii).
See 'Highland,' &c.
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).
Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).
—— Total Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).
Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
—— Damage by Fire, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 386 (i).
—— Insurance *re* Fire: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 967-975 (i).
—— Instructions to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).
—— Loss by Fire to Clothing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 845 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay Lists of 18th Regt., Personations, &c.: Ques.(Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Permanent Force, Annual Cost per Man, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
——— Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
——— Increase of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
——— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
——— Requirements *re* Instuctions, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
——— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 4129, 5279 (iii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Provisional School Allowances: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1019 (i).
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N. W. M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rifle Shooting, Standard *re* Proficiency: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1595 (i).
Ross Rifle, Marks I and II**, Defects, Issue of, Contract re: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, Ques. of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
——— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifles, Mark II**, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
——— Number received, Contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
——— Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
——— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
——— Regulation of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn re Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii)
——— Weight of, &c.: Ques. Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3491 (ii).
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
——— Servants' Quarters, Completion of, Total Cost, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
——— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii).
——— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Savard, Lt.-Col., 18th Regt., Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (v).
Scott, Col. B. A., Defaulting Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Talbot, Capt. Rene, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
Tents, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 2149 (ii).
Topographical Surveys, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1375 (i).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Wharfs transferred from P. W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Milk Standards, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cowan) in Com. of Sup., 1341 (i).
Milk Tests and Glassware: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B., Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 336 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Public Gifts, Acceptance of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 8785 (v).
Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
See 'Ottawa Mint.'
Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).
Mobilization Equipment, Canadian System *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1200 (i).
Moncton Cut-Off, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
—— Locomotive and Carshops: in Com. of Sup., 2933 (ii).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Mond Nickel Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Monopolies, Investigation of: See 'B. No. 101.'
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Montmagny Mutual Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Montreal Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Montreal Harbour Berths, Date of Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5498 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Montreal, Kapitachuan and Rupert's Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 703 (i).
Montreal River, Contract *re* Improvements, Name, Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1014 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Stmnt. of Expenditure, Indebtedness, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1580 (i).
Monuments *re* Battlefields: in Com. of Sup. 8575 (v).
Monuments, Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6099 (iv).
Morrisburg Ferry and Dock Co.: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Motions to Adjn., Rulings of Mr. Speaker: Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
Motions, Unopposed, Preparation by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1600 (i).
Motors injuring People: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Motors, 'Use of' and 'Joy Rides': *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Mounted Police Barracks, Calgary, Application *re* Transfer to Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1206 (i).
Mounted Police, Emplymt. by Alberta and Saskatchewan, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 843 (i).
Mounted Police Force, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
—— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Lourier) 1730 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mudie, Allen R., and Thos. G. Warwick, Claims *re* Section 24-38-10, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1022 (i).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Go. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Music, Copyright of: *See* 'B. No. 41.'

Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
——— Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
National Anthem, Singing *re* Naval Debate: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3208 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
National Battlefields Commission, Purchase of Property in Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3671 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 787 (i).
National Park, Sask., Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 790 (i).
National Resources Commission, Names of Members, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY.
Accidents, Circular *re* Explosives: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 4512 (iii).
Adjustment of Disputed Item, ref. to in Letter of Aud. Gen., O.C.'s, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 3495 (ii).
Amounts paid to Contractors, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 164 (i).
——— Board of Arbitrators, Names, Contractors' Claims *re* Over-Classification: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 836 (i).
Classification, Resignation of Mr. Lumsden: (M.) Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 2330, 2949 (ii).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel *re* Lumsden Charges: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 4070; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 4071, Neg. (Y. 66; N. 100) 4076 (iii).
——— Letters of Aud. Gen., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 386 (i).
——— Letter to Mr. Lumsden *re* Mr. Doucet's Opinion: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i)
——— Letter to Prime Minister: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 448, 622 (i).
——— Meeting of Com.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3480 (ii).
——— on Order being called for Com.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2189 (ii).
——— Payments of Counsel Fees: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 8832 (v).
——— Payment of Counsel Fees: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8841 (v).
NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*
——— on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden 697 (i).
——— Classification, Lumsden Charges, Rep., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr.R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
——— Return, Arrangement of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
——— Resignation: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 258 (i).
——— Printing of Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 377 (i).
——— Delay in Printing Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1302 (i).
——— Classification, 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc., 3985 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Lennox) Notice of M. to consider, 5820 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Lennox) to consider, 6015 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc., 8737 (v).
——— Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5196 (iii).
——— Error in Res. in Com. *re* Reporting to Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5277 (ii).
——— Changes in Report: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5562; on M. for Sup., (Mr. Barker) 5570 (iii).
Commissioners' Rep., Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 622 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3682
——— M. to print (Mr. Graham) 97 (i).
Commissioners, Profits *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3165 (ii).
Commission, McIntosh, Mr., Promotion, &c., Certificate: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. Lennox) 1686 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 839 (i).
Commissioners, Number of Members, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 630 (i).
Construction, prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) *re* Royal Commission, on M. for Sup. 8242 (amt.) 8261, Neg. (Y. 62; N. 105) 8341 (v).
Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3065 (ii), 5230, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
——— Names of Contractors, Estimated Expenditures, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2297 (ii).
——— Provision *re* Forfeits, corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 447 (i).
Counsel before Public Accounts Com., Names, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4516 (iii).
Dates of Contract from Winnipeg to Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 165 (i).
——— Winnipeg and Superior Section, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 164 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCL. RAILWAY—*Con.*

Estimated Cost of Excavations, on District 'F': Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2285 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Name of Ass't. Engineer in Aug. and Sept., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).

McArthur Contract, Name of Signatory: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3491 (ii).

Objections *re* Classifications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3169 (ii).

O'Brien & Fowler, Contract to, &c., Estimated Quantities, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2715, 3490, 3291 (ii).

Portions surveyed by G.T.P., Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2283 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6392 (iv).

Tenders *re* St. Boniface Shop: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8835 (v).

Tunnel east of Winnipeg, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2284 (ii).

Wheat Shipments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1206 (i).

Winnipeg and Lake Superior Division, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 165, (i); 2284 (ii).

Naturalization Act: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).

Naturalization Laws, Reply to Inquiry from Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7291 (iv).

Natural Resources, Conservation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 84, 115 and 185.' *See* 'Conservation.'

Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).

Naval Cadets, Instructions *re* Seamanship, Rate of Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1971 (ii).

Naval Defence Conference, on M. to adjn.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6 (i).

——— Information from New Zealand: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).

Naval Service of Canada, Establishment B. 95 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1° m., 1732 (i).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 1738; (Mr. Jameson) 1762; (Mr. Monk) 1769; (i)); 2° m. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2952 (ii).

Debate:

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979; (amt.) 2991; (Mr. Monk) 2991; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3002; (Mr. Lemieux) 3023; (Mr. Middlebro) 3210; (Mr. Fowke) 3236; (Mr. Burrell) 3245; (Mr. Clark) 3269; (Mr. Sproule) 3281; (Sir Frederick Borden) 3296; (Mr. Foster) 3344; (Mr. Macdonald) 3386, 3575; (Mr. Roche) 3619; (Mr. Sealey) 3649; (Mr. Goodeve) 3659; (Mr. Beauparlant) 3683; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3697; (Mr. Congdon) 3720, 3748; (Mr. Hughes) 3760; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 3798; (Mr. Broder) 3822; (Mr. Warburton) 3946; (Mr. Cowan) 3962; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 3982 (ii); 3987 (iii); (Mr. Schaffner) 4012; (Mr. Rivet) 4036; (Mr. Edwards) 4061, 4083; (Mr. Béland) 4108; (Mr. Doherty) 4125, 4129; (Mr. Turgeon) 4161; (Mr. Barnard) 4182; (Mr. Devlin) 4197, 4316; (Mr. Magrath) 4328; (Mr. McKenzie) 4343 (Mr. Daniel) 4367; (Mr. Verville) 4383; (Mr. Best) 4392; (Mr. Demers) 4396; (Mr. Lewis) 4403; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4413; (Mr. Armstrong) 4423; (Mr. Geoffrion) 4444; (Mr. Blondin) 4453; (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 4457; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4475; (Mr. Boyer) 4490; (Mr. Nantel) 4535; (Mr. C. Roy) 4570; (Mr. Crothers) 4583; (Mr. Dubeau) 4611; (Mr. Donnelly) 4618; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 4622; (Mr. Porter) 4639; (Mr. E. Roy) 4667; (Mr. E. Paquet) 4678; (Mr. Lachance) 4848; (Mr. Perley) 4863; (Mr. Crocket) 4873; (Mr. McAllister) 4879; (Mr. Herron) 4888; (Mr. J. Turcotte) 4893; (Mr. Marshall) 4910; (Mr. Molloy) 4913; (Mr. Clare) 4922; (Mr. Neely) 4931; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4947; (Mr. Gervais) 4951; (Mr. Wm. R. Smyth) 4975; (Mr. Gladu) 4983; (Mr. Beattie) 4989; (Mr. Séguin) 4991; (Mr. Emmerson) 5003; (Mr. Lancaster) 5016; (Mr. Lalor) 5031; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5042; (Mr. Lortie) 5069; (Mr. Owen) 5079; (Mr. Proulx) 5082; (Mr. Meighen) 5081; (Mr. MacNutt) 5091; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Neg. (Y. 18; N. 175) 5095; (Mr. Thoburn) 5097; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 74; N. 129) 5101; (Mr. Northrup) 5102; (Amt.) 5107; Neg. (Y. 78; N. 119) 5191; 2° agreed to (Y. 118; N. 78) 5193; (Mr. Staples) 5133; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5142; (Mr. Wallace) 5149; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 5152; (Mr. Lake) 5158; (Mr. Campbell) 5175 (iii).

In Committee:

(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Amt., 7393-7495; (Mr. Sproule) 7396; (Mr. Northrup) 7396-7495; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7396-7495; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7398; (Mr. Hughes) 7399; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7400; (Mr. Aylesworth) 7403; (Mr. Congdon) 7417; (Mr. Lancaster) 7418; (Mr. Doherty) 7419; (Mr. Daniel) 7434; (Mr. Blain) 7435; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7441; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7442; (Mr. H. H. McLean) 7443; (Mr. Boyce) 7444; (Mr. Armstrong) 7452; (Mr. J. Haggart) 7454; (Mr. Fielding) 7467; (Mr. Burrell) 7472; (Mr. Macdonald) 7474; (Mr. Edwards) 7481; 3° m., 7528 Agreed to (Y. 111; N. 70) 7590; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7528; (Sir Frederick Borden) 7529; (Mr. Fielding) 7536; (Mr. Burrell) 7540; (Mr. Cowan) 7543; (Mr. Bristol) 7544, 7567; (Mr. Middlebro) 7545 (v).

Naval Defence Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 520, 1100, 1600 (i).

——— on Order for Com.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 6948 (iv).

Naval Defence, Personal Eplanation (Mr. Edwards) *re* 'Globe' report, 4533 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) *re* Sir Frederick Borden's Speech, correction, &c., 4710 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) *re* 'Round Robin,' 4305 (iii).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Rutan) 5002 (iii).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 855 (i).
Naval Defence, Further Documents: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2797 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2931 (ii).
Naval Defence, Land Available for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1367 (i).
Naval Defence Programme, List of Experts, Technical Adviser, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1546 (i).
Naval Service of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 95.'
Naval Service Appointments, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8838 (v).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8495 (v).
—— Number of Applicants, Policy of Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1970 (ii).
—— Purchase of 'Rainbow,' Expenditure *re* 'upkeep,' &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3738 (ii).
See 'Niobe.'
Naval Service Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).
See 'Wireless.'
Naval Ships, Purchase by Govt., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1972 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Negro Clergyman in House: *See* 'Parliamentary Corridors.'
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Nelson River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, Estimated Cost for 1909, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 98 (i).
—— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspaper Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Newspaper, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks: (Mr. Blain) 6141 (iv), 8818 (v); List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
Newspaper Postage to U.S., Classification, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1973 (ii).
New Westminster District Lands, Disposal of contrary to Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 788 (i), 3169 (ii).
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
New Westminster Penitentiary Fish Contract: *See* 'Penitentiary.'
New York State Canals, Letter from Supt. F. C. Stevens: Read (Mr. Perley) 5625 (iii).
—— Reciprocal Use of by Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 5202 (iii).
—— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4128 (iii).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nickel Deposits in Canada, Control of by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Conmee) 2490 (ii).
Nickel Mines in Canada, Evidence of Mr. A. Wilson *re* Control by Americans: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2189 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Nicoll, Emily Maud, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 222.'
'Niobe,' Purchase of, without Parliamentary Authority: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3481 (ii).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Norris, Mr. T. C., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 850 (i).
—— Payments to, for 1908-9. Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 2718 (ii).
North Atlantic Fisheries, Date of Meeting at The Hague, Counsel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 271 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Claims for Moneys, Fiat, &c. granted: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 640 (i).
—— M. for. Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 644 (i).
—— Pet. of Right, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1547 (i).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
—— Inspector: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).

N.E. ¼ Section, Section 11, Sale and Refunds, &c.: M. For Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5502 (iii).
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 154.'
Northern Mortgage Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Northern Quebec Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Pole Territorial Rights, Request of Capt. Bernier: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2711 (ii).
See 'Arctic.'
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
North Sydney Immigration Shed: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
North Thompson Valley Telegraph Line: in Com. of Sup., 6156 (iv).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).
Northwest Lands in Townships 52, 53 and 54, Terms of Sale: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 1373 (i).
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
N.S. Representation in H. of C., Amt. in B. N.A. Act: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1965 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Oaths: *See* 'B. Nos. 1 and 100.'
Obscene Literature: *See* 'Skill,' &c.
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
Offences against the Person: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Oka Indians, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 7844 (v).
Oka River Forest Reserve, Pet. *re* Drainage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 8582 (v).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.'
Old Age Annuities: in Com. of Sup., 8811 (v).
See 'Finance.'
Old Proprietor Buoy Light, Defective Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 108 (i).
See 'Hestia.'
Ontario and Ottawa Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Pugsley) *re* Speaking in Com., 4798; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4798 (iii).
Ordnance Corps, Ottawa, Lodging Allowance, Ottawa Collegiate Grounds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Ordnance Militia Stores Building, Instruction to Dom. Police *re* Patrolling: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 837 (i).
Ordnance Store, Kingston, Lease of Building from Clarified Milk Co., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5781 (iii).
Ore Deposits, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'
Original Construction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Ottawa Army Service Corps at Quebec, Authority for employing Horses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 2289 (ii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Allotted Space, Number of Occupants, Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 623 (i).
—— Design Competition: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6180 (iv).
—— Sussex Street, Architect's Plans: in Com. of Sup., 7166 (iv).
—— (Y.M.C.A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa City Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
—— New: in Com. of Sup., 548 (i).
Ottawa Electoral District, Pet., Judgment *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3476 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission: *See* 'B. No. 230.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8662 (v).
Ottawa Militia Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 597 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Ottawa Mint, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7866 (v).
See 'Mint.'
Ottawa, Montreal and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Ottawa and Montreal Power and Transmission Co.: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
See 'Committee,' 6605 (iv).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Ottawa Parliament Grounds Driveway: in Com. of Sup., 8173, 8191 (v).
Ottawa Printing Bureau Building: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).

Ottawa and Quebec East, Representation in the House of Commons : Amt. (Mr. Meighen) to Com. of Sup., 1305; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 90) 1329 (i).
—— Decision of Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 413 (i).
—— Cor. in Toronto 'World': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 521 (ii).
—— Ques. *re* Disposal of Protests by Speaker, 802 (i).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Meighen) Authorities quoted (Mr. Speaker) 833 (i).
—— Prime Minister's Resignation : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1446 (i).
—— Resignation of Prime Minister, 1689 (i).
—— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1729 (i).
Ottawa, Rideau Valley and Brockville Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 183.'
Ottawa River Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com. of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Ottawa Standardizing Building: in Com. of Sup., 572 (i).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
Ottawa Victoria Museum: in Com. of Sup., 566 (i).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Oyamel Co., Payments to *re* Tamarack Wood: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7870, 8834 (v).
Oyster Barrels: *See* 'B. No. 192.'
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 8545 (v).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parliamentary Corridors, Coloured Clergyman ejected: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 7182 (iv).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 1 (i).
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i), 5758 (iii).
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
Patents, Relief Bills: *See* 'B. No. 92.'
Paterson, Mr. T. and J. F. Sibbard, Claims *re* Section 16-30-9: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Lake) 1686 (i).
Patronage Distribution: Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 3134 (ii).
See 'Party.'
Partridge Island Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 595 (i), 3450 (ii).
Patrol Vessels for Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
Patronage List and Tory Whip, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Blain) 7070 (iv).
Party Patronage, System: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 2432 (ii).
—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 1792 (i).
—— on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2151 (ii).
See 'Patronage.'
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Paul, Mr. William, Purchase from by Govt. of Gasolene Boat: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1975 (ii).
Pay and Allowances for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 8559 (v).
Pay-lists of 18th Regiment, Personations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., Cancellation of Grant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1376, 1535 (i).
Peace River Country, Portions opened up for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4313 (iii).
—— Estimated Acreage of Arable Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2924 (ii).
Peat Bogs, Operation: in Com. of Sup., 8553 (v).
Peat Testing Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Peigan Indian Reserve, Disposal of Sale of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 172 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 1801 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6936 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7856 (v).
Pembina River Fishing Regulations : Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Pender Island Canal, Cost, Length, Depth, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2427 (ii).
Penitentiary at New Westminster, Contract *re* Fish Supply: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7516 (v).
Pension Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 155 and 212.
See 'Finance.'
Pension Fund of Merchants Bank: *See* 'B. No. 133.'
Pensions *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Pensions to Militia: *See* 'B. No. 194.'

Permanent Corps, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1781 (i).
——— Annual Cost Per Man, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1013 (i).
——— Number of Re-enlistments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3735 (ii).
——— Officers' Entertaining Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1530 (i).
——— Requirements *re* Instructions, Payments, &c., Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1011 (i).
——— Schools of Instruction, Certificates issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1531 (i).
——— Total Strength and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266, 843 (i).
Petawawa Military Review, Visit of Sir John French, Arrangements *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4129 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 5279 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Petroleum, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Petroleum Fields in N. W., Royalty Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
Petroleum Locations on Athabasca River, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3493 (ii).
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Piche Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i)
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (i).
Pilotage Dues: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Pilots' Association Fund, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 7517 (v).
Pincher Creek Sub-land Agency: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8840 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pine Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
——— Ownership: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 4734 (iii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crocket) *re* Par. in 'Globe,' 3476 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 3739 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3744 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 588 (i).
Pintsch Gas Apparatus, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 2943 (ii).
Pioneers Lean Co.: *See* 'B. No. 211.'
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pitt Meadows, B.C., Lease of Land on Special Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 274 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Pointe Bleue Indian Agent, W. Donohue, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Political Literature franked by Sol. Gen.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7784 (v).
See 'Franking.'
Polytechnic School, Montreal: in Com. of Sup., 8822 (v).
Population, Method of Estimating *re* Budget Speech: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 4846 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur Dry Dock, Applications *re* Subsidy: M. for Pets.* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3136 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5003 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks,' &c.
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729, 6101 (iv).
See 'Fort William,' &c.
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
——— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Officials: Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) in Com. of Sup., 3121 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3295 (ii).
——— Right of Way, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8661 (v).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
—— Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Port Stanley Life Saving Station: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
Post Office Act (inspectors' salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Post Office Act Amt. Bill: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6955 (iv).
POST OFFICE.
'Air Brake Magazine,' Postal Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6694 (iv), 8118 (v).
Algoma Free Mail Delivery, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1020 (i).
Barrie and Allandale Letter Rate, Res. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
Blairmore Station Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7871 (v).
Boar's Back Post Office, Name of New Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 5778 (iii).
—— Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4313 (iii).
Camborne Postmaster, B. C., Pet. *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1016 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 2713 (ii).
Campbellford Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i).
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5692 (iii).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii).
Central Park Postal Service, B.C., Date of Discontinuance, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2293 (ii).
—— Pets. *re* Closing; Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3169 (ii).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
—— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
Charleston or Kelmont P.O., Pets. *re* Establishing: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 2150 (ii).
'Cotton's Weekly,' Discrimination *re* Postage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4517 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 5894 (iii).
—— P. M. G.'s Answers: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8818 (v).
Dauphin Post Office, Date of Opening: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 3136 (ii).
Delisle Postmaster, Alfred Gagne, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dixon Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3293 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
Dolbeau Postmaster, J. Tremblay, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4516 (iii).
Dunkin and Highwater Mail Service, Complaint of Mr. C. A. Barnett *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Revenue from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1009 (i).
Edmonton, Calgary, &c., Post Offices, Revenue per Month, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1590 (i).
Frontenac County Mail Contracts, Route, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5105 (iii), 7066 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6654 (iv).
Gowganda Junction Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Grenville Station to Grenville Village, Mail Service, Number of Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 131 (i).
Grimsby Post Office Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 928 (i); 8814 (v).
Halifax Post Office, Reconstruction. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3483 (ii).
Holland Post Office Postal Boxes: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7865; 7881 (v).
Innisfail Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Kilmant & Shacleton, Application *re* Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
Lachute Post Office, Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 3137 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Lethbridge Post Office Accommodation, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 641 (i).
——— Total Revenue for ten months, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3933 (ii).
——— Cor., Reps. &c. with Depts.: M. for copies* (Mr. Magrath) 1380 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Magrath) 3682 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Magrath) 8855 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. of Sup., 582, 941 (i); 7781 (v).
Latellier Mail Service, Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 7290 (iv).
Macleod Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Mails between G.B. and Canada for last two months, Date of Closing, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 5501 (iii).
Mails between Montreal and Lower Provs., Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8581 (v).
Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Mail Contracts with Capt. Noonan, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1379 (i).
Mail Delivery Free, Closing of Distribution Offices: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1196 (i).
Mail Matter, Free Delivery to Street Address: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 7869 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8118 (v).
Mail Privileges to Members *re* Postal Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2146 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 5690 (iii); 8808 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).
Markham Post Office Completion and Opening: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 3137 (ii).
Mercer, R. G., Apptmt. as Supt. of Ry. Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Metabetchouan Postmaster, Mr. Jean Gauthier, Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 4515 (iii).
Milledgeville-Holderville, N.B. Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4518 (iii).
Montreal Post Office, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Montreal Post Office and Postal Stations, Reps. &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 1581 (i).
Montreal Postal Station 'D': in Com. of Sup., 703 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
New Westminster, P.O., B.C., Basis of Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
North Bay Post Office Inspector: Remarks (Mr. G. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 7863 (v).
North Toronto Free Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) in Com. of Sup., 7864 (v).
Owen Sound Post Office, Apptmts. of Mail Carriers, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Parry Sound Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Arthur) in Com. of Sup., 930 (i); 5758 (iii).
Postal Contracts and Fair Wage Clause: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 242 (i).
Postal Regulations during Recess of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2486 (ii).
Postal Service at Cedar Croft, &c., where situated, Number accommodated, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 447 (i).
Postal Violations, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2292 (ii).
Postmaster General, Absence *re* Official Business: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 267 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Post Office Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6650 (iv).
——— Outside Service Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii); 7863 (v).
Post Offices opened on Sundays to Boxholders: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
——— Stmnt.: Read (Mr. Lemieux) 3672 (ii).
See 'Winnipeg.'
Post Offices, Closing on Sundays, Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2931 (ii).
Post Office, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
Post Offices Generally, Policy of Building: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 683 (i).
Post Office Guide, Index, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5607 (iii).
P. O. Inspectors, Salary Increase, Pets. *re* Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3167 (ii).
Post Offices, Location in Federal Buildings, System of rating Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5779 (iii).
Post Office Mail Contracts, Advertising, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6683 (iv).
Post Offices opened in 1909, Dom. and Weekly Mails, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 625 (i).
Post Office Parcel Delivery, Signing for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 3682 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office Promotional Examinations, 1908, Accepted Answer to Question 4: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2290 (ii).
Powassan-Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
——— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
——— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6678 (iv).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
Rivière du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Rural Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Free Mail Delivery, Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
——— List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
——— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
——— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
——— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
——— Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
St. Catherines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Scotsburn-Loganville, Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Sydney, N.S., Free Mail Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137
Toronto Sub-post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i).
Troy, Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office, Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
——— *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
See 'Post Offices, &c.'
Potatoes, Sale and Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
Potvin, P. A., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8837 (v).
Poultry Dept., Experimental Farm, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4519 (iii).
Powassan—Nipissing Mail Routes, Pets. *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 108 (i).
Pre-emption Payments, Notice *re* Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 432 (i).
Prendergast, Mr. Justice, Transfer to Man. Bench: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 3489 (ii).
Press Despatches from England, Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 228.'
Press Gallery Reports, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4712-13 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Judgments, Reps *re* Libel Suits: M. for Copy (Mr. McKenzie) 656 (i).
Prince Albert and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
P. E. I. Ry., Branch through New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).

P. E. I. Ry., Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3063 3102 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).
——— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3170 (ii).
——— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, Surveys *re* Construction: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 277 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Change of Route, &c.: M. for Cor., 3171 (ii).
Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Sound SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8809 (v).
'Princess' Str., Name of Officer in Charge: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 8238 (v).
Pringle, Cecilia Marie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Printing Outside of Govt. Bureau, Payments re &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 414 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2713 (ii).
Printing, &c., *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 8493 (v).
Printing and Stationery, Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7287 (iv).
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Private Bills, Consideration of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8364, 8380 (v).
——— M. to extend time: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1597 (i).
——— Suspension of Rules: M. (Mr. Miller) 8351 (v).
See 'Bills,' 'Senate Amts.'
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Aylesworth) *re* Legal Work to Toronto Lawyers, 8362 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Barker) *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' *re* Salary to Leader of Opposition, 6612 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Interrupting Mr. Clare *re* debate on Naval Bill (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5200 (iii).
Privilege, Ques, of *re* 'Globe's Rep. of Prime Minister's Speech (Mr. Lake) 2430 (ii).
Proportional Representation in the House of Commons: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 136 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 429 (i).
See 'Representation,' &c.
Prorogation: Mess. from His Ex., 8857 (v).
——— Round Robin *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 4305 (iii).
Protection Piers, along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Protection Service, Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8509 (v).
Protectorate Life Ins. Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Provincial Boundaries Extensions, Notice to Provs. of N.B. and N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3166 (ii).
Provincial and Federal Jurisdiction *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 8546 (v).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 602; Amt. (Mr. Blain) 612 (i).
Public Accounts Com. and N. T. Ry. Commission, Payments to Counsel by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rhodes) 5502 (iii).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Public Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
Public Works Health Act: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS:
Annapolis Harbour Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
Arichat Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4259 (iii).
Athabasca River Channel, Removing Boulders, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Athalmer Wharf, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Aylmer Post Office, Additions: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Aylmer Wharf, Lake Deschenes: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Bamfield Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Bathurst Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4798 (iii).
See 'Loggie.'
Bathurst Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Bay St. Lawrence Lightkeeper, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4311 (iii).
Bayside Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Beaumarais Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
Bécancour River Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3865, 3875 (ii).
Belfast, Pier, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Belle River Harbour, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
Black Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Blue Rocks Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bluff Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bout de l'Ile Bridge, Repairs to: Remarks (Mr. Séguin) 6394 (iv).
Breen's Pond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 977 (i).
Bridges, Dominion Traffic: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
B.C., Expenditures by Govt. on Public Works, Discrimination *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4219, 4281 (iii).
Brockville Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii).
Brooklyn Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 978 (i).
Brudenell Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
Brulé Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Buctouche Channel Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Buildings, Mar. Provs., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 596 (i).
——— Que. Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
See general heading.
Burk's Head Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com., of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Byng Inlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Cabano Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup. 3878 (ii).
Campbell River Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4276 (iii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Cap à l'Aigle Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3881 (ii).
Cape Bald Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Cap de Chatte Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3888 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Cariboo Causeway, N.S., Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Carleton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3885 (ii).
Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Central Economy Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Centreville Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8817 (v).
——— Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 978 (i).
Chance Harbour Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Chapeau Bridge, Culbute Canal, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Chapel Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Chicoutimi Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3886 (ii).
Chicoutimi Public Building, Ground Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Chilliwack River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
China Point Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Christian Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Clear Lake, Application to raise Water Level, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Roche) 3495 (ii).
Cobourg Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 1372 (i).
Collingwood Harbour Dock: in Com. of Sup., 3467 (ii).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4277 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Contrecoeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3889 (ii).
Coquitlam River, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4291 (iii).
Cove Head Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Cummings Cove, Deer Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
Dalhousie Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2707 (ii).
——— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).
David's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Deep Brook Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delap's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Delorey's Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Devil's Island Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Digby Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8572 (v).
Digby Harbour Piers: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Digby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 573 (i).
Diligent River Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Dom. Dredging Co., Amounts paid by Govt. to: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
Dorchester Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3391 (ii).
Doucet's Landing Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3890 (ii).
Dover Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
Dredge Construction at Sorel, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3159 (ii).
Dredges, Purchase of, Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. German) 3944 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 3986 (iii).
Dredging at Bathurst and Campbellton, Contract of A. & R. Loggie: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6508 (iv).
Dredging, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iv).
—— Plant, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4777 (iii).
Dredging, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6137 (iv).
—— Plant, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).
Dredging, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4780 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 4738, 5608 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 4738 (iii).
—— Repairs to Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).
Dredging, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4809 (iii).
—— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6124 (iv).
Dredging Plant, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 4759 (iii).
Dredging Plant, Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 4771 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging Inspection on Public Works: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 4252 (iii).
Dredging Plant, St. Lawrence River: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Dublin Shore Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Eastern Dredging Co., Contracts, Payments to by Pub. Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2717 (ii).
Eastern Passage Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Father Point Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8190 (v).
Fiddler's Elbow, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup.. 3833 (ii).
Fighting Island Channel Improvements: Remarks (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 3860 (ii).
Fort George Canyon Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Fort William Wharf, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 3891 (ii).
Fox Island Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Fraser River, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Fraser River Dredging, Depth of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2487 (ii).
Fraserville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 662 (i).
Fredericton Building, Pavements: in Com. of Sup., 581 (i).
Gaspé Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3892 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3837 (ii).
Gaspereaux River Dredging, Total Payments for Mar. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2487 (ii).
—— Demand for Papers read by Minister (Mr. Crocket) 2489 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Gimli Wharf Extension: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Godfroy Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Grand Bend Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Grand Mechin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3900 (ii).
Grand Mère Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Grand Mira Wharf, Contract *re*, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6799 (iv).
Grande Rivière (Gaspé) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
Grande Vallée Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contracts on Kaministiquia River: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3484 (ii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3905 (ii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7496 (v).
Gulf Shore Breakwaters: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
Gull Cove Breakwater, Recommendations of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 6798 (iv).
Gulliver's Cove Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1206 (i).
Habitant River Wharf at Canning: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Haggerty's Wharf Pier Head: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Haileybury Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
Halifax Customs House, Repairs, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3672 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 574 (i).
Hampton Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 992 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: *See* general heading.
Harrington Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
K
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (v).
Hartland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 582 (i).
Hawkesbury Bridge, Ottawa River: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
Hecla Island Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 4271 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 587 (i).
Ile Verte Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
'Industry' Dredge, Total Cost, Date of Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Inverness Broad Cove Mines Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Inverness Harbour Improvements, Expenditures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4513 (iii).
Joggins Mines Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Judique Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i)
Juniper Island, Stoney Lake: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Kamouraska Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
Kemptville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Kensington Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
——— Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1783 (i), 1970 (ii),
——— Repairs, Recommendations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3736 (ii).
——— Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Debate on Budget, 2106 (ii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (v).
Kingsport Breakwater: in Com. of Sup. 995 (i).
Kingston Mills Bridge, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i).
Kingston Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7505 (v).
Kouchibouguac Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (ii).
Lachine Post Office, Tower Clock: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachine Public Building, Heating Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
Lachute Public Building, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3483 (ii); Remarks (Mr. Perley) 5689 (iii).
LaHave River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lake Aylmer Wharf, Stratford Centre: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Nipissing Roller Dams, Total Cost, Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 850 (i).
Lake Nipissing Water Level, Claims for Damages, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Works, Foreman, Charges against, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4517 (iii).
Lake Winnipeg Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).
Lameque Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
L'Ange Gardien Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3862 (ii).
Laprairie Protection Wall: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Last Mountain Lake Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4731 (iii).
Latchford Dam, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 3165 (ii).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Leitche's Creek Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Lennox Island Indian Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7847 (v).
Lennox Island, Port Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2694 (ii).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Le Petit Debarquement: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Lévis Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).
Lewes and Yukon River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4730 (iii).
Lillooet River Obstructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4298 (iii).
Lion's Head Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
Liscombe Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (v).
Litchfield Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little Anse Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).
Little River Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 995 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Little Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lockport, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Loggie, A. & R., Amounts paid *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5622 (iii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
Lower Argyle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Lunenburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
McGregor's Creek Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (ii).
McNair's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Mace's Bay Pier-head: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Main-à-Dieu Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 996 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 678 (i).
Maritime Dredging Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 849 (i).
—— Date of Work at Gaspereaux, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2928 (ii).
See 'Gaspereaux.'
Markham Post Office Building Site, Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 99 (i).
Martin Island, River Sydenham Protection Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Masset, Queen Charlotte Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Matane Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 700 (i).
Meteghan River Breakwater, Amt. (Mr. Pugsley): in Com. of Sup., 996 (i).
Michipicoten Docks, Plans, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 783 (i).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Middle Island, Port Medway Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Minnedosa Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8571 (v).
Mira River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 999 (ii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7507 (v).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
Montebello Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7510 (v).
Mud Lake Bridge, Surveys, Estimates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3294 (ii).
Murray Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2908 (ii).
Napanee River, Dredging for coming Season: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1194 (i).
Napanee River Dredging Contract, Total Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 109 (i).
Napanee River Dredging: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1022 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 1155 (i).
Natashquan Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
Naufrage Pond, Protecting Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Nechaco and Stewart River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4727 (iii).
Neguac Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3394 (ii).
New Carlisle Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
New Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
New London Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3395 (ii).
Newspapers, List *re* Advertising Public Works: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 8818; List read (Mr. Pugsley) 8825 (v).
See 'Public Works—Advertising.'
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7511, 8169 (v).
Nitinat Lake Outlet, Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 4715 (iii).
Nootka Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
North Bay Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Northport Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
North Saskatchewan River, Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4273 (iii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Absence of Crew *re* Voting: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4077 (iii).
——— Names of Employees, Total Expenses *re* Operating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4078 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Norway Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Nyanza Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
Oakville Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 4809 (iii), 6148 (iv).
Okanagan Lake Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) in Com. of Sup., 4724 (iii).
Ottawa City Buildings, Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 536 (i).
——— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
——— Departl. Buildings, Sussex St., Canadian Stone used in Construction: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5106 (iii).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 571 (i).
——— Govt. Building (Y. M. C. A.) Taxes, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1009 (i).
——— Heating and Lighting Contracts in Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1203 (i).
——— Labour Dept., Rent of Y. M. C. A. Building: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 627 (i).
——— Langevin Block, Boilers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).
——— National Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6158 (iv).
——— Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).
——— Mint, Royal, Total Cost, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 103 (i).
——— Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
——— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
———Steps and Walks to House of Commons, Matting Covering: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 448 (i).
——— Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 8170 (v).
——— Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
——— Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Ottawa River Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Ottawa River Water Storage Dams: in Com of Sup., 6162 (iv).
Owen Sound Public Building, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 166 (i).
Owl's Head Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Parker's Cove Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Parkhill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Parrsboro' Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 577 (i).
Partridge Island Quarantine Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Paspebiac Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
Petit Rocher Roadway: in Com. of Sup., 3396 (ii).
Petit Saguenay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Piché Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
Picnic Islands Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Pictou Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
Pictou Post Office, Copper Roofing, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3489 (ii).
Pine Brook Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8816 (v).
Pinckney Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Pink Rock Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3397 (ii).
See general heading.
Piper's Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1158 (i).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 704 (i).
Pointe du Chene, N.B., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Porcher Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. Com. of Sup., 8182 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Inspectors, Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6507 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 6101 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3861 (ii).
—— Total Expenditure from 1904-9: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Colborne Public Works, Total Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1967 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6126 (iv).
Port Dufferin Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Dufferin Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4082 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 1161 (i).
—— Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 4513 (iii).
Port Hope Piers: in Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
Port Joly, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
Port Maitland Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
Port Malcolm Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
Port Moody Wharf Repairs: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Port Selkirk Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Protection Piers along Lake Fronts: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 3854 (ii).
Providence Bay, Manitoulin Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (ii).
Public Works Advertising, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 8118 (v).
See 'Newspapers.'
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i).
—— Employees during Ottawa Bye-Election Campaign: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2489 (ii).
—— Engineering Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6163 (iv).
—— Engineers, Number of Residents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2293 (ii).
—— Engineers, Inspectors, &c., Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Public Works Generally in Prov. of Quebec, Uselessness of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3865 (ii).
Public Works Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
—— Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Harbour, Levis, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
——— Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Rivière aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (iii).
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
——— Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8522 (v).
——— Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).
Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).
Shawinigan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).
Shelburne Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).
Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
Souris, Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
——— Expenditure to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3676 (ii).
——— M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
——— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
Tracadie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii)., 6123 (iv).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Dept., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach Harbour, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wolfe Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Pulp Co., Chicoutimi, Tolls paid *re* Saguenay Booms: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 7871 (v).
Pulp and Pulpwood Exports from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 836 (i).
Pulpwood Exportation, Notice of Motion: Remarks (Mr. German) 3986 (iii).
Pure Foods, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Quaco Harbour Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3427 (ii).
Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
Quarantine Boat for Halifax Harbour, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 2429, 3292 (ii).
Quarantine Inspectors, Apptmts. of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
Quarantine Inspectors for Frontier, Cor. *re* Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1208 (i), 5561 (iii).
Quarantine Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Quebec, Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Quebec Barracks for Permanent Corps: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Quebec Bridge, Board of Engineers, Additions, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 103 (i).
—— Consideration to Quebec Bridge Co. *re* Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 260 (i).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s Finances at time of Collapse, Payment to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3485 (ii).
—— Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Criticism in 'Scientific American' *re* Plans: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 3390 (ii).
—— Expenditure incurred since Aug. 29th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1969 (ii).
—— Tenders for New Piers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 840 (i).
—— Total Cost, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1205 (i).
Quebec Canals, Macadamizing Roads: in Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).
Quebec Citadel Drill Shed: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec City Newspapers, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3486 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 4315 (iii).
Quebec Command, Medical Officer, Payments to, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Allen) 1789 (i).
Quebec Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
Quebec Detention Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec East (St. Roch) Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
Quebec Fisheries and Special Regulations, Licenses granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6940 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Lévis, Deepwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, Ocean Merchant Vessels, Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) 6178 (iv).
Quebec Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).

Quebec-Lévis Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carrière) 6390 (iv).
Quebec Militia Ordnance Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 823 (i).
Quebec Provincial Immigrant Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 926, 959 (i).
Quebec and St. Lawrence River, Invasion of, Protection: Ques. (Mr. J. P Turcotte) 7513 (v).
Quebec Superior Court, Montreal, Number of Cases standing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1369 (i).
Quebec Water Lots, Sale of, to Private individulas, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 430 (i).
Queen Charlotte City Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).
Queen's Own Rifles, at Aldershot, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3678 (ii).
Quesnel-Fort George Mail Service, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 6941 (iv).
Questions standing as Notices of Motions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6941 (iv).
Questions withdrawn, Procedure *re*: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1799 (i).
Rabies, Number of Cases reported to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 2926 (ii).
Rabies, Regulations by Dept. of Agriculture: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4532 (iii).
Race Tack Gambling: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Race Track Gambling B. 6: Ques. of Order *re* Translation of Evidence: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 6404; agreed to (Y. 99; N. 55) 6406 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Miller) *re* Letter of Minister of Justice, 6715 (iv).
Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 3. 4. 5, 24, 39, 48, 53, 66, 104, 145, 174.'
Railway Appeals from Ry. Commission: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Ry. Belt, B.C., Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Ry. Commission, Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Ry. Commission, Jurisdiction: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Contracts with Municipalities: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Ry. Employees, Right to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Railways and Fires: *See* 'B. No. 48,'
Ry. Labourers' Pay: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Railways, Locations of, without Consent: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Ry. Mail Service, Superintendents: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Operators' Hours: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Railway Rates, Commutation Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Railways, Speed of Trains over Level Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Ry. Subsidies from Municipalities: *See* B. No. 5.'
Railway Subsidies. *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Railway Act Amt. Bills: Delay in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 925 (i).
Railway Rep. of Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7190 (iv).
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Lancaster) to reduce Number, 8374 (v).
—— Rules *re* Bills: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8833 (v).
Railway Mail Clerks, Application *re* Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6390 (iv).
—— Recommendation of C. S. Commission *re* Standard Cars: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5106 (iii).
—— Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6958 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 678 (iv).
Railway Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378 (i).
RAILWAYS:
Alien Labourers on Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 8577 (v).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Grievances *re* Operation by G.T.Ry., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 192 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 5.'
B. C. Ry. Belt, Claims *re* Streams, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
B. C. Ry. Subsidies, Particulars *re*: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5929 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Applications *re* Renewals: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3735 (ii).
Canadian Northern Railway, Claims *re* Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. J. P. Turcotte) on M. for Sup., 8782 (v).
—— Control of other Ry. Cos., Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1207 (i).
—— Subsidies *re* Main and Branch Lines, &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 2298 (ii).
C.P.R. Teulon Branch Extension, Govt. Approval: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3067 (ii); 8820 (v).
—— Statement Read (Mr. Graham) 3206 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Number of Acres of Land: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
—— Par. in Newspapers *re* Obstructions: Remarks (Mr. MacNutt) 7187 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Level Crossings Protection, Mr. J. Murphy's Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1198 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Company's Accounts, Progress *re* Lawsuit: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
Passenger Service, Delays, Inefficiency, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 378
P.E.I. Railway: in Com. of Sup., 3063, 3102 (ii).
—— Branch thorugh New London, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Warburton) 5500 (iii).
—— Murray Harbour Branch Survey: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7518 (v).
—— Royal Junction, Surveys, &c.; M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Borden) 3170 (ii).
—— West Shore Extension, Memorials, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Richards) 5501 (iii).
Private Cars, Expenditure *re* Hauling: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).
Quebec Bridge Co., Payments by Govt., Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 628 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Min., Apptmt. of, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 2718 (ii).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 246 (i).
—— Statistical Officers: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Statistics Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1729 (i).
Railway Commission Building, Heating Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4309, 4846 (iii).
Railway Commission, Apptmt. to Vacancy *re* Decease of Mr. Greenway: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 1022 (i)
—— Ques. (Mr. Roche) 131 (i).
Railway Commission, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3131 (ii).
—— Maintenance of Board: in Com. of Sup., 3127 (ii).
—— Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).
Railway Crossings, Application to Board *re* Protection, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 277 (i).
St. John River Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
—— Rules *re* Employment of Railway Men: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8586 (v).
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1570 (i).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids; in Com. of Sup., 3472 (ii).
Rainy River Radial Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Rates of Cable Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104 and 234.'
Rechabites, Order of: *See* 'B. No. 112.'
Red Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Red River Dredging, Quantity, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7871, 8237 (v).
Red River Protection Channel: in Com. of Sup., 4266 (iii).
Reed, Ada Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Representation in H. of C. in Mar. Provs., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Warburton) 644 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Rescue Station in Coal Mining District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 3935 (ii).
Residents in H. of C.: Inquiry for Ret., 3296 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Restaurant, House of Commons, Apptmt. of Com.: M. (Mr. Pugsley) 376 (i).
Restigouche Log Driving and Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
Restigouche River Bridge, Metapedia: in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iv).
Retail Merchants' Association of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Returns, Careless Arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 522 (i).
Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4812, 5624 (iii); (Mr. Daniel) 924 (i); (Mr. Foster); 8580; (Mr. G. V. White) 8585 (v).
Reynolds, Conductor, Award of Albert Medal for Heroism: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3209 (ii).
—— Tel. from Strathcona *re* Albert Medal Award: Remarks (Mr. Murphy) 4208 (iii).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Richelieu River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (iii).
Richibucto Cape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3428, 3438 (ii).
Richibucto Wharf, Purchase, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 3838 (ii).

Richibucto Wharf, Sale of: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 7592, 7650; Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7600, 7632 (v).
Rideau Hall Furniture: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 8742 (v).
Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 8192 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8491 (v).
——— Removal of Squatters: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1368 (i).
Rifles for Cadet Corps, Number, Pattern, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 265 (i).
See 'Ross.'
Rifle Practices, Facilities *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1594 (i).
Rifle Practices for Schools of Instruction at St. John's: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1776 (i).
Rifle Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 8561 (v).
Rifle Ranges in Regina for N.W.M. Police: in Com. of Sup., 8802 (v).
Rigaud Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8814 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere aux Vases Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (iii).
Riviere du Lievre Inhabitants, Deputation *re* Claims of McLaren Co.: Ques. (Mr. Major) 1777 (i).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
——— Crossing Protection: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1778 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Riviere du Loup and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii), 8810 (v).
Riviere du Loup Wharf Renewals: in Com. of Sup., 4226 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
River Herbert and Minudie, N.S., Mail Contracts, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1380 (i).
River des Prairies, Deepening, &c., Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 114 (i).
Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6150 (iv).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
Robinson's Crossing Subway: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
Robinson, Mrs., Pets. *re* Release from Imprisonment: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 924 (i).
Rock Island Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, Inquiry for Tracing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 170 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
Rondeau Park Forest, Removal by Provl. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. McCoig) 6944 (iv).
Ross Rifles, Dates of Issue of Special Marks: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 154 (i).
——— Distribution of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Hughes) 338 (i).
Ross Rifle Marks I. and Marks II.**, Defects, Issue of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1532 (i).
——— Ques of Order *re* Answer of Minister (Mr. Monk) 1534 (i).
——— Withdrawal by Minister, 1597 (i).
Ross Rifle Mark II.**, Certificate *re* Bisley Team, Number issued, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 273 (i).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4311 (iii).
——— Number received, contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5499 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Regulations of National Rifle Ass'cn.: M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 4519 (iii).
——— Special Issue to Bisley Team, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 134 (i).
——— Submission to N. R. Ass'cn. *re* Bisley Meet: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4082 (iii).
——— Weight of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 8678 (v).
Rothwell, Johnson & Co., Cor. *re* Legal Services for N.T. Ry. Commissioners: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Meighen) 643 (i).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, Transfer from St. Johns, Que.: Ques. (Mr. Worthingon) 3491 (ii).
Royal Guardians: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Royal Military College Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
R.M.C. College Buildings, Change of Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 3169 (ii).
——— Cadets, Visit to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8584 (v).
——— Riding Establishments, Dimensions, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 381 (i).
——— Servants' Cottages, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 263 (i), 5781 (iii).
Royal Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 557 (i)
Royal Mint, Loss *re* Operation, Amount of Silver, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
See 'Mint, &c.'
Royal Society Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7865 (v).
Rules of the House: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 1536. 1545 (i).
——— Special Committee *re*: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1299, 1441 (i).
——— Progress of Committee: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 4307, 5893 (iii).
——— Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 7527 (v).

Rules of the House, Rep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8365 (v).
—— Report laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7867 (v).
Rural Free Mail Boxes, Destruction of, Punishment *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 630 (i).
—— Change in Design of Box: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1783 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery in Elgin, Number of Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 264 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, List of Routes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1380 (i).
—— Locks furnished Patrons: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 784 (i).
—— Method, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sinclair) in Com. of Sup., 6701 (iv).
—— Routes, Number in Operation, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 259 (i).
—— Routes, Stmnt. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'
Rush-Bagot Treaty, Abrogation of *re* War Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5762 (iii). 7520 (v).
See 'U. S.,' 'Warships.'
Rustico Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).
St. Andre de Kamouraska Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge and Approaches: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4263 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids, Construction *re*, Division of Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor)8239 (v).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (iv).
St. Andrews Rapids Locks, Tel. Read: in Com. of Sup., 8819 (v).
St. Andrews Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).
Ste. Anne des Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4231 (iii).
St. Catharines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
St. Charles de Caplan Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4234 (iii).
St. Charles, Man., Post Office, Establishment of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Staples) 3682 (ii).
St. Charles River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (iv).
St. Charles River Water Lots, Control by Quebec Harbour Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 129 (i).
—— Sale of to Private Individuals: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 625 (i).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 136.'
St. Clair River Sand, Lease by Ont. Govt. to Detroit Co.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5820 (iii).
Ste. Croix Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
St. Denis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard Wharfs, Pets., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 110 (i).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 591 (i).
St. John Harbour, N. B., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii), 6106 (iv).
St. John Harbour Wharfs: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).
St. John River Channel Survey, Accounts, Vouchers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 154 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 6394 (iv), 8118, 8580 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Daniel) 8737 (v).
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 3446 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Consideration by Govt. *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 122 (i).
—— Legislation *re* Operation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7292 (iv).
St. John Wharf Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (ii).
St. Johns, Que., Govt. Lands used by Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3494 (ii)
—— Military Property, Valuation, Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
St. Joseph de Sorel Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
St. Lambert Military School of Instruction, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3738 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Building: in Com of Sup., 955 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Expenditure re: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1195 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 4254 (iii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Deepening from Port Colborne to Montreal, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 841 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* Dredging at Batiscan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 841 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel at Kingston, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3833 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 8521 (v).
—— —Expenditures *re* Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3168 (ii).
St. Lawrence, North Shore Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
St. Lawrence Power Transmission Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'

St. Lawrence Power Co., Compliance with Act of Incorp.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7869, 8107, 8659 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Application: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1529 (i).
——— Original Reps. of Engineers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 5617 (iii).
St. Leonard, N.B., and Van Buren, Me., International Bridge.: in Com. of Sup., 6151 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
St. Maurice River Dredging, Grand Piles Chute, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 5931 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
St. Peters' Indian Reserve, Claims *re* Speculators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 129 (i).
——— Instruction sent to Agent *re* Surrender, M. for Copy* (Mr. Bradbury) 643 (i).
——— Instructions to Chief Justice Howell: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 2279, 2636 (ii).
——— Instructions to J. O. Lewis *re* Patents: M. for Papers* (Mr. Bradbury) 1380 (i).
——— Letter from Rainway *re* Details of Expenditure: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 1802 (i).
——— Letter of Mr. Ernest Raynor: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 1963 (ii).
——— Moneys paid *re* Surrender: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bradbury) 1022 (i).
——— Negotiations with Wm. Frank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7065 (iv).
——— Payments to E. Raynor: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 7520 (v).
——— Reps. and Accounts of Geo. Tracey: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bradbury) 1976 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Williams: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 7009, neg. (Y. 57; N. 107) 7165, 7071 (iv).
——— Investigation by A. S. Williams, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Bradbury) 3494 (ii).
——— Rep. of A. S. Williams: Inquiry for (Mr. Bradbury) 5689, 5762 (iii).
——— Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 348 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 2296 (ii).
——— Treatment *re* Surrender of, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Bradbury) 414 (i).
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).
St. Simeon-Tadousac Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 3936 (ii).
Ste. Thérèse Post Office Site, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 787 (i).
Sackville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Average Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1780 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Saguenay District, Booms, Tugs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (iii).
Sailing Directions to Captains of Steamers; Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8533 (v).
Salaries of Civil Service: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Salmon Fishery, Digby, Reports, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 1022 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2798 (ii).
Salmon River Dam and Fishing Rights: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 8535 (v).
Salmon River Post Office, Vacancy *re* Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2929 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 8177 (v).
Saskatchewan Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Saskatchewan, Provl. Subsidies Aggregate Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3167 (ii).
Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8110 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Accident, June, 1909, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyce) 4315 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 837 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
——— Iron Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 3124 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, &c., Applications *re* Subsidy, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 171 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 3833, 3945 (ii), 5278 (iii).
See 'Dry Docks.'
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3474 (ii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).
Sauvé, Mr. A., Claims for Homestead *re* S. A. Campaign: M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyer) 2032 (ii).
Savard, Lt. Col. 18th Regiment, Retention of Moneys from Capt. Talbot: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8658 (v).
——— Sale of Uniforms of 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Savings Banks Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Saw Pit Block and Span Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).
School Lands, Area sold at Regina, Fees, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 432 (i).
School Lands Sales, Conditions, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5930 (iv).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 8518 (v).

School Slates and Lead Pencils, Number imported, Valuations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 6506 (iv).

Scott, Col. B. A., defaulting payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).

——— Resignation from 18th Regiment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8109 (v).

See 'Militia.'

Scott, Mr., Expulsion from Saxony, Rep. *re* to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 1444 (i).

Scott, Elmore Walker, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 165.'

Scotsburn-Loganville Mail Contract, Apptmt. of Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 2290 (ii).

Scugog Lake, Lands flooded, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2187 (ii).

Sea Gull Dock, Name of Supt., Rate of Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 106 (i).

Seal Cove, Grand Manan Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Seal Cove Life Boat, N.B., Inspection *re* Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2146 (ii).

Sealing on Pacific, Negotiations *re* Closing, Compensations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2294 (ii).

Sec. of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 337 (i), 7767 (v).

Section 29, Twp. 9, Range 22, Applications *re* Right of Way: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Magrath) 643 (i).

Seed Control Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 16 and 55.'

Seeds and Seed Control Act: in Com. of Sup., 7389 (iv).

Seed Grain Advances, Total Sum refunded, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 629 (i).

Seed Grain Distribution, Average Price, Additional Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1002 (i).

——— to Homestead Holders, Quarter Section 24: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1195 (i).

Segregation: *See* 'Convicts.'

Sel. Standing Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 343 (i).

Selkirk Dock, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, Amt. to B.N.A. Act: Prop. Address to His Maj. (Mr. Lancaster) 1977; Neg. (Y. 23; N. 111) 2002 (ii).

Senate Amts. to Private Bills, Rule *re* Consideration: (Mr. Speaker) 5776 (iii).

Senate Chamber, Redecorating: in Com. of Sup., 8176 (v).

Senate and H. of C. Residents: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3296 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.

Senate Sessional Indemnities: in Com. of Sup., 7771 (v).

Senate Vacancies in N.S., Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 386 (i).

Senate Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. of Successor to Mr. Ferguson: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 1376 (i).

Serpentine River Navigation: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4304 (iii).

Sessional Employees, Number on 25th January last, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4514, 5001 (iii).

Sessional Messengers, Instructions given by Mr. Speaker Blanchet: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 2298 (ii).

Shawenegan Falls: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).

Shea, Bernard, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'

Shediac Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3449 (ii).

Shelburne Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1176 (i).

Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).

Shigawake Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4227 (iii).

Shippigan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (ii).

Shipping Statistics, Number of Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 444 (i).

——— Registered in Canada, Number of Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5890 (iii).

Ships, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 15.'

Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 10.'

Ships, Masters' Certificates: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Ships, Seizure of: *See* 'B. No. 138.'

Ships: *See* 'Vessels.'

Sibley Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).

Side Ladders for Box Cars, I. C. R.,: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (ii).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 8527 (v).

Silver Ore, Theft of: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Sinclair, Mr. John E., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 6506 (iv).

Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7853 (v).

Skeena River Improvements, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (iii).

Skill and King, Sale of Obscene Literature, Detention of Books: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7517 (v).

——— Letter of Attny. Gen. for Ont.: Read (Mr. Boyce) 8345 (v).

——— Par. in Can. Municipal Journal: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 7068 (iv).

——— Further Explanation: (Mr. Aylesworth) 7183 (iv).

Skinner's Cove Boat Harbour, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Paysheets, &c.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3495 (ii).

Slides and Booms—Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6149 (iv).
Snake Island Fish Hatchery, Contracts *re* Spawn: M. for Copies* (Mr. Campbell) 277 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, Breakwater, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
Sorel Yard Property Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8523 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Purchase of Tool Grinders: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
—— Slope Trimmings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3105 (ii).
Souris-Knight's Point Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2696 (ii).
Souris Life Saving Station, Ownership of Site: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7065 (iv).
Souris Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
S.A. Veteran's Association, Military Reserve: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2149 (ii).
S.A. Contingent despatched from Canada, Expenditure by Imp. Govt. and Can.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1204 (i).
S.A. Patriotic Fund, Control of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
S.A. Veterans' Scrip, Amendment *re* Issue: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 133 (i).
—— Issue of to Relatives: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 8580 (v).
—— Locations in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1590 (i).
—— Number issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
—— Number of Warrants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 107 (i).
South African Volunteers, Bounty: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
S.A. Volunteers Bounties Act, Amt. *re* Surgeons: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3732 (ii).
S.A. War, Expenditure for Imp. Govt. by Canada: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 632 (i).
S.A. War, Aud. Gen.'s Messenger re-instatement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8567 (v).
South Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
Southern Alberta Land Co., Decription of Areas under Agreement with Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1686 (i).
South Ingonish Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Sovereign Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Spallumcheen River Bank Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 4718 (iii).
Spanish Ship Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 1177 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Speedy Trial Act, Number of Cases heard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1374 (i).
Spencer's Island Lighthouse, Total Cost, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3292 (ii).
Stampers and Sorters, Salary Increases: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. on C. S. Bill, 6960 (iv).
Stanley Barracks, Purchase of Land *re*: Ques (Mr. Wallace) 2952 (ii).
Steamer for River St. Lawrence, Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 8510 (v).
SS. Passengers landing at St. John, N.B., Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7976, 8477 (v).
—— Letter of Supt.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 8579 (v).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 231.'
Stenographers for Committees, Emplymt. of, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tolmie) 8677 (v).
Stewart Wharf, Portland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).
Stipendiary Magistrates in N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8799 (v).
Stone Industry Protection: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) on M. for Sup., 7330 (iv).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8189 (v).
Strikes, Investigation of: *See* 'B. Nos. 23 and 198.'
Subsidies: *See* 'Bounties, &c.'
Subsidy to Can. Northern Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 227.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 226.'
Sub-Target Rifle Machines, Number purchased, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i).
Sullivan & Langdon, Messrs., Amounts paid *re* Public Works, Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1974 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 2150 (ii).
Summerside Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Summerside Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 580 (i).
Superior Court, Additional Judges in Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 332 (i).
See 'Judges,' &c.
Supply Bills: *See* 'Bills Nos. 173, 196 and 235'
SUPPLY—
Committee:
Adulteration of Food:
General Vote, 1345 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 7284 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 7373 (iv), 7763 (v).
Cold Storage for Food Products, 7362 (iv)

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—*Con.*
Cold Storage for Fruit, 7383 (iv).
Dairying Industry, 7362 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 7381 (iv).
Exhibitions, 5728 (iii), 7389 (iv).
Experimenal Farms, 5724 (iii), 7333, 7392 (iv), 7764 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 7377 (iv).
Fumigation Stations, 7380 (iv).
Grant to Charlottetown Exhibition, 7766 (v).
Health of Animals, 7755 (v).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 7380 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, 7748 (v).
Patent Record, 7371 (iv).
Public Works Health Act, 7392 (iv)
Seed Control Act, 7389 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 7380 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7391 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 5607 (iii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 219 (i), 7764 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 7768 (v).
Customs, 243 (i).
Depts., Generally, 8811 (v).
External Affairs, 337 (i).
Finance, 335 (i).
Indian Affairs, 344, 414 (i)
Inland Revenue, 229 (i).
Interior, 7767, 8193 (v).
Justice, 253 (i).
Labour, 235 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 250 (i).
Militia, 7767 (v).
Mines, 336 (i).
Mounted Police, 415 (i).
Naval Service, 8514 (v).
Post Office, 5607 (iii), 6650, 6675 (iv).
Public Works, 333 (i).
Railways and Canals, 246 (i).
Secretary of State, 337 (i), 7767 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 415 (i), 8808 (v).
Customs:
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 1358 (i), 8803, 8807 (v).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 8488 (v)
Timber Protection, 8491 (v).
Water Power Investigations, 8496 (v)
Excise:
Extra Duty at Distilleries, 1331, 1333, 1336 (i).
L. A. Frechette, Translation, 1343 (i)
Methylated Spirits, 1344 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 1344 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1331 (i).
Stamps, 1342 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 1341 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Electric Power Export, 1356 (i)
Salaries, &c., 1354-5 (i).
Travelling Expenses, 1356 (i).
Fisheries:
B. C. Claim *re* Fish Licenses, 8552 (v).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 8544 (v).
Cold Storage for Bait, &c., 8545 (v).
Dog Fish Works, 8545 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con*
Committee—*Con.*
Fisheries—*Con.*
Fish-breeding Establishments, 5750 (iii), 8540 (v).
Fresh Fish, Transportation, &c., 5747 (iii).
Intelligence Bureau, 8547 (v).
Legislation, &c., 8543 (v).
Licenses, 8547 (v).
Oyster Culture, 8545 (v).
Protection Service, 5752 (iii).
Provincial Rights, &c., 8546 (v).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 8536 (v).
Geological Survey:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 7769 (v).
Explorations, &c., 8555 (v).
General Expenses, 8556 (v).
Maps, &c., 8556 (v).
Mines Branch, Ore Deposits, 8553 (v).
Peat Bog at Alfred, 8553 (v).
Storage of Explosives, 8556 (v).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 8556 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Depy. Administrator's Salary, 5615 (iii).
General Expenses, 8487 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 8195, 8494 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 5729 (iii), 8207 (v).
W. T. R. Preston, Rent, &c., 8213 (v)
Indians:
British Columbia, 7858 (v).
Indian Education, 7861 (v).
Man. and N. W. T., &c., 7848, 7858 (v)
New Brunswick, 7846 (v).
Nova Scotia, 7845 (v).
Ont. and Que., 7835 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 7846 (v).
Justice:
Salary to N. W. T. Magistrate, 8799 (v).
Supreme Court, 8798 (v).
Labour Dept.:
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 8799 (v).
Technical Education Commission, 8800 (v).
Legislation:
Indemnity to Absent Members, 7771 (v).
Library, 8801 (v).
Senate, 7771 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 8525 (v).
Ice Breaking, 8526 (v).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers, 8528 (v).
Pensions to Pilots, 8527 (v).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 8523 (v).
Signal Service, 8527 (v).
Wireless Stations, 8513 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
General Vote, 5690, 5711 (iii), 8808-8810, 8811 (v).
Militia:
Annual Drill, 8564 (v)
Engineers' Services, 8569 (v).
Grant to 65th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
5th Regt. Armoury, 8570 (v).
Gratuities, 8571 (v).
Maintenance of Properties, 8571 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Monument at Stoney Creek, 8575 (v)
Ordnance, &c., 8556 (v).
Pay and Allowances, 8573 (v).
Salaries, &c., 8573 (v).
Topographical Survey, 8574 (v).
Minor Revenues:
General Vote, 1358 (i).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Handicrafts Guild, 7866 (v).
Conservation Commission, 7866 (v).
Naturalization Act, 7865 (v).
Royal Mint, 7866 (v).
Royal Society, Printing, &c., 7865 (v)
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8802 (v).
Rifle Range, Regina, 8802 (v).
Naval Service:
Construction, Maintenance, &c., 8495 (v).
Fisheries Protection Service, 8509 (v).
Hydrographic Surveys, 8511 (v).
Steamer to replace 'La Canadienne,' 8510 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Cattle Inspection, 8519 (v).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 8514 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 8521 (v)
Rewards for Saving Life, 8515 (v).
Schools of Navigation, 8518 (v).
Tidal Service, 8512 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 8519 (v).
Post Office:
Additional Amount, 8818 (v).
Mail Service, 5752 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 7865 (v).
R. G. Mercer, Appmnt., 5755 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 7863 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Astronomical Observatory, 416, 536 (i).
Eastern Block, 571 (i).
New Buildings, 548 (i), 7166 (iv),
Royal Mint, 557 (i).
Testing Building, &c., 572 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 563 (i).
Harbours and Rivers:
Port Arthur, &c., Improvements, 5729 (iii); 6101 (iv).
Quebec Harbour, 6102 (iv).
Red River Improvements, 6103 (iv), 8819 (v).
St. John Harbour, 6106 (iv).
Tiffin Harbour, 5746 (iii); 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Harbour, 6122 (iv).
Victoria, Harbour, B.C., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 5747 (iii); 6123 (iv).
Marine Department:
Permanent Piers, 8523 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 8521 (v)
Dredging Plant, 8523 (v).
Sorel Property, 8523 (v).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia, 8190-91 (v)
Generally 596 (i); 8191 (v).
Manitoba, 8182-8185 (v).
New Brunswick, 580-596 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 573-579 (i).
Ontario, 597 (i); 7173-7181 (iv); 7495 8169-8181 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 580 (i).
Quebec, 661-704, 823-833, 926-975 (i); 8814 (v).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 8191-93 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 5607 (iii); 8185-8189 (v).
Dredging:
British Columbia, 6138, 6141 (iv).
Manitoba, 6137 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 4780, 5608, 5716 (iii).
New Plant, 4738, 4755-4780 (iii).
Ont. and Que., 4809 (iii), 6124 (iv).
Repairs, 4731, 5716 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia, 4276-4305, 4715-4730, 5608 (iii).
Generally, 4731 (iii).
Manitoba, 4254-4272 (iii).
Maritime Provinces, 3452 (ii).
New Brunswick, 2697-2710, 3391-3430, 3438-3452 (iii).
Northwest Territories, 4276 (iii).
Nova Scotia, 976-1001, 1158-1192 (i); 8816, (v).
Ontario, 3455-3475, 3833-3862 (ii), 5608 (iii), 8818 (v).
Prince Edward Island, 2693-2697 (ii).
Quebec, 3862-3872, 3875-3914 (ii), 4210-4254 (iii).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 4272-4276 (iii).
Yukon Territory, 4730 (iii).
Miscellaneous:
Compensation, S. J. Dale, 6167 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6163 (iv).
Lake Nipissing Dams, 6164 (iv).
Memorial *re* Telephone at Brantford, 6161 (iv).
Sir Leonard Tilley, 6161 (iv).
Monument, Late Hon. Geo. Brown, 6158 (iv).
Late Sir L. H. Lafontaine and R. Baldwin, 6160 (iv).
Late D'Arcy McGee, 6159 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 6158 (iv).
Richelieu River Survey, 5720 (iii).
River St. John International Commission, 6163 (iv).
Salaries, Engineers' Branch, &c., 5720 (iii), 6163 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 5719 (iii).
Upper Ottawa, Storage Dams, 6162 (iv).
Roads and Bridges:
Chapeau Bridge, 6150 (iv).
Courtenay Bay, Aboiteau, 6150 (iv).
Dom. Bridges, Generally, 6152 (iv).
International Bridge, St. Leonard, N.B., 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Hawkesbury, 6151 (iv).
Interprovincial Bridge, Metapedia, 6152 (iv).
Ottawa City Bridges, 6152 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice District, 6149 (iv).
Saguenay District, 6149 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 5614 (iii), 6156-58 (iv).
Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 6153 (iv).
Moosejaw-Wood Mountain, &c., 6154 (iv).
Sask and Alta., 5614 (iii), 6154 (iv).
Quarantine:
Steamers, 7392 (iv), 7766 (v).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Chambly, 3122 (ii).
Cornwall, 3123 (ii).
Galops, 3124 (ii).
Lachine, 3103 (ii).
Quebec Canals, 3122, 3123 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, 3106, 3124 (ii), 5616 (iii).
Soulanges, 3105 (ii).
Statistical Officers, 3131 (ii).
Trent, 3106, 3126 (ii).
Welland, 3120 (ii), 8821 (v).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 3127 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Car, 3127 (ii).
Polytechnic School, Montreal, 8822 (v).
Railway Commission, 3127 (ii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Railway, 3067 (ii), 8819 (v).
Intercolonial Railway, 2872-2887, 2933-2949, 3091 (ii).
National Transcontinental Railway, 3065 (ii), 5229, 5246 (iii), 8352 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3063-3065, 3102 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, 3070 (ii), 8821 (v).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 8810 (v).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 5714 (iii), 8810 (v).
Old Age Pension Fund, 8811 (v).
Salaries, &c., 5713 (iii).
Concurrence:
Trent Canal, Construction, 5602 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Ry. Commissions, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4518 (iii).

Supreme Court, Purchase of Law Books: in Com. of Sup., 8798 (v).

Surrey, B.C., Land Sales, Dates and Terms: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).

Surveys in Twp. Nine, Man., Alterations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 272 (i).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number contracted for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1535 (i).

Suzerainty to England, Report of Prime Minister at Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2289 (ii).

See 'Privilege.'

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Medical Attendant: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7849 (v).

Swim's Point, Approach to Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

Swine Commission, Report of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2429 (ii).

—— Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5782 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Broder) 5689 (iii).

Sydenham River: *See* 'Martin Island.'

Sydney Free Mail Delivery: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 1022 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Maddin) 3137 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 1014 (i).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Sydney Mines Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

Tadousac Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).

Talbot, Capt. Réné, Payment *re* Allowances for 1907: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 6800 (iv).

Tariff Changes Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 233.'

Tariff Commission, 1906, Date of Meeting at Middleton, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1020 (i).

Tariff with U.S., Importations, &c.: Inquiry for (R. L. Borden) 6100 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5891 (iii).

—— Intermediate Tariff: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5892 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U.S.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lennox) 5759 (iii).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 5942; Resolutions laid on Table, 5967 (iv).

—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5278 (iii), 6100 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5690 (iii).

—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5762 (iii), 5932 (iv).

Technical Education: in Com. of Sup., 8800 (v).

—— Commission *re* Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 1023; Amt. (Mr. King) to adjn. Debate, 1076; agreed to (Y. 78; N. 56) 1098 (i).

—— Replies from Provl. Premiers: Read (Mr. King) 3160 (ii).

—— Postponement of Debate, Letter from Mr. King to Hamilton Board of Trade: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 3208 (ii).

—— Letters of Premiers: Read (Mr. King) on M. for Sup., 2661 (ii).

Telegraphs, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 104, 105 and 234.'
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii), 6156 (iv).
Telegraph Lines between L'Anse St. Jean and St. Alexis, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Telegraph Lines, North Shore, St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 6153 (iv).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).
Telephones, &c.: *See* 'B. Nos. 104, 145.'
Telephone Memorial at Brantford, Contribution: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Temporary Loans Outstanding on March 1, 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8237 (v).
—— since beginning of present Session, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i). *See* 'Finance.'
Tenecape Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
Tents, Militia, Average Cost, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1779 (i). *See* 'Militia.'
'The Wharfs' Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Thornbury Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
Thornton, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 626 (i).
Three-Fathom Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (iii).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup.. 8512 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5746 (iii), 6121 (iv).
Tignish Protection Piers: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Tilley, Sir Leonard, Memorial at St. John, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Tobacco, Canadian, Encouragement of: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 1342 (i).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Expenditure *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Rhodes) 3495 (ii). *See* 'Boat,' &c.
Toney River Channel Protection: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Tonnage Tax imposed on Can. Vessels on Great Lakes by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1530 (i).
Topographical Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8574 (v).
Toronto Barracks, Disposal of Site on Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3167 (ii).
Toronto Central Terminal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Toronto Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Toronto and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Toronto Harbour, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 4250 (iii).
—— Extension, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2929 (ii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3852 (iii)
—— Payments to John E. Russell: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3735 (ii).
Toronto Sub-Post Offices, Ownership of Building, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3677 (ii).
Toronto 'World,' Ownership by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5993 (iv).
Tourists' Post Offices, Number temporarily established, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 170 (i)
Tracadie and D'Arcy Island Quarantine Lazarettos: in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv.)
Tracadie Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 596 (i).
Trachoma in Regina Schools: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 3390 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 621 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 8808 (v).
—— Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Trade Commissioners, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Trade Negotiations with U. S., Par. in New York 'Sun': Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6393 (iv).
Trade Relations: *See* 'U. S. Trade,' 'Tariff.'
Trade Representatives in Germany, Apptmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 5278 (iii). *See* 'Germany.'
Train Rules Code, Approval of Ry. Commission: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 8834 (v).
Traynor's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (ii).
Treaties with U. S., Number, Dates, Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 268 (i).
Tremblay, Mr. J., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Girard) 8836 (v).
Trent Canal, Bradford Channel, Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 384 (i).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3106 (ii).
—— Damage to Property: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Expenditure on Sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 446 (i).

Trent Canal, Floods in Twp. of Asphodel, Payment of Damages, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3733 (ii).
—— Floods, Charges against L. F. Clarry: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4714, 5209 (iii), 6096 (iv).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3126 (ii).
Trent Canal, Newmarket: M. (Mr. Campbell) to reduce vote, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 5604 (iii).
—— Survey, Rep. *re* Kempenfeldt Bay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 169 (i).
—— Water Powers, Control by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Arthurs) 2185 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
Troy, Inverness, N. S., Postmaster, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7288 (iv).
Trusts, Investigation of: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Trust and Loan Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, Govt. Assistance, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1380 (i).
Turtle Mountain Reserve, Homesteading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 8492 (iv).
—— Tree Planting, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5932. 6181 (iv).
Tusket Wedge Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i)
Union Life Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
U. S. Canals: *See* 'New York State.'
U. S. Emigration from Canada, Rep. of American Consul at Kingston: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 431 (i).
U. S. Govt. Officials, Interference with Travelling Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6942 (iv).
U. S. Minimum Tariff, Decision *re* Canadian Exports: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3058 (ii).
—— Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2153, 3480 (ii).
U. S. Tariff Negotiations *re* Canada: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4712 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'
U. S., Trade Relations with, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8742 (v).
U. S. Training Vessels in Great Lakes, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 132 (i).
—— Passage through Canals, Deptl. Consultations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 108 (i).
—— M. for O. C.'s (Mr. Edwards) 135 (i).
—— Violation of Rush-Bagot Treaty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 103 (i).
See 'War Vessels,' &c.
U. S. War Vessels on Great Lakes: M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 791 (i).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Upper Washabuck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1179 (i).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178, 8185 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
Vancouver Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6122 (iv).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Vaudreuil Cove Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (iii).
Veilleue, Charles, Payments to: Ques. (Mr Girard) 8836 (v).
Ventilation of House of Commons: in Com of Sup., 8170 (v).
Vessels, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Vessels, Reporting of to Customs: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Veteran Land Grants, Number taken Up, Assignments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 447 (i).
See 'S. A. Veterans.'
Veterans of 1866-7, Land Grants to: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2188 (ii).
Veterinary Service, B. C., Vacancies, Examinations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 132 (i).
Victoria Harbour, B.C., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6123 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5747 (iii), 6123 (iv).
Victoria Immigration Building, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 1369 (i).
Victoria Immigration Building, Number of Inmates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Victoria Jubilee Bridge Highway, Emigrants' Burying Ground, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 5889 (iii).
Victoria Museum Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 8556 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 5711 (iii).
Vitrified Sewer Pipe Imports, Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 3931 (ii).
Volunteer Bounty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 87 and 163.'
Voters' Lists for Thunder Bay, &c., Total Cost of Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 629 (i).
Wakefield, W. A., Emplymt. by Immigration Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 5890 (iii).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'

Walkerville Post Office, Appropriation for: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1373 (i).
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Walton, Mr. George, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3734 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5501 (iii).
War Ships on Great Lakes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8737 (v).
See 'Rush-Bagot,' 'U. S.,' &c.
War Vessels, Negotiations *re* Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2713 (ii).
—— O. C.'s *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2144 (ii).
War Vessels on Great Lakes, Rep. to Imp. Govt. *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1367 (i).
See 'Rush-Bagot.'
Warwick, Thos. G., Payment *re* Value of Improvements on Entry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 275 (i).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8178 (v).
Water Powers in B. C. Ry. Belt: *See* 'B. No. 187.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: *See* B. Nos. 84, 115, 119, 143, 150 and 185.'
Water Supply for Dom. Buildings, Experiment by Govt. *re* Purifying: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 130 (i).
Waterways Commitee, Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 3390 (ii).
Waterways International Commission Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 209 (i).
Waterways Treaty, Announcement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2713 (ii), 4403 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. R. L. Borden) 109 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3481 ii), 6100 (iv).
—— Treaty and Georgian Bay Canal, Privs. of U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 3159 (ii).
Waterways Treaty, Papers laid on Table, 5932 (iv).
—— Printing of Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7187 (iv).
—— on Order for Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1536 (i).
—— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1802 (i).
Watha Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 843 (i).
Watson, R. J. Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Burrell) 2488 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Budget (Mr. Fielding) 1446 (i).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Fisher) to report Progress, 2277 (ii).
Ways and Means, Procedure *re* Supply Bill: M. (Mr. Fielding) 6397 (iv).
—— U.S. Tariff Negotiations, M. for Com., 5942 (iv).
See 'U. S. Trade Relations.'
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Weekly Report, 'La Revue Hedomadaire,' French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 3482 (ii).
Weighing of Cargoes: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Weights and Measures Inspection, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
Welland Canal, Expenditure *re* Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1968 (ii).
—— Land Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3120 (ii).
—— Route through Lot 50, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 8660 (v).
—— Surveys *re* New Canal: in Com. of Sup., 8821 (v).
See 'Canals.'
West Advocate Wharf: in Com. of Sup.,1179 (i).
West Baccaro Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
West Dublin Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1180 (i).
Western Canada Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Western Grain Trade: *See* 'Grain,' &c.
Westminster District, Land leased to B.C. Mills, Timber and Trading Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2291 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Westport Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Weyburn Security Bank: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Weymouth Port Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4788, 5718 (iii), 6131 (iv).
Wharfs, Public, Number leased under Act of 1909: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 260 (i).
Wharfs transferred from P.W. Dept. to Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
Wharfs transferred to P.W. Depts., Revenue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4228 (iii).
Wheat, Oats, &c., Average Production of Spring and Fall, 1909: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5777 (iii).
'Whig,' Kingston, Payments to by Govt. *re* Printing: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1778 (i), 2428 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Edwards) 3494 (ii).

Whitby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 8818 (v).
Whitby Post Office, Total Cost, Original Estimate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3486 (ii).
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8179 (v).
Whitford, Mr. James, Issue of Scrip, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 6935 (iv).
Wiarton Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 3475 (ii).
'William Joliffe,' Str., Date of Charter for Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 2187 (ii).
Williamshead Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 8191 (v).
Williamsville Post Office, Revenue, Pets. *re* Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7287 (iv).
Winding-up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Windsor Branch Ry., Termination of Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1370 (i).
Windygates Post Office, Pet. *re* Change, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2930, 3168 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 4315 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6394 (iv), 8118 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) 8364 (v).
Winnipeg Barracks, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1777 (i).
Winnipeg Beach, Protection Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 7289 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (v).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8184 (v).
Winnipeg Immigration Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
Winnipeg Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 8185 (v).
—— Closing on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 3134 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Answer, 3484, 3672 (ii).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 4315 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Winnipeg Wharfs, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3864 (ii).
Wire Fencing, I. C. R., Tenders for 1909, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1974 (ii).
Wireless Stations in Canada, 7395 (v).
—— Erection of: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
Wireless Telegraphy on Great Lakes: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 3135 (ii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Wolfe's Island Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i), 6164 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
Wood Permits to Residents for Fuel Purposes in Twp. 50, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4079 (iii).
See 'Hay.'
Wool and Yarns, Quantity exported from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1376 (i).
Woollen Industry, Reps. of Mr. Costello and W. G. Clarke: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3737 (ii).
Wrecks on Lake Erie, Negligence *re* Signals: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1597 (i).
—— Stmnt. read (Mr. Brodeur) 1684 (i).
Wrecking Plant for B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
Wrecking Plant on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts: M. for Cor. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 644 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 444 (i).
Yakoun River Obstruction, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
Yamaska and Richelieu Rivers, Surveys *re* Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5720, 5724 (iii).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
Year Book, Amount of Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1020 (i).
Yukon Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8193 (v).
Yukon Govt., Administration: in Com. of Sup., 5615 (iii), 8487 (v).
Yukon Territory, Goods admitted free of Duty, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 3492 (ii).
Zinc Ores, Bounty on: *See* 'B. No. 182.'